EDUCATION COMMITTEE

13 June 2017

M I N U T E S

Present:
Professor Anthony Smith (Chair);
Ms Mehjabin Ahmed; Dr Tracey Allen; Ms Wendy Appleby; Dr Simon Banks; Ms Halima Begum; Dr Ben Clifford; Mr Mark Crawford; Dr Julie Evans; Professor Dilly Fung; Ms June Hedges; Dr Christine Hoffman; Dr Arne Hofmann; Professor Tim McHugh; Ms Blathnaid Mahony; Dr Helen Matthews; Mr Derfel Owen; Professor Norbert Pachler; Dr Mike Rowson; Dr Hazel Smith; Professor Eva Sorensen; Ms Olga Thomas; Professor Angie Wade and Ms Susan Ware.

In attendance: Dr Ann Griffin; Mr David Lloyd; Dr Jenny Marie; Ms Melanie Mullin, Mr Darren Payne; Mr Simon To; Professor David Waters, Ms Anniina Wikman; Mr Oliver Wilton and Mr Rob Traynor (Acting Secretary).

Apologies were received from: Dr Clare Goudy; Dr Fiona Strawbridge and Ms Lizzie Vinton

Key to abbreviations	
ARQASC	Academic Regulations and Quality Assurance Sub-Committee
AS	Academic Services
EC	Extenuating Circumstances
EdCom	Education Committee
FTC	Faculty Teaching Committee
FTF	Faculty Tutor Forum
HEFCE	Higher Education Funding Council for England
HEI	Higher Education Institution
HESA	Higher Education Statistics Agency
IOE	Institute of Education
LSA	Late Summer Assessments
MLA	Master of Landscape Architecture
NSS	National Student Survey
PMAP	Programme and Module Approval Panel
PoT	Peer Observation of Teaching
SSCC	Staff Student Consultative Committee
StARs	Student Academic Representatives
TEF	Teaching Excellence Framework
UCLU	UCL Union
VPESA	Vice-Provost (Education and Student Affairs)

PART I: PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

61   MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING
        (EdCom Minutes 49-60, 25.04.17)

61.1   **Approved** – the Minutes of the meeting held on 25 April 2017.

62   MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

62A   Anonymous Marking
        (EdCom Minute 38, 02.03.17)

62A.1   Faculties had previously been asked to consider a draft policy on anonymous marking (EDCOM 3-06 (16-17) and feedback their comments and suggestions for further discussion at EdCom.

62A.2   **Agreed** – that this item will be added to the July EdCom meeting for discussion. Faculty Tutors are asked to consider three key questions for the draft policy in order to help the discussion:
        i.   The extent of compliance with the policy across UCL.
        ii. Any barriers to implementation.
        iii. Whether the recent amendments help to resolve some of these barriers.
        The draft policy to be re-circulated with the EdCom minutes.

                                                    Action – Faculty Tutors and the Acting Secretary

63   CHAIR'S ACTION TAKEN SINCE THE LAST MEETING

63A   Teaching Excellence Framework Update

63A.1   The Chair reported that the release of the TEF results had been delayed by HEFCE due to the continuing election purdah. The VPESA office will circulate communications on UCL's reaction to the results once they are released[1].

63B   National Student Survey

63B.1   The Chair reported that the UCL final NSS response rate was 49.4%, below the 50% threshold required for publication. The Chair had discussed the UCL response rate with senior HEFCE officials who recognised that 2017 had been an extraordinarily difficult year for the NSS due to the NUS boycott. Their approach to publication will be to publish subjects which had reached 50%, whilst considering how to publish the institutional level results below 50% in a robust and fair way. This might include caveats on the data's reliability. HEFCE will confirm how affected HEIs' data will be published in early July. It was noted that 10 HEIs' overall response rates were below the 50% threshold for publication, including Oxford and Cambridge.

63B.2   The Chair further reported that the VPESA office had conducted modelling of the response rate data by subjects and departments to project likely satisfaction scores on the basis that student responses were the same as 2016. It was noted that some subject groups which had provided high satisfaction scores in the past, such as the Medical School, had markedly lower response rates this year and their absence would affect the overall UCL scores. It was projected that the Overall Satisfaction, Teaching and the Assessment and Feedback scores were likely to decline by 1%, though the score for Academic Support was expected to improve. HEFCE had also commented on the new questions in the survey, which were piloted in some HEIs last year, but generally received lower satisfaction scores, though was not released publically. This might also depress the Overall Satisfaction scores in the 2017 NSS, albeit a concern for the whole sector and not just UCL. The Chair was keen for this advanced information on the NSS to be shared with colleagues across UCL and noted that much work had gone into promoting the survey across the university this year, in difficult circumstances. Staff should therefore not be too disheartened with the outcome but a wider discussion of response rates would be helpful.

---

[1] The TEF results were released on 21 June 2017 and the results and communications can be accessed through the Teaching and Learning webpages: https://www.ucl.ac.uk/teaching-learning/teaching-excellence-framework-tef-2017

63C   Attendance Monitoring

63C.1   The Chair gave advanced notice of an item for discussion for EdCom early in the next session. This was to consider the current Attendance Monitoring policy and whether the rules around this (students must attend at least 70% of lectures) were still appropriate or fit for purpose. Consideration might also be given to investing in technology to monitor student attendance more effectively. It was suggested that it would be helpful for this item to be considered by the Faculty Tutor Forum first, to then report on its discussion to EdCom.

63C.2   **Agreed** – that the FTF discuss attendance monitoring early next session and then to report the key points of the discussion to EdCom, for further consideration.

Action- the Registrar/Chair of the FTF and the Acting Secretary to note

---

PART II: MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

---

64   LATE SUMMER ASSESSMENT AND CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE 2017-18 REGULATIONS

64.1   **Received** – <u>EDCOM 5-01 (16-17)</u>, the draft LSA and Consequences of Failure 2017-18 regulations introduced by the Deputy Director of Academic Services.

64.2   **Reported:** the AS Director and Deputy Director, with the Chair of ARQASC, reported that:

   a) The draft regulations had undergone extensive consultation and discussion through a series of well attended faculty meetings, a UCL-wide Town Hall event and written submissions. Many staff and students contributed and a range of views were received.

   b) Lengthy discussions were also held by AQRASC and its members, including student representatives, on the often diverse views and arguments received on the proposed changes to the regulations. ARQASC had come to a considered view on the proposals and these were presented in the draft paper for EdCom's consideration and approval.

   c) The ARQASC Chair thanked his UCL colleagues and students for their contributions and the AS officers for their effective management of the consultation, collation of the responses and contributions and production of the paper.

64.3   The following points were noted in the discussion:

   a) *Consequences of Failure: Resits and Repeats* - the key principle informing the regulations was that a small level of failure should be managed by either condonement or by resits, but larger levels of failure would require a student to repeat the year. Hence the students that failed more than 60 credits would have to repeat the year as they would be trailing too much academic failure to progress to the next session. Previously, such students were only required to resit the individual components they had failed, but this often led to further academic failure later in their studies. Repeating the year with tuition and resitting all components within the modules would ensure that they were better equipped to progress. It was noted that students taking the LSA resits (i.e. who had failed less than 60 credits), would only resit the failed component and not the assessments which they had passed. Members noted the concern from respondents to the consultation that requiring students failing more than 60 credits to repeat with tuition may exclude some students on financial grounds. However, it was noted that there was significant risk attached to offering students with higher volumes of failure the opportunity to take LSAs as only two attempts were allowed and further failure meant termination of their studies. After lengthy discussion, members agreed to allow very well defined discretion for Exam Boards to offer the choice for students to resit, though careful advice should be given to those students of the implications for further failure and the potential difficulties of managing a high volume of reassessment.

   b) *Capping of Marks* – resits and repeat year marks will be capped at the pass mark. The student representatives expressed concern that capping the marks would be unfair on the

repeat year students as they faced other consequences for academic failure including the substantial costs of extra tuition fees, the additional effort to repeat their study and the delays to completion of their degrees. The argument was acknowledged that wealthier students could be advantaged if modules were not capped by playing the system to improve their overall results (i.e. they would not be constrained by the cost of doing so), but the student representatives believed that this would be only a very small number of students and that punishing the majority of repeat year students with the cap on marks was unfair. The prevailing view of ARQASC and EdCom was that this needed to be an academic decision, not based on the consequences of additional costs to students etc. It was further noted that students in difficulties were in any case covered by the EC regulations and that these rules applied to academic failure only. Parity was also essential with the students who did not fail – if there was no cap, students with a more serious level of failure would be rewarded if they later repeated and substantially improved their marks. It would thus be unfair to allow these students a second chance of achieving better marks than their peers who had passed first time by working harder and engaging more with their programmes. It was also noted that if resits were capped, repeat marks must also be.

c) *Condonement* - diverse views on condonement of marks for marginal failure were received, though ARQASC's recommended that condonement should be used before resits were offered. It felt that although students resitting may achieve improved marks, this was often minimal and it would better to condone the failed mark so that they progressed without having to resit. It was noted that there were strong feelings in Brain Sciences on PGT condonement and that many students would prefer to resit as condoned marks had a larger impact on their degrees. There was a common view that condonement makes more sense at UG level. However, it was noted that the PGT rules were already UCL policy and it was not proposed to alter them in the draft policy, though suggested that the Academic Manual make this clearer. The possibility of condoning marks down to zero had also elicited strong views, but was considered necessary to enable maximum flexibility in applying condonement. In practice it was likely to be rarely used and noted that a student would need to perform very strongly in their other modules in order to achieve the sufficient mean overall grade to progress

d) *Deferred Assessment* - it was suggested that the two year maximum for completion of the deferral could be punitive for those students on a flexible 5 year programme (often with work commitments), fairly common in the Faculty of Brain Sciences or those with mental health problems. Some of the returning students are completing projects and just need supervision, not teaching, though returning to study after more than two years could prove difficult for many students. A small number of requests for suspensions of regulations had come to the attention of AS in this area.

Agreed - to consider the rules for deferred assessment in the next iteration of the regulations.

e) *Communicating the changes to the regulations* - the regulations will be published in the Academic Manual and a briefing message sent to faculties and departments. ARQASC will also consider the communications around this at its next meeting. It was suggested that informing departmental staff meetings of the revised regulations would be helpful. The Deputy Director of AS invited further suggestions from members for wider dissemination across UCL.

64.4   **Approved** – EDCOM 5-01 (16-17), the Late Summer Assessments and Consequences of Failure 2017-18 regulations. The Chair thanked AQRASC and the EdCom members and noted that the approved regulations were less punitive for students and more enabling, whilst meeting the student request for LSAs and ensuring UCL's academic standards.

64.5   **Agreed** – that members forward any suggestions for communicating the changes to the approved regulations to AS.

Action – EdCom Members

65   **UPDATES TO THE ACADEMIC MANUAL 2017-18: CHAPTER 7 ACADEMIC PARTNERSHIPS FRAMEWORK**

65.1   **Received** – <u>EDCOM 5-02 (16-17)</u> the draft Academic Manual Chapter 7: Academic Partnerships Framework presented by the Senior Policy Advisor (Academic Partnerships).

65.2   **Reported** – the Senior Policy Advisor (Academic Partnerships) reported that:
   a)   The draft policy had been considered and approved by ARQASC and by RDC, the latter focussing on the proposed new regulations for split-site PhDs.
   b)   The changes to the regulations were largely operational, incorporating amendments to definitions and processes. New annexes included the principles for the management of study abroad.
   c)   The changes were based on the feedback received from a consultation with faculties, staff and appropriate committees. They were based on the operation of the regulations in practice, initially introduced last year, rather than major policy changes to them.

65.3   **Approved** – <u>EDCOM 5-02 (16-17)</u>, the draft Academic Manual Chapter 7: Academic Partnerships Framework.

<div align="right"><u>Action: the Senior Policy Advisor (Academic Partnerships) to note</u></div>

66   **PEER DIALOGUE SCHEME AMENDMENT**

66.1   **Received** –<u>EDCOM 5-03 (16-17)</u>, a paper outlining amendments to the Peer Dialogue Scheme introduced by Dr Jenny Marie, Senior Teaching Fellow, UCL Arena Centre for Research–based Education.

66.2   **Reported: –** Dr Marie outlined two proposals for amendments to the Peer Dialogue scheme:
(i) An additional option allowing staff to reflect on their educational practice with students who they do not teach and
(ii) Extending Option A to allow for a wider diversity of educational practice to be observed. The first option was based on a UCL ChangeMakers' project (Student Reviewers of Teaching scheme) which enables students to engage in dialogue with other teachers on educational practice. Outcomes could be shared with SSCCs which would widen student understanding of teaching. It was proposed that the ChangeMakers' scheme would continue to run and link into peer dialogue, should academic staff wish, but staff could also engage with students outside the scheme. The second amendment was based on a successful pilot allowing for not just observation of teaching, but other options such as learning materials, projects and feedback, which may be more attractive to staff. It was noted that the guiding principle of peer dialogue was that it is a professional development tool, rather than a managerial tool.

66.3   The following points were noted in the discussion:
   a)   It was queried how outputs would be measured under the proposed amendments. A short record was kept by departments of the engagement between staff under the old PoT policy. It was not clear how departments would be able to do so under the amended policy. It was also not clear how the policy would identify poor performance, as well as best practice, so that it could be improved. The mechanism for doing this was absent from the proposed policy.
   b)   It was noted that peer dialogue and PoT before it were never intended to be used as a managerial tool for identifying and reporting poor performance; this should be picked up through other means such as monitoring student feedback in staff appraisals. It was noted that the Peer Dialogue scheme would likely be viewed with suspicion by staff should it be used in this way and EdCom noted strong views by some members who felt that this would be an unacceptable use of the scheme.
   c)   The PoT policy had stipulated that a simple record of the engagement be kept showing the date(s) and names of the participants only, details of the engagement were for discussion between the appraiser and apprais only. The Chair noted that changing the Peer Dialogue scheme to monitor and report on staff performance would require consideration and consultation through UCL Human Resources and was therefore not the business of EdCom.

d) It was noted that the FTC Terms of reference currently stipulated that departments report on the numbers of staff undertaking peer dialogue (but not the content of the engagements), under the previous PoT policy. This would need to be amended if monitoring the instances of peer dialogue was no longer part of the policy.

e) It was suggested that guidance for Heads of Department would be helpful to gauge whether peer dialogue engagements between staff and students would be appropriate. Such engagements could be very beneficial for staff and students and, if linked to SSCCs as suggested in the ChangeMaker project, would produce a rich source of information and data for in depth reflection and analysis.

66.4 **Approved:** – <u>EDCOM 5-03 (16-17)</u>, the Peer Dialogue Scheme Amendments, noting the above discussion.

Action: Dr Jenny Marie and EdCom members to note

67   SSCC/StARS TRENDS REPORT

67.1 **Received** – <u>EDCOM 5-04 (16-17)</u>, the SSCC/StARs Trends Report introduced by the UCLU Education and Campaigns Officer.

67.2 **Reported: –** The Education and Campaigns Officer reported that UCLU had conducted analysis of the SSCC minutes received so far in 2016-17 to ascertain the key issues and concerns raised by StARS. The approach to the analysis of the SSCC comments had changed with a new coding system developed, in line with the analysis for the NSS and other surveys. The sentiment of the comments had also been analysed to identify whether they were positive, neutral or negative. The analysis showed that Teaching and Learning was the most frequently discussed area, with much positive comment. Assessment and Feedback and Organisation and Management were the next most common areas, though they received mainly negative comments. The report contained five recommendations reflecting student priorities about the key areas of concerns, each with suggestions to address them. The Chair thanked UCLU for its excellent report. The Committee discussed each of the recommendations in turn, with the exception of Recommendation 3 on Assessment and Feedback, for which it was noted that the key issues were being covered by an assessment review.

67.3 *Recommendation 1 Space* – this included: (i) proposals to end 8am lectures and explore the use of under-utilised time in the timetable (e.g. Monday mornings and Friday afternoons), (ii) ensuring that externally hired teaching spaces are appropriately equipped, (iii) improving communications on the UCL Estate plans with students and (iv) tighter institutional control of student number growth to ensure a better student experience. The following points were noted:

a) The Registrar reported that a consultation with staff had been conducted, which included departments and Departmental Administrators. One possibility discussed was running the UCL day from 8.30am to 6pm, thus adding an hour to the official day. This would create a great deal of space on the timetable and be equivalent to opening a new large building.

b) The timetable, including the examinations timetable had been extensively discussed and it was noted that there were plans to reduce the number of exam venues next year to 4 larger venues to reduce the complexity of the timetable and the level of risk in losing venues. A suggestion to allow PGT teaching on Wednesday afternoons was also being considered, with practice at other universities taken into account. Earlier module selection was also under discussion and this might allow earlier publication of the exam timetable and avoidance of some of the severe difficulties encountered this year.

67.4 *Recommendation 2 Module Allocation and Timetabling* - this included (i) proposals to initiate a consultation with students on module choice and whether reduced choice and more directive advice might encourage more realistic and suitable choices for students; (ii) more careful planning and communication on module choice to ensure more realistic and feasible choices made and (iii) ensuring that the UCL IT systems are effective in enabling staff guidance and student choice. The following points were noted:

a) The recent TOPS work-stream on teaching and programme administration had received useful feedback from staff and student focus groups. Departments were often frustrated

when other areas of UCL were using their modules and felt that they had less control in managing their own students' access to them.

b) Many students reported that they found the large range of modules to choose from confusing and whilst appreciating the opportunities available, wanted reliable information on what modules would be most appropriate for them and whether they were deliverable. Students were often disappointed when their module choices were not allowed due to over-subscription, or withdrawal of the module.

c) There was much support for the action proposed for the creation of more coherent option choices and guided advice, but noted that there was a risk that this could limit freedom of choice, which many student found attractive about UCL. It was suggested that programme coherence might be considered in terms of the connected curriculum.

d) It was noted that PMAP had requested that new programmes outline more specifically the kind of module choice outside the programme and department which would work and had asked Vice-Deans (Education) to confirm that modules had the capacity to be included as a module choice.

e) It was noted that inter-disciplinary programmes would need careful consideration and planning; it was vital that their students continued to have wide access to UCL modules. This was also true of affiliate students. It was clear that the right balance between effective module choice and the freedom to choose would need to be found.

67.5   *Recommendation 4 Learning Resources* - this included proposals to (i) develop E-Learning materials in line with the E-Learning Baseline and consideration of adding that engagement with the baseline to the ASER process; (ii) developing the recognition of excellence in learning resources drawing on student feedback and (iii) ensuring the availability of staff training for learning provision. The Library Representative confirmed that ISD and the Library would consider these recommendations in light of their implementation of the E-Learning baseline.

67.6   *Recommendation 5 Fees and Funding* – this recommended that the costs for compulsory elements of programmes such as laboratory work or field trips should be covered by the tuition fees. Although raised by a minority of students, this was a serious concern for those affected that could lead to financial difficulties. The following points were noted:

a) It was noted that in some faculties such as the Built Environment where field trips were extensively used, the tuition fee did cover some of the cost, but students still needed to pay towards the overall costs. Such trips were expensive to organise and had to meet tight UCL regulations for insurance, health and safety, staff duty of care and the use of UCL approved travel agencies. Students often complained that they would be able to book cheaper travel themselves, but it was not possible to use unauthorised booking agents for official UCL trips. The Built Environment were concerned that the costs of field trips might prove prohibitive for students from less well-off backgrounds and had deliberately tried to keep trips in the UK or London, though this too led to complaints.

b) This was also a problem outside UCL. King's College London had recently adopted a policy of arranging trips to less expensive locations in the UK and Europe, avoiding North America and further afield.

c) It was suggested that whilst the policy for compulsory elements of tuition should be covered by the tuition fees, this might not apply to optional choices, which would give the students the freedom to choose, especially if the costs were expensive.

Agreed - that this matter is referred to the FTF for further discussion.

Action- the Registrar/Chair of the FTF and the Acting Secretary to note

67.7   **Agreed** – That EdCom members note the UCLU SSCC/StARS Trends report and the EdCom discussion and circulate the report to colleagues, faculty and departmental committees as appropriate.

Action- EdCom members to note

68   STUDENT COMPLAINTS REPORT 2017

68.1   **Received** – EDCOM 5-05 (16-17), the Students Complaints Report 2016-17, introduced by the Casework Manager, AS.

68.2   **Reported: –** The Casework Manager reported the following:

a)   The overall number of complaints at UCL had increased on the previous sessions, with increases for UG and PGT students, though a decline for PGR students.

b)   The IOE recorded the largest number of complaints, many from the PGCE programmes, often connected to the programme offer in the prospectus and how this transcribed to the actual experience on school placements. The Student Complaints Office had been in discussion with the IOE to seek ways to address this in the future. It was noted the Competitions and Marketing Authority rules made it imperative for universities to be very careful in describing programmes of study in their prospectuses and other information and in ensuring that provision matches this.

c)   UCL had also recorded a high number of complaint referrals to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator.

d)   Student and Registry Services had conducted a review of UCL complaints procedures and the structures for dealing with it and steps had been identified to improve this through clearer identification of roles and responsibilities at various UCL levels, structural changes to the Complaints Office and adopting an institutional wide approach to dealing with complaints. Consultations were still ongoing with staff and students and it was intended that the revised practices and structures for dealing with complaints would be in place for the 2018-19 session.

e)   The report also presented data on the UCL Student Mediator cases, the Rights and Advice Officer and student disciplinary cases. The latter provision was also being revised with support from the Provost.

68.3   The following points were noted in the discussion:

a)   It was queried whether complaints arising from failed EC appeals were notable in the data and whether this was an issue that was likely to arise. It was noted that since the EC policy and procedures was recently updated, there had been an increase in appeals. However, it was likely that where the policy was followed correctly and reasonable evidence considered, there would be less grounds for complaint.

b)   It was noted that the Complaints Office had recently held a workshop on complaints for Population Health Sciences which was considered very useful in informing the staff of their responsibilities and how to deal with complaints. The Complaints Manager confirmed that the workshop was available for other faculties.

68.4   **Approved:** – EDCOM 5-05 (16-17), the Student Complaints Report 2016-17 and the proposed actions outlined within it for improving the service at UCL.

PART III: OTHER MATTERS FOR APPROVAL OR INFORMATION

---

69   RECOMMENDATION TO ACADEMIC COMMITTEE OF APPROVAL OF NEW PROGRAMMES OF STUDY

69.1   **Received:** EDCOM 5-06 (16-17), a proposal that EdCom recommend for AC approval a new UCL programme of study, the Master of Landscape Architecture (MLA), introduced by Mr Oliver Wilton, Director of Education, the Bartlett School of Architecture.

69.2   **Reported: –** The Director of Education reported that the rationale for the introduction of the new programme was similar to that for the MPlan (Master in Planning), an award also based in the Faculty of the Built Environment. The MLA, a two year 300 credit Masters programme, was a widely recognised qualification globally and used in countries such as the USA, Canada, India and Australia. It was also intended to seek recognition for the MLA by the chartered professional body for Landscape Architects, the Landscape Institute. The MLA was

recognised by students interested in this area and the HESA data indicated that enrolment numbers on MLA programmes elsewhere in the UK had grown by 70% in recent years. The discipline had expanded and was becoming more influential in city and town planning and as such was well placed to meet the UCL Grand Challenges agenda, as well as meeting research-based educational criteria for the connected curriculum. The proposal had strong support from the School of Architecture as well as in the Faculty.

69.3 The Registrar noted that careful scrutiny was necessary before granting the use of a new award title at UCL, to ensure that the title had weight in wider academia and that it was likely to be still be relevant and in use in a few years' time. The Registrar was supportive of this request and noted that the Bartlett School of Architecture had presented a coherent case properly and through the correct processes. There were no concerns with adding this qualification to the list of UCL Masters programmes.

69.4 **Agreed:** that EdCom recommend approval of the new MLA qualification to AC. It was noted that the Bartlett School of Architecture may wish to seek AC Chair's action for approval as the last AC meeting of the session was to be held in the next few days.

Action: Mr Oliver Wilton to notify the AC Secretary.

70 APPROVAL OF NEW PROGRAMMES OF STUDY

70.1 **Approved** – the programmes recommended by Programme and Module Approval Panel for approval at EDCOM 5-07 (16-17).

71 APPROVAL OF NEW ACADEMIC PARTNERSHIPS

71.1 **Approved** – the new academic partnerships recommended by Academic Partnerships Review Group for approval at EDCOM 5-08 (16-17).

72 MINUTES OF SUB COMMITTEES AND WORKING GROUPS

72A **Received** – Minutes of the Academic Regulations and Quality Assurance Sub Committee EDCOM 5-09 (16-17)
13 March 2017

72B **Received** – Minutes of the Academic Partnerships Review Group EDCOM 5-10 (16-17).
6 April 2017 and 5 May 2017

72C **Received** – Minutes of the Programme and Module Approval Panel EDCOM 5-11 (16-17).
3 April 2017 and 27 April 2017

72D **Received** – Minutes of the Quality Review Sub Committee EDCOM 5-12 (16-17).
30 March 2017 and 15 May 2017

73 SUSPENSIONS OF REGULATIONS

73.1 **Approved** – The anonymised suspensions of regulations report at EDCOM 5-13 (16-17).

74 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

74A **ASER Intensive Update**

74A.1 The Directors of AS and UCL Arena provided an update on the ASER Intensive engagements held this session:

a) The ASER Intensive process had allowed continued discussions with those departments struggling with aspects of the ASER data (such as the NSS) and had enabled critical dialogue, identifying underlying challenges and engaging with staff and students to seek solutions to the issues raised. It was acknowledged that it may take some time for some of the departments to show major improvement, although many were showing signs of beginning that process.

b) A wide spectrum of activity had been initiated through the ASER engagement, including a review of Year 1 assessment and UCL Arena were planning more input next year, to help improve teaching practice in the departments.

c) The Chair noted that ASER was also useful in providing evidence for UCL to the TEF Assessors of how departments with academic difficulties were identified and addressed.

d) It was suggested that it would be helpful if Faculty Tutors were also included in the outcomes of the ASER Intensive engagements, especially the work on curriculum and assessment changes.

75   DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS:

- 25 July 2017, 2.00–4.30, Haldane Room, Wilkins Building

ROB TRAYNOR, on behalf of

LIZZIE VINTON
Secretary to Education Committee
Assessment Regulations and Governance Manager | Academic Services | Student and Registry Services
Email: l.vinton@ucl.ac.uk
19 July 2017