



## EDUCATION COMMITTEE

14 October 2011

### MINUTES

*Present:*

Professor Vince Emery (*Acting Chair*)

Mr Bob Allan  
Prof Alexi Marmot  
Mr David Ashton  
Ms Karen Barnard  
Prof David Bogle  
Dr Sue Bryant  
Mr Neil Chowdhury  
Mr Jason Clarke  
Dr Brenda Cross  
Mr Luke Durigan  
Dr Caroline Essex  
Prof Mike Ewing

Mr Marco Federighi  
Ms Valerie Hogg  
Ms Kathleen Nicholls  
Dr Hilary Richards  
Dr Steve Rowett  
(*Vice Dr Fiona Strawbridge*)  
Dr Ruth Siddall  
Prof Richard Simons  
Ms Olga Thomas

*In attendance:* Ms Sandra Hinton (Secretary); Ms Paula Speller.

*Apologies for absence were received from:* Professor John Mitchell; Mr Martin Reid; Dr Fiona Strawbridge.

**Key to abbreviations:**

AC	Academic Committee
EdCom	Education Committee
FAQ	Frequently Asked Question
FTC	Faculty Teaching Committee
ILTS	Institutional Learning and Teaching Strategy
IT	Information Technology
JSSC	Joint Staff Student Committee
MAPS	Mathematical and Physical Sciences (Faculty)
PIQ	Programme Institution Questionnaire
PGT	Postgraduate taught (student)
PMASG	Programme and Module Approval Steering Group
PT	Personal Tutor
QAA	Quality Assurance Agency
QMEC	Quality Management and Enhancement Committee
RAS	Registry and Academic Services
RDC	Research Degrees Committee
RRG	Regulation Review Group (of EdCom)
UCLU	UCL Union
UCLBE	UCL Board of Examiners
UKBA	UK Border Agency

1 **TERMS OF REFERENCE, CONSTITUTION AND 2011-12 MEMBERSHIP**

***Received***

- 1.2 At APPENDIX EDCOM 1/01 (11-12) - the Terms of Reference, Constitution and 2011-12 Membership<sup>1</sup>.

***Approved***

- 1.3 The above.

2 **MINUTES**

***Approved***

- 2.1 The Minutes of the meeting of EdCom held on 6 July 2011 [*EdCom Mins. 47-63, 06.07.11*], issued previously, were confirmed by the Committee and signed by the Chair, subject to a minor amendment at Min. 52.5, bullet 3, which should read '*It was resolved that Professor Vince Emery should be appointed as Academic Champion*'.

3 **MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

*[See minutes 4, 5, & 8 - 11 below]*

4 **ENGAGEMENT MONITORING**

*[EdCom Min. 50, 10-11]*

***Received***

- 4.1 At APPENDIX EDCOM 1/02 (11-12) – a note from the Director of Student Services and at Appendix A, a memo setting out the overarching principles and procedures for Engagement Monitoring for 2011-12.
- 4.2 An oral report from the **Director of Student Services, Mr David Ashton**.

***Reported***

- 4.3 UCL had been accorded Highly Trusted Sponsor status by the UKBA. As part of this agreement, UCL was governed by UKBA regulations, including monitoring requirements. Highly Trusted Status was renewed annually and in assessing renewal, UCL's ability to monitor in particular the engagement of its Tier 4 students would be scrutinised. An online engagement monitoring system had been developed in Portico to assist with the monitoring of students. Named departmental/divisional staff are required to indicate where students have not been engaging with their studies. The arrangements for engagement monitoring in the 2011-12 session were set out at Appendix EDCOM 1/02 (11-12) Appendix A. This document also included useful FAQs on engagement monitoring. As per last session, monitoring would be

---

<sup>1</sup> Professor Vince Emery will serve as Acting Chair of the Committee in place of the Dean of Students (Academic)/ Acting Vice-Provost (Education) pending the appointment of a permanent Vice-Provost (Education).

undertaken by staff in RAS to ensure that the process was being followed. RAS staff would raise issues with Faculty Tutors as appropriate.

**Discussed**

- 4.4 The first point of engagement occurred at enrolment (or re-enrolment). EdCom had previously agreed that for new students who commenced their studies at the start of the 2011-12 session, the deadline for enrolment should be two weeks after the start of teaching (14 October 2011). This was being strictly adhered to and departments who had special cases for consideration for admission after this date should write to their Faculty Tutors who would write to the Director of Student Services. A report was not yet available to show how many new first year Tier 4 students had not enrolled.

**5 PERSONAL TUTORING: OVERVIEW, MONITORING AND IMPLEMENTATION**  
[EdCom Min. 58, 10-11]

**Noted**

- 5.1 Faculty Tutors and Faculty Graduate Tutors had been asked to distribute a proforma to their Heads of Department (or equivalent), asking them to note progress against, or comments on, each of the key elements of the Personal Tutoring Scheme. An overview or summary of these responses was then requested, one from each faculty in respect of undergraduate programmes and postgraduate programmes.

**Received**

- 5.2 At APPENDIX EDCOM 1/03 (11-12) – reports from Faculty Tutors and Faculty Graduate Tutors on progress in implementing the Personal Tutoring Scheme. The reports were at Annexes 1-15.
- 5.3 An oral report from the **Acting Chair of EdCom, Professor Vince Emery**.

**Reported**

- 5.4 All faculties had responded to EdCom's request for information (although in widely differing formats, which had made comparisons difficult). From the evidence presented by the reports, most faculties seemed to be conforming to a similar pattern of tutorials (with the exception of the Faculty of the Built Environment and the MBBS programme within the Faculty of Medical Sciences). The required number of UG interactions (5) had inspired differing responses. Some departments had evidently considered that this was too many to fulfil, and in other departments, the students themselves had not considered that all were necessary. There was a broad consistency of approach to personal tutoring of PGT students but there remained some PGT programmes where the Programme Director took the lead as PT for all students on the programme. This was not a robust system and would be difficult to manage if the Programme Director became unavailable or where large numbers of students were enrolled on the programme.

**Discussion**

- 5.5 The main points of the discussion were as follows:

- Some concerns were noted that in one faculty, specific careers advice to PGT students was subsumed within personal tutorials. This worked well for the faculty concerned and they expressed a reluctance to stop doing it. However, it was noted that PTs should not be expected to be expert careers advisers and there should be a more effective referral mechanism to the UCL Careers service, which was equipped to provide expert advice and support for PGT students. Additionally, the Director of UCL Careers Service requested that, during a students' final PT meeting prior to graduation, PTs should identify to the Careers Service those students who might be at risk of under-employment on leaving, so that these students could be prioritised for additional support.
- EdCom agreed that PGT students often required a higher level of support than UG students and further concern was expressed about those programmes where the Programme Director acted as PT to all students on the programme. This was unsustainable even on very small programmes and those who did this should be asked to spread PT responsibilities more widely. It was acknowledged that there were logistical difficulties (PGT students in some faculties were only in attendance on particular days of the week) however, the practice, as well as placing a heavy burden on individual Programme Directors, also represented a potential conflict of interest for them and was to be avoided.
- The Dean of Students (Welfare) noted that the PT Scheme had been implemented in response to the results of a student survey. However, the success of the Scheme was being put at risk by the increasingly frequent non-attendance of some students at PT meetings. The UCLU representatives were asked to help publicise the PT Scheme to students. The Dean of Students (Welfare) would also be raising this issue at the meeting of JSSC on 24 November 2011.
- It would be helpful if faculties were made aware at an earlier stage of any problems with students noted by the PT. The Faculty of Laws had an effective system for this and the Director of Information and Data Services, whilst noting that there was a considerable queue of unfunded IT projects to be dealt with, agreed to investigate the feasibility of expanding this further. There might also be scope for creating an 'early warning' system within the Engagement Monitoring or Key Skills recording system. However, in the meantime, a well-timed email from the PT to the faculty remained the most effective way of flagging up issues.

5.6 Overall, the PT system was considered to be working well, but further work was needed to minimise variation between faculties and departments.

**Resolved**

- 5.7 That the Director of UCL Careers Service request that, during a students' final PT meeting prior to graduation, PTs should identify to the Careers Service those students who might be at risk of under-employment on leaving. **[Action: Ms Karen Barnard]**
- 5.8 That the Director of Information and Data Services investigate creating an 'early warning' system arising from PT meetings. **[Action: Ms Kathleen Nicholls]**

- 5.9 That EdCom review the situation again in 2012-13, paying particular attention to the operation of PT for PGT students. **[Action: Ms Sandra Hinton]**

## 6 DRAFT ANNUAL REPORT FROM EDCOM TO AC

### *Received*

- 6.1 At APPENDIX EDCOM 1/04 (11-12) – the draft Annual Report.

### *Discussed*

- 6.2 EdCom approved the above Annual Report for submission to AC's December 2011 meeting.

## 7 HANDLING OF NON-COMPLETES WHEN CONSIDERING STUDENTS FOR AWARD

### *Received*

- 7.1 At APPENDIX EDCOM 1/05 (11-12) – a paper from the Dean of Students (Academic).
- 7.2 An oral report from **the Dean of Students (Academic) Professor Mike Ewing**.

### *Reported*

- 7.3 In order to achieve a degree under UCL's Harmonised Scheme of Award, students must have completed 12 course units and have passed at least 11. In the 2010-11 session, the large number of suspensions of regulations requested to allow incomplete students to pass showed that Examination Board Chairs remained unfamiliar with UCL regulations and that departments had given misleading oral and written advice to students.

### *Discussed*

- 7.4 EdCom's RRG had considered the issues in June 2011<sup>2</sup> and had ruled that students must be complete in all course units in their first and second years but were not obliged to have *passed* all course units to progress. Faculty Tutors should be permitted to allow progression, provided that a student had only missed the progression hurdle by 0.5 of a course unit. Students who missed progression by more than this should be referred to the Dean of Students (Academic) via the Director of Student Services for a suspension of regulations. This did not represent a change to the scheme of award but was an attempt to notify relevant parties of the existing regulation in order that the regulation could be made clearer at an earlier stage and to avoid a student remaining unaware that they were incomplete until such a late stage of their programme of study that a suspension of regulations was required.

### *Resolved*

---

<sup>2</sup> See RRG Minutes, 20 June 2011 at APPENDIX EDCOM 1/10 (11-12).

- 7.5 That this regulation should be disseminated to Departmental Tutors and Chairs of Boards of Examiners. It should also be set out in departmental handbooks. **[Action: Ms Irenie Morley]**

## 8 UCL CRITERIA FOR TRANSFERS BETWEEN DEGREE PROGRAMMES

[EdCom Min. 34, 10-11]

### **Received**

- 8.1 At APPENDIX EDCOM 1/06 (11-12) – a paper on UCL criteria for transfers between degree programmes.
- 8.2 An oral report from **the Faculty Tutor/Faculty Graduate Tutor, Faculty of MAPS, Dr Caroline Essex.**

### **Reported**

- 8.3 On 26 May 2011, EdCom had approved a paper which set out criteria for direct admission into the second year of a programme of study. The acting Vice-Provost (Education) subsequently indicated that UCL faculties and departments should also be applying the same criteria in cases of transfers between faculties for students who were already at UCL and also between different departments within the same faculty. The current criteria were set out in APPENDIX EDCOM 1/06 (11-12).
- 8.4 EdCom was invited to consider (i) the question of whether the criteria should be applied to current UCL students and (ii) the order in which approval for such transfers should be given. It was suggested that the primary consideration should be whether there was sufficient capacity within the department and faculty in terms of student numbers, as a student might meet all the relevant academic and personal criteria but yet still be unable to transfer if there was no space for them.

### **Resolved**

- 8.5 That the regulations should be amended to the following effect:

*'Transfer between degree programmes are governed by UCL's General Regulations 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 for Change of Degree Programme. Such transfers require UCL approval and cannot be guaranteed. Students must satisfy the entrance requirements for the new degree programme, there must be places available on the programme, and it must be practical for the student to complete the new degree programme satisfactorily.'*

*'UCL approval' will normally mean the approval of the Dean of Students (Academic) but this responsibility is delegated to the Faculty Tutor for transfers within a faculty.*

*For **inter-faculty** transfers, the following criteria will apply and will be used by the Dean of Students (Academic) when making a decision.*

- a. The student must have met the standard A-level/IB entrance requirements and must not have received a rejection to a previous application.*
- b. The student must have achieved, in their current or most recent studies, at*

least a 2(i) performance as determined by the Harmonised Scheme and any additional requirements of the receiving faculty.

- c. A supportive reference, preferably from the faculty or department at which the student is currently or was last based.
- d. Detailed comparison of the degree programme and the modules taken showing the equivalence or otherwise in the accompanying case for APL.
- e. Sufficient capacity within the Department and Faculty in terms of student numbers.

For **intra-faculty** transfers the above criteria should also apply. However, if a student does not satisfy one or more of the criteria, a case should be made to the Dean of Students (Academic).’

- 8.6 That the above criteria once enshrined in the regulations should be circulated as appropriate. **[Action Ms Irene Morley]**

## 9 QAA CONSULTATION ON EXTERNAL EXAMINING ‘EXPECTATIONS’ AND GUIDANCE – UCL RESPONSE

[EdCom Min. 56.5, 10-11]

### **Received**

- 9.1 At APPENDIX EDCOM 1/07 (11-12) – a paper setting out UCL’s response (submitted online on 1 September 2011) and any issues raised.
- 9.2 An oral report from the **Acting Chair of EdCom, Professor Vince Emery**.

### **Reported**

- 9.3 UCL’s response to the External Examining Expectations and Guidance had suggested one change of wording to the guidance, at Expectation 5, where it was felt that the Expectation had not adequately reflected the fact that in some disciplines, it was necessary to use professionals to consider assessment of students (eg. in Fine Art, Architecture or Design subjects). The wording as originally set out at Expectation 5 had seemed to suggest that only Externals from other academic institutions were viable.
- 9.4 The consultation had raised a number of issues for EdCom to note and these had been flagged as appropriate at APPENDIX EDCOM 1/07 (11-12). One of these issues concerned the central recording of those UCL staff who acted as External Examiners for other institutions. It was suggested that this might be done via MyView.

### **Resolved**

- 9.5 That the Acting Chair would investigate the feasibility of recording UCL staff External Examiner activity on MyView with UCL Human Resources. **[Action: Professor Vince Emery]**
- 9.6 That where indicated at APPENDIX EDCOM 1/07 (11-12), RAS’s Curricular Development and Examiners’ section would include additional information in the Regulations for Boards of Examiners, appointment letters and External Examiner report forms as appropriate, once the consultation had been completed and the final version released. **[Action: Ms Irene Morley]**

10 **SPECIAL PROVISIONS AEGROTAT**

[EdCom Min. 61.3, 10-11]

**Noted**

10.1 A Special Provisions Aegrotat meeting was held on 7 July 2011.

**Received**

10.2 At APPENDIX EDCOM 1/08 (11-12) – a paper from the Director of Student Services.

10.3 An oral report from the **Director of Student Services, Mr David Ashton.**

**Reported**

10.4 Edcom was asked to note the recommendations of the Sub-group on Awards under the Special and Aegrotat Provisions, which had been approved by Chair's Action. The Sub-group had discussed the the quality of medical evidence/documentation submitted to it and when it should be deemed appropriate for a student to be advised to withdraw rather than be considered for an award under the Special and Aegrotat Provisions. It was clear that some students had been given poor advice in this respect.

**Discussed**

10.5 The Vice-Provost (Education) stressed that Special and Aegrotat Provisions should be considered as a final resort in the case of, for example, a chronic illness where there was no reasonable prospect of the student being able to complete examinations at a future date. However, a single, acute event or illness might be dealt with by withdrawing or, in certain instances, by an application for special examination arrangements. EdCom endorsed the Sub-group's recommendation that there should be improvement in (i) the quality of medical evidence submitted (ii) the quality of advice to students.

11 **INSTITUTIONAL LEARNING AND TEACHING STRATEGY – IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

[EdCom Min. 57, 10-11]

**Received**

11.1 An oral report from the **Director of Student Services, Mr David Ashton.**

**Reported**

11.2 The ILTS Implementation Plan (Item 52) required EdCom to 'monitor the range of assessment types in use across disciplines with a view to informing UCL strategies for encouraging greater diversity in this area'. It was anticipated that a report would be produced which detailed key assessment types used at UCL for discussion by EdCom on 8 December 2011.

**Discussed**



- 11.3 It was noted that EdCom's PMASG also monitored the range of assessment types proposed in the PIQs it scrutinised and often referred proposals back to their authors for further work if the assessment methods proposed were considered insufficiently diverse.

**Resolved**

- 11.4 That a report on key assessment types be submitted to EdCom on 8 December 2011. **[Action: Mr David Ashton]**

**12 ACTION TAKEN BY THE VICE-CHAIR**

**12A Approval of new programmes of study**

**Noted**

- 12A.1 The EdCom Vice-Chair (also Acting Chair), Professor Vince Emery, acting on behalf of EdCom and on the recommendation of PMASG, approved the institution of the following programmes of study:

- BA Geography (International)
- BSc Geography (International)
- BSc Anthropology (with a Year Abroad)
- MRes Healthcare Engineering for an Ageing Population
- BSc Planning and Real Estate
- MRes in Organic Chemistry: Drug Discovery
- MA in Early Modern Studies
- MSc Financial Risk Management
- PG Cert/MRes Risk and Disaster Reduction
- PG Dip/MSc Infrastructure Investment and Finance
- MA Transnational Studies

**12B Change of Title**

**Noted**

- 12B.1 The EdCom Vice-Chair (also Acting Chair) had approved a change of title for the Doctorate in Clinical Communication Science (replacing Doctorate in Speech and Language Therapy). The Chair of RDC had previously also approved this change of title by Chair's Action.

**13 MINUTES FROM STEERING GROUPS**

**13A.1 Programme and Module Approval Steering Group**

**Received**

- 13A.2 At APPENDIX EDCOM 1/09 (11-12) - the Minutes of the meeting of PMASG held on 29 June 2011.

13B **Regulation Review Group**

***Received***

13B.1 At APPENDIX EDCOM 1/10 (11-12) - the Minutes of the meeting of the RRG held on 20 June 2011.

***Noted***

13B.2 The RRG had previously resolved (Min. 9.7.2, 20/07/11) that an offer of referred assessment should be taken up within two weeks of its being made. This was causing difficulties in one faculty.

***Resolved***

13B.3 That this issue should be re-submitted for further discussion by the RRG in order to reach a workable solution. **[Action: Ms Sandra Hinton, Professor Mike Ewing to note]**

14 **CHAIR'S BUSINESS**

14A **Common Timetable Review**

***Noted***

14A.1 Professor Vince Emery, Acting EdCom Chair and Academic Champion to the Common Timetable review, noted that he had been in communication with various key staff regarding the review and would be meeting the Director of information and Data Services on 6 November 2011 to discuss data and next steps.

15 **DATES OF MEETINGS 2011-12**

***Noted***

15.1 Further meetings of EdCom in 2011 would be as follows:

- Thursday 8 December 2011, 2pm to 4pm
- Wednesday 14 March 2012, 2pm to 4pm
- Friday 4 May 2012, 2pm to 4pm
- Friday 29 June 2012, 2pm to 4pm

15.2 All meetings are in the South Wing Council Room.

SANDRA HINTON

Senior Quality Assurance Officer

Academic Support, Registry and Academic Services

7 November 2011

[telephone: 020 7679 8590; internal extension 28590; fax 020 7679 8595; e-mail s.hinton@ucl.ac.uk