



EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Tuesday 26 November 2013

MINUTES

Present:

Professor Mike Ewing (*Chair*)

Mr David Ashton	Mr Keir Gallagher
Ms Karen Barnard	Ms Judith Hillmore
Professor David Bogle	Dr Arne Hofmann
Professor Chris Carey	Dr John Mitchell
Mr Jason Clarke	Ms Kathleen Nicholls
Mr Mike Cope (<i>vice: Dr Fiona Strawbridge</i>)	Dr Hilary Richards
Dr Brenda Cross	Ms Olga Thomas
Dr Caroline Essex	Professor Derek Tocher
Dr Julie Evans	Mr Ben Towse
Mr Marco Federighi	Dr Paul Walker
Dr Dilly Fung	Dr Andrew Wills

In attendance: Ms Clare Goudy; Ms Sandra Hinton (Secretary); Ms Irenie Morley; Professor Anthony Smith; Dr Hazel Smith.

Apologies for absence were received from: Ms Valerie Hogg; Mr Zubair Idris; Ms Cecilie Jorgensen; Dr Helen Matthews; Ms Paula Speller; Dr Fiona Strawbridge; Ms Susan Ware.

Key to abbreviations

AC	Academic Committee
AISG	Administrative Information Services Group
CALT	Centre for the Advancement of Learning and Teaching
CMIS	Content Management Interoperability Services
CPD	Continuing Professional Development
EDCOM	Education Committee
FTC	Faculty Teaching Committee
ISD	Information Services Division
ISGC	Information Services Governance Committee
LTISG	Learning and Teaching Information Services Group
MPP	Master of Public Policy
MPA	Master of Public Administration
NYU	New York University
PIQ	Programme Institution Questionnaire
PMASG	Programme and Module Approval Steering Group
RDC	Research Degrees Committee
SIFSWG	Student Information System Funding Working Group
SIPB	Student Information Programme Board
SoP	School of Pharmacy
UCLBE	UCL Board of Examiners
UCLU	UCL Union
UKBA	UK Border Agency

15 MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF 4 OCTOBER 2013

Confirmed:

- 15.1 The Minutes of the meeting of EdCom held on 4 October 2013 [*EdCom Mins. 1-14, 04.10.13*], circulated previously.

Reported:

- 15.2 The EdCom Chair welcomed the following new members to EdCom:
- Dr Dilly Fung, Director of the Centre for the Advancement of Learning and Teaching;
 - Mr Dan Cofas, Postgraduate Student nominated by the UCLU [**in absentia**];
 - Ms Cecilie Jorgensen, Undergraduate Student nominated by the UCLU [**in absentia**].

16 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES [*see also Mins. 17, 18, 20, 21, 22 & 26 below*]

16A School of Pharmacy: request for derogations [*EdCom Min. 8, 13-14*]

Received:

- 16A.1 An oral report from the Director of Student Administration.

Reported:

- 16A.2 At its 4 October meeting, EdCom had received a very late request from the SoP for derogations in respect of degree weightings and capped resits. EdCom had resolved:
- that any weightings which had already been notified to students who commenced their studies in 2013-14 should be permitted to stand, but that the MPharm should conform to the weighting of 4-year degrees at UCL from session 2014 -15 onwards;
 - that as UCL policy did not permit it, the request for capping should be refused.
- 16A.3 When this was conveyed to the SoP by the Life Sciences Faculty Tutor, the School had noted that EdCom's rationale for allowing the derogation on degree weighting (that the students had already been notified) applied equally to the request for capping. The decision on capping had therefore been reversed by EdCom Chair's Action.
- 16A.4 The Chair and the Director of Student Administration had since met with SoP representatives and the Director of Student Administration would be submitting a paper to EdCom's 6 March meeting which clearly set out (i) all proposed SoP derogations and (ii) those areas in which compliance with UCL's regulatory framework would be required. [**Action: Mr David Ashton, Ms Sandra Hinton to note**]

16B Examination re-sit fees [EdCom Min. 10B.3, 13-14]

Noted:

- 16B.1 The UCLU Education and Campaigns and Postgraduate Students' Officers had confirmed that they would not now be submitting a paper to the 26 November EdCom meeting, but that they hoped to submit a paper to the Committee in the New Year.

RESOLVED:

- 16B.2 That the Director of Student Administration would meet with the UCLU Officers to explain more fully the origin and structure of examination resit fees prior to the submission of their paper. **[Action: Mr David Ashton, UCLU Officers]**

17 PERSONAL TUTORING – MONITORING AND OVERVIEW [EdCom Min.5, 10-11]

Received:

- 17.1 An oral report from Dr Paul Walker, Senior Teaching Fellow, CALT.

Reported:

- 17.2 As part of its remit to support and develop Personal Tutoring, CALT had sent out a survey to Departmental Tutors about Personal Tutoring practice in departments. Dr Walker reported that CALT's work in this area had been two-fold; providing facilities, briefing and support materials for Personal Tutors and students as well as seeking to understand more of the custom and practice in departments. Early indications from the survey were that there was wide variation in the way in which Personal Tutoring was carried out within departments and that there seemed to be relatively little in the way of a collective understanding of the purposes and potential benefits of Personal Tutoring. More work had yet to be done in finding ways to optimise the embedding of Personal Tutoring into academic practice. CALT would submit a written report to the meeting of EdCom on 6 March 2014, when a fuller response to the departmental survey had been received and more reliable and representative data was available for analysis.

Discussion:

- 17.3 EdCom noted that departmental engagement with the online materials to support Personal and Professional Development was also disappointingly low. Anecdotally, the low figures for departments entering the necessary data online for their students was attributed to the fact that this was embedded in Portico, which was perceived as being rather 'user-unfriendly'.

RESOLVED:

- 17.4 That EdCom's CALT representative would submit a written report on Personal Tutoring to the meeting of EdCom on 6 March 2014. **[Action: Dr Paul Walker, Ms Sandra Hinton to note]**

18 REFERRALS [EdCom Min.5.7, 13-14]

Received:

- 18.1 At EDCOM 2/10 (13-14) a paper, introduced by the EdCom Chair, Professor Mike Ewing.

Reported:

- 18.2 The paper was being submitted to EdCom with a request to Faculty Tutors that the issues which it set out in respect of referrals should be taken back to departments for further discussion. The Chair of the UCLBE was also invited to submit the paper to the Board for further discussion. When all discussion and responses had been received by the EdCom Chair, a final paper would be submitted to EdCom meeting of 6 March 2014.

Discussion:

- 18.3 The UCLU Officers expressed some confusion regarding the relationship between fails and re-sits as set out in the paper. The Director of Student Administration offered to explain the complexities of referrals during the meeting already proposed at Minute 16B.2 above to discuss examination re-sit fees.

RESOLVED:

- 18.4 That Faculty Tutors submit the paper at EDCOM 2/10 (13-14) to their departments for further discussion, and forward the departmental responses to the EdCom Chair.
[Action: Faculty Tutors]
- 18.5 That the Chair of the UCLBE submit the paper for discussion at its next meeting on 26 February 2014. **[Action: Professor Chris Carey]**
- 18.6 That the Director of Student Administration meet with the UCLU Officers to explain the system of referrals during the meeting already proposed at Minute 16B.2 above to discuss examination resit fees **[Action: Mr David Ashton, UCLU Officers]**

19 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND SHORT COURSES

Received:

- 19.1 At EDCOM 2/11 (12-13) a paper by Professor Andrew Eder, Associate Vice-Provost, UCL Enterprise, introduced by the EdCom Chair, Professor Mike Ewing.

Reported:

- 19.2 The Chair reported that there was a general perception among the academic community that it was difficult to get a module approved at UCL (although it was noted that nearly 1000 had been set up last year). Consultation and market research by a CPD and Short Course Facilitation Group had confirmed an appetite to move towards an expanded portfolio of credit-bearing CPD and Short Courses across UCL. This was also being sought by some external funding organisations which required academic credits as one of the key outcomes.

- 19.3 EdCom was being invited to consider a number of proposals for credit-bearing short courses and to invite the CPD and Short Course Development Team to develop these proposals on behalf of EdCom with a view to implementation during the 2014-15 academic session.

Discussion:

- 19.4 The following points were noted:

- that the perceived difficulties around the approval of modules were actually issues with enrolment times and not problems with getting modules registered;
- that integration of CPD within the overall Portico framework would raise issues, including defining the boundaries of what a short course actually was;
- that issues in respect of distance learning and blended learning would need discussion and there would need to be appropriate recognition of the requirements of the UK Visa and Immigration Service (formerly the UKBA);
- that Student and Registry Services was not appropriately resourced to take responsibility for a proliferation of credit-bearing short courses; particularly in view of the fact that, among other things, they would need to be incorporated in all statutory returns made to the Higher Education Statistics Agency;
- that students could already take stand-alone credit-bearing modules but that these were not registered owing to the lack of resource in Student and Registry Services to manage this.

RESOLVED:

- 19.5 Bearing the above points in mind, EdCom resolved that the Academic Workstream (a sub-committee of the CPD and Short Course Facilitation Group) should be asked by the EdCom Secretary to prepare proposals for consideration by EdCom regarding (1) the Award of Credits for CPD and Short Courses and (2) the approval process for new credit-bearing and non-credit bearing CPD and Short Courses. **[Action: Professor Andrew Eder, Ms Sandra Hinton]**

20 FITNESS TO STUDY POLICY [EdCom Min.60.7, 13-14]

Received:

- 20.1 At EDCOM 2/12 (13-14) the draft policy, introduced by the Director of Student Administration, Mr David Ashton.

Reported:

- 20.2 The Director of Student Administration emphasised that the draft policy was intended to ensure that students were better supported to undertake their studies and, to this end, the draft policy was not couched in disciplinary or punitive language. The draft policy was also intended to ensure that the necessary resources and mechanisms were in place to assist the Director of Student Support and Wellbeing in determining whether students interrupting their programme of study for reasons of mental ill-health or substance abuse did not jeopardise their health and/or that their health did not jeopardise their studies on their return..

Discussion:

- 20.3 The UCLU Education and Campaigns Officer made the following points:
- that the draft had been put together without any consultation with the UCLU Welfare Officer or the Disability Officer;
 - that there was a lack of compulsory contact with the Director of Student Support and Wellbeing (the policy advocated no meeting between the Director of Student Support and Wellbeing and the student to discuss the issues);
 - that there was a lack of guidance in the draft policy as to what the recommendation to the Faculty Tutor should be;
 - that UCL should focus more attention on supporting students in such a way as to prevent the development or onset of severe health problems.
- 20.4 In response, a number of Faculty Tutors noted that the policy was intended to support cases which were both extreme and very rare. It was emphasised that the extent to which rational and systematic interaction was possible with such students could vary considerably. It was resolved that the UCLU Officers should set out in writing to the Director of Student Administration all the UCLU's issues with the draft policy.
- 20.5 The Faculty Tutor of the Faculty of Arts and Humanities and Social and Historical Sciences noted that the draft policy stipulated (at para 7) that where adjustments were not possible or if a student had been unable to continue with his/her studies even with reasonable adjustments in place, having consulted health care specialists, the Director of Student Support and Wellbeing would recommend to the student's Faculty Tutor that the student's registration should cease either permanently or for a specified period of time. However, it was important to realise that a Faculty Tutor currently lacked the power under Statute 11, (Regulations for Management 14.1 and 14.2) to suspend or terminate a student's studies on health grounds and could do this only under delegated authority of the Provost where there was evidence of academic insufficiency. EdCom resolved that this matter should be brought to the attention of the Registrar, as Secretary to UCL Council.
- 20.6 Noting the points above, EdCom broadly welcomed the policy and resolved that a further iteration should be submitted to its meeting of 6 March.

RESOLVED:

- 20.7 That the UCLU Officers should set down in writing any issues with the draft policy and email this to the Director of Student Administration. **[Action: Mr Keir Gallagher and Mr Ben Towse]**
- 20.8 That the need for further discussion regarding Regulations for Management 14.1 and 14.2 should be brought to the attention of the Registrar, as Secretary to UCL Council. **[Action: Mr David Ashton]**
- 20.9 That the draft policy be revised taking into consideration the points noted above and a further iteration submitted to EdCom's meeting of 6 March 2104. **[Action: Mr David Ashton, Ms Sandra Hinton to note]**

21 FACULTY ISSUES WITH PORTICO FUNCTIONALITY [EdCom Min. 3D, 13-14]

Received:

- 21.1 At EDCOM 2/13 (13-14) a paper, introduced by the Director of Information and Data Services, Ms Kathleen Nicholls.

Reported:

- 21.2 The paper had originally been written in July 2013 in order to respond to a number of complaints about Portico functionality raised by Faculty Tutors at EdCom's 25 June meeting, and, as such, had pre-empted the fuller review of similar issues subsequently undertaken by the Student Information System Funding Working Group (SISFWG). For this reason, the Director of Information and Data Services rather than focusing on her response, proposed instead to draw the Committee's attention to the report of the SIFSWG at Minute 22 below.

22 REPORT FROM THE STUDENT INFORMATION SYSTEM FUNDING WORKING GROUP [EdCom Min. 3D, 13-14]

Received:

- 22.1 At EDCOM 2/14 (13-14) a report from the SISFWG, introduced by a member of the Working Group, Mr David Ashton.

Reported:

- 22.2 The Director of Student Administration began by drawing the Committee's attention to the large number of business processes successfully delivered by Portico as set out in the report.
- 22.3 The Working Group had been supportive of the recommendations of the 'SITS health check' carried out in July 2013 by SUMS Consulting to the effect that there should be a 3 year rolling plan and forecast rather than an annual plan with budget expectations set prior to the bid process and that the bidding process should be on a three-year rolling basis and not require a totally fresh start and rebid each year.
- 22.4 EdCom and RDC were also invited to review their processes for considering and deciding on policy and regulation changes, taking account of the implications, including the various cost implications, of such changes in Portico.
- 22.5 The Working Group had approved the recommendation of the report carried out by SUMS Consulting, to the effect that there should be a transfer of funding to enable SIPB to manage a ring-fenced budget for Portico/SITS operational work that was not subject to competitive bidding within the AISG or LTISG domains. This would enable a move towards a more systematic and proactive approach to the enhancement of Portico.
- 22.6 EdCom was invited to endorse the Working Group's recommendations, as set out at paragraph 36 of its report. A record of EdCom's comments on the report would accompany its submission to the Vice-Provost (Education), for subsequent further discussion by the Information Services Governance Committee.

- 22.7 The Director of ISD¹ who had attended the meeting *vice*: Dr Fiona Strawbridge, commented as follows:
- that he was keen to see improved Portico services which better met the needs of the University but to achieve this it would be necessary to identify and address the underlying root causes. The reports focused on funding issues which, addressed alone were unlikely to improve the situation significantly;
 - that spend on SI projects had increased in recent years and continued to increase (he estimated this at a 60% increase this year);
 - that annual SITS upgrade and start of session projects were not competing for funding as these were mandatory activities. Bid documents were required to ensure that the activities were correctly resourced in the project portfolio and not in order that they might then compete for funding;
 - that the SIPB did, in fact, have the power to re-allocate funding between the domain groups and there was therefore no need for a separate domain group or for a ring fenced pot of money;
 - that allocating of funding between the four domain groups, in his view, worked well and would perhaps work even more effectively if there was increased academic representation on the AISG (it was suggested that this might comprise members of EdCom).

Discussion:

- 22.8 Members of SIPB noted that they had not previously been aware that it was possible to vire monies between budgets and domain groups.
- 22.9 Although student information system funding bids had in 2013 been submitted to a different ISGC domain group (the LTISG) and had been more successful, the success of these bids, attributed in part to the greater academic membership of this group, may actually have been that they had involved issues of greater interest to academic members. This could not be taken for granted in future years and was therefore not a sound basis on which to proceed.
- 22.10 EdCom strongly endorsed the Working Group's recommendation that there be a ring-fenced budget for operational Portico work.

RESOLVED:

- 22.11 That EdCom endorse the Working Group's recommendations, as set out at paragraph 36 of its report.
- 22.12 That the above minute of EdCom's comments on the report accompany its submission to the Vice-Provost (Education), for subsequent further discussion by the ISGC. ***[Action: Ms Sandra Hinton]***

¹ On 3 December, the Director of ISD then sent an email to the EdCom Chair and Mr Tim Perry, Registrar/Chair of the SISFWG, which set out his views in more detail. This will be considered under Matters Arising at EdCom's 6 March meeting.

23 PROCEEDINGS OF FACULTY TEACHING COMMITTEES: SESSION 2012-13

Received:

- 23.1 At EDCOM 2/15 (13-14) the report, introduced by the EdCom Chair, Professor Mike Ewing.

Reported:

- 23.2 The Committee was invited to note the report and consider whether any action was needed to follow up the common matters of concern raised and whether any significant issues should be brought to the attention of AC.

Discussion:

- 23.3 The Faculty Tutors of the Faculties of Life Sciences and Brain Sciences noted that some of the items set out at Annex A to the report (where notable matters considered by individual FTCs are recorded) were inaccurate and that, consequently, they could, as currently worded, present a misleading impression of the FTC's discussions. The report was traditionally circulated to Faculty Tutors prior to its submission to EdCom asking for comment on factual accuracy and the Quality Assurance Manager agreed to check whether this had happened.
- 23.4 In the meantime, the Faculty Tutor of the Faculty of Life Sciences also considered that format of the annual report on the proceedings of FTCs itself added little value. EdCom resolved that Faculty Tutors should be invited to comment on the format of the report and whether it could usefully be revised

RESOLVED:

- 23.5 That the Quality Assurance Manager should check whether the report had been circulated to Faculty Tutors prior to the meeting. ***[Action: Ms Sandra Hinton]***
- 23.6 That the Quality Assurance Co-ordinator should circulate the report to Faculty Tutors (1) asking for comments on its accuracy (if this had not already been done) and (2) inviting Faculty Tutors to comment on the format of the report and whether it could usefully be revised. ***[Action: Mr Rob Traynor]***

24 DRAFT ANNUAL REPORT FROM EDCOM TO AC

Received:

- 24.1 At EDCOM 2/16 (13-14) the draft Annual Report, introduced by the EdCom Chair, Professor Mike Ewing.

Reported:

- 24.2 The Chair reported that EdCom was being invited to approve the draft report for submission to AC on 10 December 2013. EdCom was also invited to choose three key items for particular discussion by AC and to notify these to the Secretary after the meeting.

RESOLVED:

- 24.3 That the report be approved for submission to AC on 10 December. **[Action: Ms Sandra Hinton]**
- 24.4 That members choose three key items from the report for particular discussion by AC and notify these to the Secretary after the meeting. **[Action: EdCom members, Ms Sandra Hinton to note]**

25 TO CONSIDER THE RECOMMENDATION OF A NEW DEGREE AWARD TO ACADEMIC COMMITTEE: MASTER OF PUBLIC POLICY (MPP)

To note:

- 25.1 EdCom was invited to consider the proposal for a new degree award:

- *Master of Public Policy (MPP)*

It was being sought in relation to the submission of PIQs for two programmes:

- *Master of Engineering and Public Policy*
- *Master of Science and Public Policy*

- 25.2 PIQs for these programmes had been scrutinised by EdCom's Programme and Module Approval Steering Group (PMASG) and approved by PMASG Chair's Action on 1 November 2013 (see also 13 below).

Received:

- 25.3 In accordance with the procedure for the approval of new degree awards, EdCom was being asked to consider this proposal for recommendation to AC for formal approval.

Discussion:

- 25.4 The Faculty Tutor of the Faculty of Social and Historical Sciences noted that the Director of the School of Public Policy had verbally expressed a number of concerns to him regarding the above proposal for the new degree award.

RESOLVED:

- 25.5 It was resolved that the Faculty Tutor of the Faculty of Social and Historical Sciences should invite the Director of the School of Public Policy to put his concerns in writing and to submit these to the meeting of PMASG scheduled to take place on the following day - 27 November - where it was proposed that a discussion should take place regarding (1) the specific concerns with the new degree award proposed and (2) UCL's overall approach to the issuing of new degree awards. **[Action: Dr Arne Hofmann and Professor Chris Carey]**

26 REPORT OF THE TIMETABLING REVIEW WORKING GROUP [EdCom Min.2.4, 13-14]

Received:

- 26.1 At EDCOM 2/17 (13-14) and EDCOM 2/17.1 (13-14) the report and overview, introduced by the Vice-Provost (Education) and Chair of the Working Group, Professor Anthony Smith.

Reported:

- 26.2 The Vice-Provost (Education) reported that the review had been an attempt to resolve the apparent paradox whereby staff complained of lack of teaching space and yet space utilisation surveys had revealed teaching space to be in reasonable supply. The Review Group's work had been informed by benchmarking against other metropolitan Russell Group universities undertaken by SUMS Consulting who had made a number of recommendations. In summary, the outcomes of the Review Group's deliberations were as follows:

- adoption of a Timetabling Policy to be overseen by EdCom;
- an annual Teaching Estate Utilisation survey commencing in term 1 2013-14 to assist development of a teaching space planning capability;
- early module selection;
- a review of permitted programme diets;
- further consideration of a policy of capping of student numbers on modules;
- training for 'super-users' of CMIS.

Discussion:

- 26.3 The EdCom Chair welcomed the report and noted that although programme diets were reviewed annually, some 10,000 diets were currently on the system, which was clearly unsustainable. Several 'quick fixes' were possible. Clearer guidance should also be given about how a diet should be constructed.
- 26.4 It was noted that UCL was only obliged to make core and optional modules available and timetabled clash-free. With an elective module, the onus was on the student to avoid timetable clashes.
- 26.5 Early module selection (eg; at Easter for continuing students) would enable students to make more informed choices. It was envisaged that in future, module information provided to students might even include evaluations of the modules by students who had completed them previously.
- 26.6 EdCom agreed that many other important things appeared to be moving in the right direction to enable teaching space issues to be resolved and welcomed the report and its findings.

27 REVISED STUDENT COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE

Noted:

- 27.1 At EDCOM 2/18 (13-14) a note introducing the proposed revised UCL Student Complaints Procedure.

27.2 At EDCOM 2/18.1 (13-14) the revised procedure for information.

RESOLVED:

27.3 That any EdCom members with issues to raise concerning the revised procedure, which was being submitted to EdCom for information prior to its submission to Academic Board and then Council, should send these to the Deputy Registrar, copying in the EdCom Chair and Secretary. **[Action: EdCom members to note]**

28 APPROVAL OF NEW PROGRAMMES OF STUDY

Noted:

28.1 The PMASG Chair, acting on behalf of EdCom and on the recommendation of PMASG, had approved the following programmes of study since the meeting of EdCom on 4 October 2013:

- *Master of Engineering and Public Policy*
- *Master of Science and Public Policy*
- *MSc Transport, Health and Policy*
- *MA Library Information Studies (Qatar-based programme)*
- *MSc Transport, Health and Policy*

29 ACTION TAKEN BY THE EDCOM CHAIR

29A Change to the proposed title of the MPA award

Noted:

29A.1 The EdCom Chair had taken action to approve a change to the proposed title of the MPA award for the Joint Programme with NYU. The change was:

from: *Executive Masters in Public Administration*

to: *Master of Public Administration*

29A.2 The final version of the programme title was:

Master of Public Administration, Executive Programme in Global Public Policy and Management.

30 MINUTES FROM STEERING GROUPS ETC.

30A Programme and Module Approval Steering Group

Noted:

30A.1 At EDCOM 2/19 (13-14) the Annual Report of PMASG for 2012-13.

30B UCL Board of Examiners

Noted:

30B.1 At EDCOM 2/20 (13-14) the Annual Report of the UCLBE for 2012-13.

31 DATE OF NEXT MEETINGS

Noted:

31.1 In 2013-14 EdCom would meet as follows:

6 March 2014 - 2pm - 4.30pm in Chadwick G07

1 May 2014 - 2pm - 4.30pm in the Haldane Room

19 June 2014 - 2pm - 4.30pm in the Haldane Room

SANDRA HINTON

Quality Assurance Manager, Academic Services, Student and Registry Services

[telephone: 020 7679 8590; internal extension 28590; fax 020 7679 8595; e-mail s.hinton@ucl.ac.uk
13 December 2013.