



UCL

1 February 2024

54.1. The Chair reported that she had approved the outcomes of the IOE Early Years Primary and Literacy Clusters (IOE) and Science and Technology Studies MSc (MAPS) Boards of Examiners in line with the emergency procedures for handling external examiner absence. Both board teams were commended for the actions they had taken to ensure that standards were upheld in difficult circumstances.

Director, Office of the Vice Provost Education and Student Experience (OVPESE). EdCom was asked to note the report and comment on the appropriateness of the direction of travel.

- 56.2. EdCom noted that the work, which was part of the implementation of the Excellence in Education statement, sought to understand what was already happening in this area, and working well, and where there were opportunities for development.
- 56.3. That the group felt that it was possible to define a distinctive pathway for how we deliver research intensive education at UCL, while not necessarily a distinctive definition of the principle. This focused on leveraging our strengths: our heritage, our people, and our extensive range of disciplines. Through this, they had reflected on some of the following:
- a) Whether all programmes sufficiently scaffolded learning that enabled a throughline of teaching in research skills, provided space for imaginative or creative thinking, and provided sufficient criticality early enough in the programme. Could more be done to disentangle research skills from being delivered in specific modules, instead making clearer how we are actively embedding them throughout programmes?
 - b) How we could do more to leverage student research, and create learning opportunities through, for example, increasing the access to publication.
 - c) That while we made effective use of staff subject expertise, and the content of their research, in our teaching –

assessment. Students also noted that there was already unfairness in the assessment experience – students following programmes with more in person assessments were not benefitting from GenAI tools to the same extent as those on coursework heavy programmes.

57.7. The Chair reflected on the discussion and summarised her responses to some of the feedback:

- a) She confirmed that the intention of the document was not to encourage colleagues to move back to invigilated exams, and that there were many other methods of assessment that could be conducted in-person, including discussion of draft assignments, lab and practical work, presentations etc.
- b) She noted that we should be training our students on how to use GenAI tools as they will form a part of every modern workplace, and all graduates will be expected to know how to use them. For example, it is to be expected that all students will use them to assist their learning. However, we must ensure that they are trained to use them ethically, and that it is clear when the use of them is either undesirable in supporting students' learning, or not permitted.
- c) She acknowledged that the challenge was significant, and that it would require significant work to address, but that the alternative was to not take action to address concerns about the integrity of our assessments, and the subsequent value of our awards. This would be a significant disservice to our students and a failure of EdCom to uphold our responsibility to sustain a high quality education for all students.

constraints; however, a vote was conducted on approving the proposal –