



## EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**Mr Edwin Clifford-Coupe**  
**Dr Brenda Cross**  
**Dr Caroline Essex**  
**Dr Julie Evans**  
**Mr Marco Federighi**  
**Dr Arne Hofmann**  
**Dr Christine Hoffmann**  
**Ms Valerie Hogg**  
**Ms Bella Malins**

**Ms Kathleen Nicholls**  
**Mr Gergely Raccuș**  
**Dr Hilary Richards**  
**Dr Ruth Siddall**  
**Ms Paula Speller**  
**Ms Olga Thomas**  
**Professor Derek Tocher**  
**Ms Susan Ware**  
**Dr Andrew Wills**

*In attendance:* Ms Sandra Hinton (Secretary); Ms Irenie Morley.

*Apologies for absence were received from:* Ms June Hedges; Mr Ken Marsden; Dr Fiona Strawbridge.

### *Key to abbreviations*

AC	Academic Committee
CALT	Centre for the Advancement of Learning and Teaching
CU	Course Unit
EDCOM	Education Committee
ESPS	European Social and Political Studies
HEI	Higher Education Institution

PGT	Postgraduate taught
PMASG	Programme and Module Approval Steering Group
PPD	Personal and Professional Development
QAA	Quality Assurance Agency
RAS	Registry and Academic Services
RRG	Regulation Review Group
SLC	Student Loans Company
SoP	School of Pharmacy
TF	Teaching Fellow
UCLBE	UCL Board of Examiners
UCLU	UCL Union



**Discussion:**

17A.5 EdCom members were unclear about how days were counted with respect to weekend and public holidays when students could still be using UCL resources.

**RESOLVED:**

17A.6 The Director of Financial Planning and Strategy will clarify the counting of days and report back to EdCom. **[Action: Ms Valerie Hogg]**

**17B Undergraduate Admissions – improving conversion activity [EdCom Min.5, 12-13]**

**Noted:**

17B.1 An update at EDCOM 2/13 (12-13), introduced by the Head of Outreach and Admissions.

**Discussion:**

17B.2 The Faculty of Brain Sciences Faculty Tutor reported that holding Saturday open events was proving more challenging than previously anticipated, owing to UCL regulations on numbers of Fire Marshalls required to be present.

**RESOLVED:**

17B.3 That EdCom receive a further update at its meeting on 12 March 2013. **[Action: Ms Bella Malins]**

**18 SCHEDULED LEARNING PERCENTAGES – ISSUES ARISING FROM UCL PREPARATIONS FOR THE KEY INFORMATION SET (KIS)**

**Noted:**

18.1 A paper at EDCOM 2/14 (12-13), introduced by the Director of Academic Support.

**Reported:**

18.2 During UCL's preparations for the KIS, undertaken by a Steering Group (KISSG) of QMEC established for this purpose, an issue had arisen regarding the calculation of scheduled learning hours. EdCom was invited to consider whether the calculation method agreed by AC in 2008<sup>[1]</sup> required revision and, if so, to discuss some alternative proposals. In its deliberations, EdCom was asked to be mindful that the KIS would be treated as a statutory return upon which UCL would be audited and that future institutional reviews of HEIs by the QAA would look at how the KIS data was used.

**Discussed:**

18.3 The main points were:

---

<sup>[1]</sup> That UCL's statement on learning hours should stipulate 1200 learning hours during the 30 weeks of the academic year, and an additional 300 learning hours during vacation periods across the calendar year, a total of 1500 learning hours per undergraduate learning year.

- The KIS did not make any distinction between types of contact;
- Some members felt that the decision to calculate learning hours based on 1500 learning hours per undergraduate year should be revisited, as it seemed to perpetuate a misperception that UCL did little teaching;
- EdCom members overall were more inclined toward the proposal that UCL adopt the view that the maximum number of scheduled hours that could occur during term-time was 1200 (30 weeks at 40 hours per week) and that the other 300 hours of learning occurred during holidays, weekends and evenings and therefore should not be included for this calculation. However, more thought would be needed as to how to present this. There would need to be a clear rationale as to why UCL was calculating scheduled hours on this basis.
- If EdCom were to decide gather percentages from departments, a decision would be required before Christmas in order to give them as much notice as possible about how to calculate this before entering the data on Portico.
- If EdCom were to decide to gather contact hours, the Head of Student Data Services could do the calculation and EdCom could look again at the data gathered at its meeting of March 2013.

**RESOLVED:**

- 18.4 EdCom resolved that contact hours should be gathered. The Head of Student Data Services would perform the calculation and EdCom would then review the data gathered at its meeting of March 2013. **[Action: Mr Gary Smith]**

**19 PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

**CONFIDENTIAL** 401 T2]i0.98 0 0 10.98 70.92 462a(N)-rc

**Reported:**

20.2 As reported above, the Personal Tutoring



scrutiny of the SoP's regulatory and procedural framework with a view to integrating where appropriate, SoP's procedures with those of UCL.

**24 DRAFT ANNUAL REPORT FROM EDCOM TO AC FOR SESSION 2011-12**

***Noted:***

24.1 At EDCOM 2/19 (12-13)

and its possible uses within a UCL context. Once this had been fully thought through, it would be resubmitted to EdCom.

**RESOLVED:**

- 25A.5 That the RRG be invited to develop further the possibilities for UCL presented by a fit to sit policy and to submit its findings to the next meeting of EdCom. **[Action: Ms Sandra Hinton]**

**25B Barring and Academic Insufficiency**

**Noted:**

- 25B.1 At EDCOM 2/21 (12-13), a note from the EdCom Chair and some examples of draft Learning Agreements, Contracts and Suspension Warnings currently in use.

**Discussion:**

- 25B.2 The outcome of the RRG's discussion of the issues had been that barring, academic insufficiency and termination of studies should be abolished as separate procedures but retained as possible sanctions within Learning Agreements (etc.). However, EdCom members made a number of objections to this, considering that while greater use of Learning Agreements should be welcomed, barring must be retained as a separate procedure and that the existing problems with implementation of the barring procedure might be solved by making a number of simple amendments to the current stipulations that warnings should be given no later than half way through the course/module/course unit in question. Much might be done by way of minor amendments to make the process workable and EdCom was therefore adjured to think carefully before abolishing the barring procedure altogether.
- 25B.3 There were also objections to the RRG's proposals that if a student's combined Learning Contracts applied to 2 or more course units then the Faculty Tutor should apply to the Dean of Students (Academic) for a Learning Agreement that applied to the whole session. This amounted, it was felt, to a removal of the Power to Suspend vested in the Provost and delegated by him to Faculty Tutors under Regulation for Management 14.2. The removal of this power from the Faculty Tutor, it was felt, entailed the removal of the Faculty Tutors' ability to act in such matters. Moreover, this also implied the transferring of responsibility to the Dean of Students (Academic) for the interviews which accompanied Suspension Warnings which, given their number, represented a large additional workload. The Chair agreed that the RRG should discuss the issues further.

**RESOLVED:**

- 25B.4 That EdCom invite the RRG to discuss the issues further and to submit its findings to the next meeting of EdCom. **[Action: Ms Sandra Hinton]**

**25C SAME SESSION AND SEPTEMBER RESITS**

**Noted:**

- 25C.1 The RRG had discussed the above at its meeting of 13 November 2012 and had resolved that the Chair would prepare a paper for Faculty Boards of Examiners,







**Discussion:**