Education Committee

Thursday 25 April 2024

Minutes (Confirmed)

Present:

Professor Kathleen Armour

Professor Paola Pedarzani; Professor Mary Richardson; Professor Aeli Roberts; Mr Mike Rowson; Professor Bill Sillar; Dr Hazel Smith; Ms Issy Smith; Dr Fiona Strawbridge; Professor Olga Thomas; Dr Nalini Vittal; Dr Kathryn Woods and Professor Nicola Walshe

In attendance: Ms Hannah Swallow; Mr Mark Rice; Ms Lizzie Vinton; Lisa French (Acting Secretary); Mr Rob Traynor (Assistant Secretary) and Ms Esra Celik (observing the meeting).

Apologies: Dr Nicole Brown; Professor Parama Chaudhury; Mr Shaban Chaudhury; Ms Sarah Cowls; Mr Ian Davis; Mr Ashley Doolan; Mr Daniel Farrell; Ms Manya Gupta; Professor Norbert Pachler; Dr Francesca Scott; and Professor Stan Zochowski.

Part I: Preliminary Business

63. Welcome, Apologies and Announcements

The Chair led colleagues in extending thanks on behalf of Education Committee (EdCom) to Ms Lizzie Vinton for

63.2 The Chair informed the Committee that the agenda for the EdCom Away Day on 16 May 2024 would include the future teaching estate and the feedback and assessment guidance.

64. Minutes

64.1. Approved subject to amendment of mi7(e)1Minutnu

65. Matters Arising

65.1. Arising from minute 55.1A, it was noted that Dr Fiona Strawbridge would provide an update to the Committee at its next meeting on the quality of AV in teaching spaces.

65.2. Arising from minute 58, it was noted that Academic Committee had approved the establishment of a Recruitment and Admissions Committee.

Part II: Matters f or Discussion

66. Personal Tutor Review

66.1. Received - the paper at EDCOM 6-02 (23-24), introduced by Dr Kathryn Woods, Pro-Vice-Provost Education (Student Academic Engagement). She highlighted that the personal tutor review had identified risks to UCL in being able to demonstrate compliance with the Office for Students (OfS) Condition of Registration B2. The Committee was invited to discuss the recommendations from the review.

66.2. The following points were raised as part of the discussion:

a) The recommendations from this review were welcomed, as academic staff were concerned about the boundary between their role and the role of Student Support and Wellbeing.

b) Further consideration was required on how personal tutoring was reflected in staff workload modelling.

c) It was suggested there should be more flexibility built into minimum office hours to ensure this was compatible with different staff working patterns, and that the term µ R I I L F H K R X U V ¶ should be reconsidered as this could be confusing for students.

d) The Personal Academic Tutoring dashboard was seen as key to the successful implementation of this policy.

e) There was concern that this policy could not be implemented without further investment into Student Support and Wellbeing.

f) The definition of academic support should reference the other academic support available to students through, for example, lectures and Moodle.

g) EdCom agreed µPersonal Academic T X W R U ¶ should E H U H Q D P H G µPersonal Academic M H Q W R U ¶

66.3. EdCom recommended there should be centrally allocated funding for professional support for students in departments, for example similar to the current Student Advisors or broader Student Experience Officers, that these should be locally embedded but supported in a central network, and that they should be made

available to all students. Where individual departments were able to choose whether or not to allocate resource to this support, EdCom considered that there would be highly variable and inequitable treatment of students across UCL. The Chair agreed to report this recommendation to the University Management Committee (UMC).

66.4. EdCom approved the recommendations from the Personal Tutor Review outlined in EDCOM 6-02 (23/24), with the considerations noted above.

67. Updated Higher Education Providers Consumer Protection Law Guidance

67.1. Received - the paper at EDCOM 6-03 (23-24), introduced by Ms Hannah Swallow, which outlined a risk-based approach to programme amendment and consultation with students.

67.2. Ms Swallow explained that all major, moderate and minor amendments to core modules required [illegible] with larger cohorts a response might not be received from every student and departments should consult with the legal and compliance teams for further advice.

67.3. EdCom commented that departments should be responsible for offer holder summaries, although noted it was currently difficult for departments to check whether these were correct as programme summaries were not always updated following a programme amendment. This should improve with the implementation of a new Curriculum Management System.

67.4. EdCom approved the updated definition and guidance for contact hours and the updated approach to consultation with prospective students/current students.

68. Revision to Degree Apprenticeship Programme Approval Timelines

68.1. Received - the paper at EDCOM 6-04 (23-24). EdCom approved the removal of the recruitment phase (1 year) of the timeline for approval of new programme proposals for degree apprenticeships.

69. In-Session Revision to Academic Misconduct Regulations

69.1. Received - the paper at EDCOM 6-05 (23-24), introduced by Mr Zak Liddell. EdCom approved the change to the academic manual outline in EDCOM 6-05 (23-24).

70. Feedback and Assessment Guidance

70.1. The Committee agreed this item would be discussed at the EdCom Away Day on 16 May 2024.

71.

- Thursday 25 July 2024, 14:00 ±16:30

Lisa French
8 May 2024