



EDUCATION COMMITTEE

29 June 2012

MINUTES

Present:

Professor Mike Ewing (*Chair*)

Mr David Ashton
Ms Karen Barnard
Professor David Bogle
Dr Sue Bryant
Ms Maheema Chanrai
Mr Neil Chowdhury
Dr Brenda Cross
Professor Vince Emery
Dr Caroline Essex
Mr Marco Federighi
Dr Arne Hofmann

Dr Christine Hoffmann
Ms Katherine Majid
Prof Alexi Marmot
Ms Helen Matthews
Dr John Mitchell
Ms Kathleen Nicholls
Dr Hilary Richards
Prof Richard Simons
Dr Fiona Strawbridge
Ms Olga Thomas
Ms Susan Ware

In attendance: Ms Sandra Hinton (Secretary); Professor Carmel McNaught (observing); Ms Irenie Morley.

Apologies for absence were received from: Mr Jason Clarke; Ms June Hedges; Ms Valerie Hogg.

Key to abbreviations used in this Agenda:

AC	Academic Committee
EdCom	Education Committee
ISD	Information Systems Division
KIS	Key Information Set
MAPS	Mathematical and Physical Sciences (Faculty)
PDMSMG	Programme Diet and Module Selection Management Group

67 **TERMS OF REFERENCE, CONSTITUTION AND MEMBERSHIP**

Noted

67.1 On 22 March 2012, AC resolved that the terms of reference of EdCom should be amended to encompass taught (undergraduate and postgraduate) student admissions and this change had now been made. In respect of this change, the **Head of Outreach and Admissions, Ms Bella Malins**, had been invited to join EdCom with immediate effect.

67.2 The Chair of QMEC thanked the following members of the Committee, who would be stepping down from EdCom at the end of session 2011-12,

Mr Luke Durigan, Education and Campaigns Officer, UCL Union [*in absentia*]. He would be replaced by Mr Edwin Clifford-Coupe.

Mr Neil Chowdhury, UCL Union Medical and Postgraduate Students' Officer. He would be replaced by **Mr Dante Micheaux**.

Mr Milo Bem, UCL Union International Students' Officer [*in absentia*]. He would be replaced by **Mr Mehran Bhatti**.

Professor Vince Emery. See also Minute 83C below.

Professor Sue Bryant.

67.3 The Chair thanked the staff and student representatives for their contribution to the work of the Committee. The Chair noted however, that the UCL Union International Students' Officer, Mr Milo Bem, had not attended any meetings of EdCom during the session.

68 **MINUTES**

Approved

68.1 The Minutes of the meeting of EdCom held on 4 May 2012 [*EdCom Mins. 54-66, 04.05.12*], issued previously, were confirmed by the Committee and signed by the Chair.

69 **MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

[*See also Minutes 73, 74 and 79 below*]

69A **Recording of external examiner activity undertaken by UCL staff**
[*EdCom Min. 39A, 11-12*]

Noted

69A.1 On 4 May 2012 the Vice-Chair reported that he had revisited, with Mr Richard Warren of UCL Management Systems Division, the possibility of recording UCL staff external examiner activity via existing functionality and had been informed that this was unlikely to be feasible. This activity would therefore need to be captured on spreadsheets, maintained in and by faculties. The Vice-Chair would update EdCom on this and on the related issue of the institutional recognition and reward of external examiner activity undertaken by UCL staff in due course.

70 **ACADEMIC REGULATIONS FOR 2012-13**

Noted

to review this during the forthcoming session 2012-13. **[Action: Ms Sandra Hinton to note]**

71 ANONYMITY FOR SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT

Received

71.1 At APPENDIX EDCOM 5/39 (11-12) – a paper from the MAPS Faculty Tutor.

71.2 An oral report from the **MAPS Faculty Tutor, Dr Caroline Essex.**

Reported

71.3 There were a number of difficulties in using candidate identifiers from the start of the session which compromised anonymity in examination marking. These were detailed in APPENDIX EDCOM 5/39 (11-12). EdCom was invited to consider ways of resolving this.

Discussion

71.4 It was noted that the UCL regulations on anonymity explicitly contradicted the advice contained in the Assessment Strategy, which advised that feedback should be offered in person where possible.

RESOLVED

71.5 That the anonymity rule be modified by requiring anonymity to be observed only where the weighting of the summative component being assessed was above 40% in any module assessment. If a candidate identifier was required which was not the candidate number, the SRN should be used. **[Action Ms Irenie Morley]**

72 KPMG AUDIT OF UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS

Received

72.1 At APPENDIX EDCOM 5/40 (11-12) – a note on the issues.

72.2 An oral report from the **Chair, Professor Mike Ewing.**

Reported

72.3 An internal audit of undergraduate admissions by KPMG had taken place in 2011 and a number of recommendations had been made for improvements including one concerning the central UCL Admissions Team's monitoring of departmental compliance with the service standards on admissions set out in the Academic Manual. KPMG had recommended that *'the central team should perform some quality assurance work on the admissions process in departments. In so doing, it may be necessary to reconsider the resources available to perform this task'*

72.4 UCL's initial response to KPMG had indicated that there was insufficient resource within central Admissions to undertake regular oversight of

departmental admissions processes and that improved management data would be required in order to monitor departmental turnaround times. This would be part of the ongoing admissions systems development. Discussions with the faculties would be needed to ascertain whether the recommendation

during the placement abroad for students supported at UCL by the Student Disability Services. It was recommended that this was undertaken in conjunction with the students' Departmental Tutors, as they would be aware of the students' circumstances. However EdCom noted that it was not always possible to identify mental health difficulties where these were undeclared or unreported to Student Psychological Services etc.

73.5 The group would continue to meet and would submit another report to EdCom in the autumn. **[Action: Mr David Ashton]**

74 **SCHEDULE OF DUTIES OF DEPARTMENTAL TUTORS**

[EdCom Min. 60, 11-12]

Noted

74.1 On 4 May, EdCom had received a draft revised Schedule of Duties on which EdCom made a number of comments and suggestions. EdCom resolved that the draft be circulated by Faculty Tutors to Departmental Tutors (etc.) and that any further comments and suggestions should be submitted to the Dean of Students (Academic). The Dean of Students (Academic) had now revised the draft to take into consideration all further comments and suggestions made and this could be found below.

Received

74.2 At APPENDIX EDCOM 5/41 (11-12) – the revised Schedule of Duties.

74.3 An oral report from the **Dean of Students (Academic), Professor Mike Ewing**.

Reported

Sections 5 and 4 (Admissions) contradicted one another and should be amended.

Section 21 (Communication), points (c) and (d), were usually dealt with by Admissions Tutors.

Section 16 (Pastoral), point (e) should be amended to the effect that The Departmental Tutor should be responsible for appointing a Careers Liaison Officer and then delegating to them the responsibility for careers guidance to students working with the UCL Careers Service.

The Schedule might in future be adapted to produce a version which encompassed the duties of Departmental Graduate Tutors, particularly in respect of PGT students.

RESOLVED

- 74.6 That the Schedule be revised, taking into account the above suggestions and the final version published in the UCL Academic Manual. **[Action: Professor Mike Ewing. Ms Sandra Hinton to note]**

ãÀ ä}Í € x

That it should be alluded to in the first Provost's Newsletter of the 2012-13 session.

That it should be put on Moodle.

That students could be alerted to its presence on Moodle and the Teaching and Learning Portal by means of an all-student email.

- 75.6 EdCom noted that the resourcing challenges posed by the strategy had been insufficiently addressed and that UCL would need to commit a significant investment of resources to the strategy if its aspirations were to be realised fully. The strategy, if implemented, had potentially large implications for the way UCL taught and assessed its students.

77 **UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS: REVISING UCAS APPLICATIONS FOLLOWING SUBMISSION**

Received

- 77.1 At APPENDIX EDCOM 5/44 (11-12) – a paper from the Head of Outreach and Admissions.
- 77.2 An oral report from the **Chair, Professor Mike Ewing**.

Reported

- 77.3 During the course of the 2012-13 admissions cycle there had been an increase in the number of instances where schools and colleges had submitted revised predicted grades. It was evident that schools were coming under increasing pressure from parents to change the predictions, often after a decision had been made by the university.
- 77.4 UCL had also been asked by schools to have a policy statement on the acceptability of additional information provided after the submission of an application. A single policy might encompass revisions to an application and/or predicted grades as well unsolicited additional information and EdCom was invited to consider the draft policy APPENDIX EDCOM 5/44 (11-12) for implementation in the 2013 entry admissions cycle.

Discussed

- 77.5 The proposed policy was approved with one amendment - it was requested that point 4 of the proposed policy should read (revisions in italics) 'Applicants who wish to be considered as a consequence of revised predicted grades *have the option of re-applying* the following year, *when they will be* considered in competition with all other applicants'.

RESOLVED

- 77.6 That the policy be amended to this effect and enshrined in the UCL Academic Manual:78.22 1 Tf0 Tc 0 Tw 23TT1 1 Tf0.0005 Tc 0.8003 Tw l6229 -1.1(the foA-aprrmarepor

79.2 At APPENDIX EDCOM 5/46 (11-12) – the Minutes of the PDMSMG 8 March 2012.

RESOLVED

79.3 That the recommendations of the PDMSMG be approved. **[Action: Ms Irenie Morley]**

80 THE DIGITAL DEPARTMENT PROJECT: UPDATE TO EDCOM

Received

80.1 At APPENDIX EDCOM 5/47 (11-12) – an update from the TDD Project Coordinator. A further report would be made to EdCom in the autumn.

81 ACTION TAKEN BY THE VICE-CHAIR

81A **Approval of new programmes of study**

Noted

83 **CHAIR'S BUSINESS**

83A **Special/Aegrotat Provisions**

Reported

83A.1 A meeting was held on 25 June 2012 to consider cases brought forward from Departments/Faculties under the Special and Aegrotat Provisions. A summary paper would be circulated once it had been prepared. **[Action: Mr David Ashton]**

83B **Examination Irregularity Panels**

Reported

83B.1 Three half-day sessions had been held to consider cases under the examination irregularity procedures. The Chair reported the following:

The process of senior invigilation staff issuing “on the spot” informal warnings and the option to consider cases with the Director of Student Services and issue up to a formal warning (with the right for the student to attend a panel) had been working well. The number of plagiarism cases had reduced significantly and this was thought to be due to the more widespread use of Turn-it-in as a learning tool for students.

The lack of attendance at plagiarism panels of departmental representatives to assist the panel had been disappointing and in some cases where a representative had been sent, they had not been well-briefed.

There was some concern about the departmental panels in terms of the consistency of penalties given. The Dean of Students (Academic) wished to review whether these were still needed and whether it might be better to bring the cases to the UCL panel in future (given the lack of attendance noted above).

Discussion

83B.2 It was noted that academics arriving in examinations often arrived late, which was disruptive to students. They were also required to be contactable. However this was not possible when they were travelling between examination sites, especially those remote from UCL. It would be preferable if they remained somewhere where they could be contacted in case a difficulty arose (such as an issue with the examination paper). A consistent policy was needed and it was suggested that the UCLBE should be invited to consider the matter further.

RESOLVED

83B.3 That the Dean of Students (Academic) review whether departmental plagiarism panels were still needed and whether these cases should

