18.4. EdCom was informed that the Faculty intended to set up agreements with other universities on entry criteria for failing students. Students would develop a portfolio on the programme mainly through continuous assessment, which would enable early identification and support for struggling students and provide opportunities to make up marks. Nonetheless, it was important that the programme was robust enough to ensure student readiness for UG study at UCL on completion of the Foundation Year 0.

18.5. **Approved** – the Foundation Year 0 regulations at EDCOM 2-03 (21-22).

19. Academic Representation Annual Report 2020-21

19.1. Received - the paper at EDCOM 2-04 (21-22) introduced by the SU Education Officer and the Policy, Governance and Insight Manager. The paper had also been received by the Student Experience Committee (StEC).

19.2. EdCom was informed that 2020-21 had again been a challenging year and the 1896 appointed academic representatives had performed admirably in often difficult circumstances. The SU had worked with representatives covering 92% of the 168 Staff Student Consultative Committees (SSCC). Feedback suggested that 76% would recommend becoming a representative. The report also summarised the achievements of the 2020 Vision project for student academic representation which had successfully drawn to a close. The SU would focus on building learning communities this year, alongside improving skill development and support to the academic representatives.

19.3. EdCom was also informed that around 1700 academic representatives had been appointed for 2021-22 so far, but there were concerns that 23 SSCCs appeared to have none and some 84 SSCCs were without a Lead Department Representative. Although training take-up had been positive, there was concern that representatives could miss out should they be appointed late. The SU was also experiencing challenges with staff shortages and was recruiting to cover this now. It was grateful for faculty and department patience.

19.4. It was queried whether this lack of student representation would be problematic for the student voice in the affected departments, or whether it was heard through other means. It was suggested that SSCCs in some instances might not be correctly positioned to meet SSCC policy, with some narrowly focussed on individual programmes and with small numbers of representatives. This was often challenging in terms of meeting the wider Student Academic Representation policy.

19.5. EdCom was informed that one faculty had a large number of such SSCCs, often for clinically orientated programmes or those on short programmes such as PG Certificates with students rarely coming to campus. The SU would be engaging with the faculty concerned in the New Year to address this. It was noted that it was

important to develop a culture of student engagement for all programmes to ensure that students felt included and part of UCL.

20.   AssessmentUCL Update

20.1.   Received – a presentation by the Director of Programme Development (UCL Arena) and the Head of Assessment Delivery and Platforms. The

21.6.

added to the Group, along with the one representative proposed in the draft Terms of Reference.

Agreed – that EdCom members interested in joining the Steering Group contact the EdCom Assistant Secretary.
Action – EdCom Members to note

23.5 **Approved** –

iv. Two other proposals:
- To confirm that all Boards of Examiners should be held virtually during 2021-22;
- Whether faculties should have full responsibility for any mark exclusion mitigations, removing the option to delegate some of this work to programme board of examiners. This would tighten up the regulations in the light of grade inflation and ensure strong faculty oversight.

26.3 It was queried whether it would be possible to amend the mark exclusion mitigation to require faculty oversight only where the component weighting was greater than 10%. There was a concern about the burden on faculties that have programmes with large numbers of modules with many small components. However, it was noted that the process for doing so would be made as light touch as possible by Student Records.

EdCom noted that the revised Annex 6.6.2 in the paper was incorrect: Managing the impact of industrial action on assessment, progression, and award. The version presented was the existing Academic Manual document and did not show the proposed changes to the text. The cover paper and other sub-sections of the rest of the paper were correct. Nevertheless, it was not possible to approve the proposed changes to Annex 6.6.2 at the meeting.

Agreed: to circulate the correct paper following the meeting and invite comments and suggestions on the text from members. It would then be considered for approval by Chair's action, subject to any necessary further editing.

Action: EdCom members and officers to note (Secretary to arrange circulation of the document).

Part III: Other Business for Approval or Information

27. Approval of New Programmes of Study

27.1. Approved - the programmes of study recommended by PMAP at EDCOM 2-11 (21-22).

28. Minutes of Sub-Committees and Working Groups

28.1. Approved the minutes of ARQASC held on 30 June 2021 at EDCOM 2-12 (21-22).

28.2. Approved the minutes of the Quality Review Sub-Committee (QRSC) held on 8 June 2021 at EDCOM 2-13 (21-22).

29. Suspensions of Regulations Report

29.1. Approved the Suspensions of Regulations at EDCOM 2-14 (21-22).

30. Any Other Business

30A Office of the Independent Adjudicator Judgement