

LONDON'S GLOBAL UNIVERSITY



UCL

---

**EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

**8 December 2011**

**MINUTES**

*Present:*

Professor Vince Emery (*Acting Chair*)

17 **MINUTES**

***Approved***

- 17.1 The Minutes of the meeting of EdCom held on 14 October 2011 [*EdCom Mins. 1-31, 14.10.11*], issued previously, were confirmed by the Committee and signed by the Chair.

18 **MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

[*See also Minutes 19 & 20 below*]

18A **QAA Consultation on External Examining 'Expectations' and Guidance – UCL Response**

[*EdCom Min. 9.5, 11-12*]

***Noted***

- 18A.1 EdCom had resolved that the Acting Chair would investigate the feasibility of recording UCL staff External Examiner activity on *MyView* with UCL Human Resources.
- 18A.2 Neither *MyView* nor *IRIS* were capable of recording this information. The issue would be investigated further by the Acting Chair and Richard Warren of ISD.

19 **INSTITUTIONAL LEARNING AND TEACHING STRATEGY – IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

[*EdCom Min. 11, 11-12*]

***Noted***

- 19.1 The ILTS Implementation Plan (item 52) required EdCom to 'monitor the range of assessment types in use across disciplines with a view to informing UCL strategies for encouraging greater diversity in this area'. EdCom resolved that a report on key assessment types be submitted to its December meeting.

***Received***

- 19.2 At APPENDIX EDCOM 2/12 (11-12) - the report and appendices A-D.

- 19.3 An oral report from the **Director of Student Services, Mr David Ashton**.

***Reported***

- 19.4 In order to facilitate discussion, an analysis of the assessment data stored on Portico at module level was undertaken and EdCom was provided with data showing overarching module assessment components (eg. written examination, oral examination, coursework etc.). The data was high-level and was intended to give a flavour of the range of assessment types in use at UCL to serve as a starting point for discussion. However, the data did not show where the assessment was undertaken as e-assessment and EdCom was invited to consider whether it would be useful to gather this data.

### ***Discussed***

19.5 The main points were as follows:

- Portico should be the definitive store for data on assessment once captured but this would have resource implications. The module approval process was currently being automated and this would help with the capture of both the high-level assessment data and its sub-components.
- As more detail on the assessment methods would be required to form both part of the Higher Education Achievement Report and the Key Information Set, a single, unified approach to data gathering to meet the requirements of both would be sensible.
- The descriptor 'coursework' was a broad one, often masking a variety of approaches. The wording of the PIQ perpetuated the traditional approach to assessment by asking whether assessment was to be by examination or coursework and then requesting word length. It would be helpful if the proposed monitoring of the range of assessment types also stimulated thinking about introducing an increased variety of assessment, which, in accordance with the ILTS, had been the driver for the above preliminary analysis.
- It would be useful if the data, grouped by faculty, were sent to Faculty Tutors for discussion by FTCs. FTCs should consider whether it would be useful to gather data on e-assessments and whether there should be a change to the overarching module assessment components terminology.

### ***RESOLVED***

19.6 That the data, grouped by faculty, should be sent to Faculty Tutors for discussion by FTCs. **[Action: Mr David Ashton]**

## 20 **REVIEW OF THE HARMONISED SCHEME OF AWARD**

*[EdCom Min.23, 10-11]*

### ***Noted***

20.1 Departments/Divisions had been provided with programme level data, via the Faculty Offices, so that the Harmonised Scheme of Award could be reviewed together with the Faculty variations on the Harmonised Scheme. However, one Faculty (Mathematical and Physical Sciences) had responded, noting that it had found difficulty in analysing the data sent and no other faculties had made any comment. Additionally, since the data had been circulated, two new faculties had been created.

### ***Received***

20.2 An oral report from the **Director of Student Services, Mr David Ashton.**

### ***Reported***



## **RESOLVED**

- 21.5 That CALT should liaise with LTSS regarding proposals to support and enhance the use of Moodle across UCL. **[Action: Dr Fiona Strawbridge and Dr Sue Bryant]**
- 21.6 That HoDs should be provided with data on Moodle usage across all the modules within their departments. **[Action: Dr Fiona Strawbridge]**
- 21.7 That any further comments and suggestions should be sent to Dr Fiona Strawbridge. **[Action: EdCom members to note]**

## 22 **OVERHEAD PROJECTORS IN LECTURE THEATRES**

### ***Received***

- 22.1 An oral report from **Dr Hilary Richards, Faculty Tutor, Faculty of Life Sciences and Faculty of Brain Sciences.**

### ***Reported***

- 22.2 Lack of consultation with faculty staff over refurbishment of teaching space,

## ***Discussed***

23.4 Discussion followed of which the main points were as follows:

- The situation for postgraduate students was more complex than that set out in the proposed service standards in faculties such as the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, where topics for dissertations were not 'set' in advance but were developed over a longer period. These topics were neither decided nor confirmed until January or February, making the proposed deadline of two weeks after the beginning of term impossible to meet.
- The quality of feedback often varied from tutor to tutor who was, in any case, often a postdoctoral student or research assistant rather than the primary supervisor. Students often worked on their dissertations during the summer, when staff were away. However, it was noted that students should be able to expect feedback during the summer. Assessment and feedback were areas where UCL often achieved lower scores in student surveys such as the National Student Survey and the International Student Barometer. It was possible that the National Student Survey would be extended to encompass PGT students and it would be useful if clear service standards for feedback to these students were in place before this happened.
- Student grievance cases at postgraduate level invariably cited lack of written feedback. A standard proforma should be considered for written feedback on projects undertaken during a Year Abroad. This would also serve to manage student expectation concerning the feedback they could expect to receive.

## ***RESOLVED***

.-1.1@urDing 4T van\$udenplace 5MC nSoectation concerninyvmOCiDinrre to bormfi0elRling

25 **PROVISION OF EXAMINATION ACCOMMODATION**

***Received***

- 25.1 At APPENDIX EDCOM 2/15 (11-12) - a report from the Head of Examinations and Academic Programmes.
- 25.2 An oral report from the **Head of Examinations and Academic Programmes, Ms Paula Speller.**

***Reported***

- 25.3 The report presented a review of current examination accommodation arrangements and provided details of an alternative accommodation for consideration. A purpose-built temporary structure had been erected in Bedford Square for the delivery of the August/September 2011 graduation

the structure of the academic year which would help to improve the delivery of taught programmes, and allow the university to introduce a generic end-of-examinations programme for all undergraduates, focusing on global citizenship and enterprise. The paper would also recommend that a final decision on a more radical change to the term structure should be informed by the outcomes of the Programme Review.

## 27 INTERVIEWS: DEFINITION AND POLICY

### *Noted*

27.1 At its meeting on 11 October 2011, the Admissions Structures and Selection Processes Steering Group had approved a revised definition and policy for interviews.

### *Received*

27.2 At APPENDIX EDCOM 2/16 (11-12) – the definition and policy.

### *Resolved*

27.3 There were a number of comments on the ASSP document and the EdCom Chair requested that these be forwarded to the Secretary to the ASSP, Mr Lyndon McKeivitt. **[Action: EdCom to note]**

## 28 DIGITAL LITERACY PROJECT

### *Received*

28.1 At APPENDIX EDCOM 2/17 (11-12) – the Digital Department Project Overview.

28.2 An oral report from Ms Lorraine Dardis and Ms Stefanie Anyadi from the **UCL Digital Literacy Project**.

### *Reported*

28.3 Although TAs contributed directly to the student experience, their specific digital literacy needs rarely been recognised or addressed. The Digital Literacy Project would therefore analyse the diverse skills and abilities needed in a modern 'digital department', and explore how best to benchmark, develop, share and evaluate best teaching administration digital practice across UCL. Supported by the Association of University Administrators, the Digital Literacy Project aimed to establish a sector-wide certification framework and a certificate was currently in the pilot stage.

28.4 In parallel, the project would explore how technology could enhance the effectiveness of academic processes. There were more than forty tools routinely used by TAs but these were not always integrated. A Steering Committee had been set up including representatives from ISD and HR and working groups had been established to identify areas where practice varied and to share any good practice. The scheme was currently voluntary but this

was under discussion with HR. It was hoped that newly recruited TAs could be assessed on arrival for internal training and support.

***Discussed***

- 28.5 The Project representatives confirmed that JISC funding was in place and that the project would like to encompass not just TAs but also academic staff and students. EdCom expressed its support for the project.

***RESOLVED***

- 28.6 That further details of the project, comprising the Project Summary, a Project Poster, a Project PowerPoint presentation and the NUS Charter on Technology in Higher Education be circulated to EdCom via the Sharepoint.  
**[Action: Ms Sandra Hinton]**

29 **GLOSSARY OF TERMS**

***Received***

- 29.1 At APPENDIX EDCOM 2/18 (11-12) – the (draft) glossary.
- 29.2 An oral report from the **Director of Student Services, Mr David Ashton**.

***Reported***

- 29.3 EdCom was asked to consider whether a glossary of terms associated with regulations, students and programmes should be devised to assist in the use of nomenclature and to ensure clarity of understanding by all parties when communicating about regulations or the student experience.

***Discussed***

- 29.4 EdCom agreed that a full glossary should continue to be developed alongside the academic regulations and resolved that a small working group be set up to continue this work.

***RESOLVED***

- 29.5 That a working group be established to develop the glossary, comprising the

### ***Received***

- 30.2 At APPENDIX EDCOM 2/23 (11-12) – a paper from the **acting Chair of EdCom.** (tabled at the meeting).
- 30.3 An oral report from the **acting Chair of EdCom, Professor Vince Emery.**

### ***Reported***

- 30.4 Following meetings with various departments within UCL to discuss the Common Timetable and a meeting of a core group of UCL stakeholders including the Vice-Provost (Education), Vice-Provost (Operations), Director of ISD, Head of Portico Services, Director of Student Services (RAS) and the Head of Room Bookings, faculties were asked to consult departments on a series of questions relating to potential improvements in the Common Timetable. The results of this consultation had been assimilated and provided a strong mandate for change in key areas of operation. The proposed changes in the operation of the timetabling at departmental/divisional levels which was circulated to faculties was summarised in APPENDIX EDCOM 2/23 (11-12).

### ***Discussed***

- 30.5 The proposed changes would be incorporated into planning for 2012-13 and represented the consensus views of the departments who responded to the questionnaire and so should have departmental support if adopted . The paper would also be submitted to AC's December meeting.

### ***RESOLVED***

- 30.6 That the paper at APPENDIX EDCOM 2/23 (11-12) be submitted to AC on 15 December 2011. [**Action: Professor Vince Emery**]

## **31 ACTION TAKEN BY THE VICE-CHAIR**

### **31A Approval of new programmes of study**

#### ***Noted***

- 31A.1 The EdCom Vice-Chair (also acting Chair), Professor Vince Emery, acting on behalf of EdCom and on the recommendation of PMASG, has approved the institution of the following programmes of study:
- *MSc Medical Bacteriology;*
  - *MSc Crime and Forensic Science;*
  - *MSc / PG Dip Engineering with Finance;*
  - *MSc / PG Dip Engineering with Innovation and Entrepreneurship;*
  - *MSc Rail Integrated Design Management (closed programme to Atkins staff);*
  - *MSc Drug Design by Distance Learning (this will be a route on the existing programme);*
  - *MSc Industrial, Organisational and Business Psychology;*
  - *BSc Psychology and Language Sciences.*

32 **MINUTES AND REPORTS FROM STEERING GROUPS ETC.**

32A **Programme and Module Approval Steering Group**

*Received*

32A.1 At APPENDIX EDCOM 2/19 (11-12) - the Annual Report of PMASG for 2010-11.

32B **UCL Board of Examiners**

*Received*

32B.1 At APPENDIX EDCOM 2/20 (11-12) - the Minutes of the meeting of UCLBE held on 19 October 2011

32B.2 At APPENDIX EDCOM 2/21 (11-12) - the Annual Report of the UCLBE for 2009-10 and 2010-11.

33 **CHAIR'S BUSINESS**

33A **Locus for Academic Regulations**

*Noted*

33A.1 The Acting Chair noted that the definitive version of the academic regulations should be stored in a single site which was well advertised and accessible. It was suggested that the new Teaching and Learning Portal might be the most suitable place for these to be held. However, the Registry and Academic Services website was shortly due for revision and this might yield alternative possibilities. Whatever site was decided upon, it was essential that all staff could be confident that the regulations stored therein were the definitive version.

34 **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

34A **LectureCast System**

*Received*

34A.1 An oral report from Dr John Mitchell, Chair of the Online Media Board.

*Reported*

34A.2 The Online Media Project Board viewed the LectureCast system as a useful tool that a number of lecturers liked to use to complement their teaching. It had traditionally been regarded as opt-in. However, in some areas of UCL, (most notably the Medical School) its use was being made compulsory, with opt-out only in exceptional circumstances. It was felt that the issues involved in this course of action should be considered at a level higher than that of the Project Board. EdCom was invited to consider the development of a possible policy on use of LectureCast for recommendation to Council.

***RESOLVED***