EDUCATION COMMITTEE

6 December 2016

M I N U T E S

Present:
Professor Anthony Smith (Chair)
Ms Mehjabin Ahmed; Dr Tracey Allen; Ms Wendy Appleby; Ms Halima Begum; Dr Ben Clifford; Mr Mark Crawford; Dr Caroline Essex; Dr Julie Evans; Professor Dilly Fung; Dr Clare Goudy; Ms June Hedges; Dr Arne Hofmann; Ms Blathnaid Mahony; Dr Helen Matthews; Professor Tim McHugh; Mr Derfel Owen; Professor Norbert Pachler; Ms Aiysha Qureshi; Dr Hazel Smith; Professor Eva Sorensen; Dr Fiona Strawbridge; Ms Susan Ware.

In attendance: Mr Rob Traynor for item 6; Ms Lizzie Vinton (Secretary).

Apologies were received from: Dr Simon Banks; Ms Judith Hillmore; Dr Christine Hoffmann; Dr Mike Rowson; Ms Olga Thomas; Professor Angie Wade.

Key to abbreviations
AC

21.2 The paper presented the work led by Professor John Mitchell and the Digital Education team in expanding the coverage of Lecturecast across UCL in response to feedback from students. The proposals suggested that an opt-out policy would be the best way of providing the highest level of coverage and would help UCL to offer the scheme in 80% of lectures held in compatible rooms. Work was underway to ensure that timetabling data were as accurate as possible so that recordings were not made for staff opting out. It was suggested that a working group was set up to oversee implementation for 2018-19 and that EdCom should play an ongoing role in monitoring the scheme and ensuring that coverage was as high as possible.

21.3 EdCom discussed whether opting out should be at the level of the individual. There were also concerns about consistency within modules and programmes if individual members of staff opted out, however there were greater concerns about student satisfaction if Department-level opt-out was allowed. It was agreed that the policy should make clear to students that there might be good reasons for a member of staff opting out, and that the policy might provide further detail on the types of situations in which this might occur to ensure a shared understanding with students. Members felt that it was important to emphasise to staff that Lecturecast would only be used for pedagogic reasons and not for any sort of monitoring purposes, and that there was the option of editing the recordings to remove, for example, conversations during breaks etc. which might not be appropriate for distribution.

21.4 There were some concerns about the impact of Lecturecast on attendance at lectures themselves – some Faculties had found this problematic, although others had not experienced any noticeable impact. Students used the recordings for a number of reasons, including revising lectures they had attended, watching lectures they were unable to attend due to work or personal commitments, or simply because that was their preferred learning style. However it was recognised that some students used the recordings because of overly-demanding timetables, and that it was incumbent upon Departments to review such problems by reconsidering timetables and ensuring that the content of lectures was discursive and engaging, encouraging students to attend in person.

21.5 UCLU supported the opt-out policy as part of their ongoing campaign to increase

although it was noted that minutes could perhaps record this more explicitly to aid monitoring. It appeared that more work was needed to increase PGT and PGR StARs recruitment and attendance. EdCom noted that a sister report had been received at RDC which had agreed that all Faculties should now have separate committees responsible for PGR student matters to ensure that research degree issues received appropriate scrutiny and to promote attendance by PGR StARs. Separate terms of reference would be developed for approval at RDC in March 2017.

22.3   The report noted a reduction in discussions about Faculty learning and teaching strategies, largely because the formal requirement for these had been removed. It would, however, be timely to now reconsider how Faculty strategies could align with and be informed by the new Education Strategy.

22.4   EdCom also discussed the dissemination of UCL policies and regulations to Faculty and Departmental committees. In some cases there was clear evidence of new policies and regulations being discussed at a local level but this was not always the case. It was however noted that this was not perhaps the most effective way to disseminate key UCL policies and that targeted communication and implementation plans should be a central part of policy developments. These should factor in consultation with FTCs, DTCs and other local fora, which needed to be given development timetables in advance so that discussions could be scheduled in effectively.

23   NEW QUALIFICATION PROPOSAL: POSTGRADUATE DIPLOMA IN EDUCATION

23.1   **Received** – the proposal at <u>EDCOM 2-05 (16-17)</u>.

23.2   EdCom noted that some points required further discussion outside of the meeting and that the matter would be considered by Chair's Action.

24   LATE SUMMER ASSESSMENT PILOT *[Minute 7 16-*

and working with Departments to develop more holistic approaches to assessment across a student's time with UCL.

25.3   EdCom welcomed the steps proposed for reducing assessment loads. It was recognised that this would require quite fundamental cultural changes and a move away from testing knowledge and further towards assessing the extent of achievement against module learning outcomes. EdCom suggested that PMAP might develop clearer guidelines about reasonable volumes of assessment in relation to credit, and for module approval forms to perhaps include more detail about individual assessments to better inform the approval process. However EdCom also recognised that this could only help to drive throuhat1 1d4(ap)3(prov)gnBT1 0 0 1 82.824 752.88 T37hane4(d TJETQgru)13(r

31   ANY OTHER BUSINESS

31A   Teaching Excellence Framework

31A.1   The metrics had now been confirmed and UCL was drawing together its written submission and related data. The implementation group would meet on 15 December with a view to circulating a draft for feedback by the end of the year. The final submission would be made on 26 January, and would be approved by EdCom Chair's Action in the absence of another meeting before that date.

31A.2   EdCom noted that the National Union of Students had proposed, and that UCLU had passed a motion to support, a national boycott of the NSS 2017. As such, UCLU would not be involved in the promotion of the survey at UCL this year. It was noted that the