

61 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING
(EdCom Minutes 49-60, 25.04.17)

61.1 Approved the Minutes of the meeting held on 25 April 2017.

62 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

62A Anonymous Marking
(EdCom Minute 38, 02.03.17)

62A.1 Faculties had previously been asked to consider a draft policy on anonymous marking (EDCOM
3-06 (1667.86 29.4 re W* n BT /F4 11.04 Tf 1 0 0 1 111.38 647.86 Tm 0 g 0 G [(06)06 (16

63C Attendance Monitoring

63C.1 The Chair gave advanced notice of an item for discussion for EdCom early in the next session.
This was to consider the

repeat year students as they faced other consequences for academic failure including the substantial costs of extra tuition fees, the additional effort to repeat their study and the delays to completion of their degrees. The argument was acknowledged that wealthier students could be advantaged if modules were not capped by playing the system to improve their overall results (i.e. they would not be constrained by the cost of doing so), but the student representatives believed that this would be only a very small number of students and that punishing the majority of repeat year students with the cap on marks was unfair. The prevailing view of ARQASC and EdCom was that this needed to be an academic decision, not based on the consequences of additional costs to students etc. It was further noted that students in difficulties were in any case covered by the EC regulations and that these rules applied to academic failure only. Parity was also essential with the students who did not fail if there was no cap, students with a more serious level of failure would be rewarded if they later repeated and substantially improved their marks. It would thus be unfair to allow these students a second chance of achieving better marks than their peers who had passed first time by working harder and engaging more with their programmes. It was also noted that if resits were capped, repeat marks must also be.

- c) Condonement - diverse views on condonement of marks for marginal failure were received, though recommended that condonement should be used before resits were offered. It felt that although students resitting may achieve improved marks, this was often minimal and it would better to condone the failed mark so that they progressed without having to resit. It was noted that there were strong feelings in Brain Sciences on PGT condonement and that many students would prefer to resit as condoned marks had a larger impact on their degrees. There was a common view that condonement makes more sense at UG level. However, it was noted that the PGT rules were already UCL policy and it was not proposed to alter them in the draft policy, though suggested that the Academic Manual make this clearer. The possibility of condoning marks down to zero had also elicited strong views, but was considered necessary to enable maximum flexibility in applying condonement. In practice it was likely to be rarely used and noted that a student would need to perform very strongly in their other modules in order to achieve the sufficient mean overall grade to progress
- d) Deferred Assessment - it was suggested that the two year maximum for completion of the deferral could be punitive for those students on a flexible 5 year programme (often with work commitments), fairly common in the Faculty of Brain Sciences or those with mental health problems. Some of the returning students are completing projects and just need supervision, not teaching, though returning to study after more than two years could prove difficult for many students. A small number of requests for suspensions of regulations had come to the attention of AS in this area.
Agreed - to consider the rules for deferred assessment in the next iteration of the regulations.
- e) Communicating the changes to the regulations - the regulations will be published in the Academic Manual and a briefing message sent to faculties and departments. ARQASC will also consider the communications around this at its next meeting. It was suggested that informing departmental staff meetings of the revised regulations would be helpful. The Deputy Director of AS invited further suggestions from members for wider dissemination across UCL.

64.4 Approved EDCOM 5-01 (16-17), the Late Summer Assessments and Consequences of Failure 2017-18 regulations. The Chair thanked AQRASC and the EdCom members and noted that the approved regulations were less punitive for students and more enabling, whilst meeting the student request for LSAs and

64.5 Agreed that members forward any suggestions for communicating the changes to the approved regulations to AS.

Action ±EdCom Members

- 65 UPDATES TO THE ACADEMIC MANUAL 2017 -18: CHAPTER 7 ACADEMIC PARTNERSHIPS FRAMEWORK
- 65.1 Received EDCOM 5-02 (16-17) the draft Academic Manual Chapter 7: Academic Partnerships Framework presented by the Senior Policy Advisor (Academic Partnerships).
- 65.2 Reported the Senior Policy Advisor (Academic Partnerships) reported that:
- a) The draft policy had been considered and approved by ARQASC and by RDC, the latter focussing on the proposed new regulations for split-site PhDs.
 - b) The changes to the regulations were largely operational, incorporating amendments to definitions and processes. New annexes included the principles for the management of study abroad.
 - c) The changes were based on the feedback received from a consultation with faculties, staff and appropriate committees. They were based on the operation of the regulations in practice, initially introduced last year, rather than major policy changes to them.
- 65.3 Approved EDCOM 5-02 (16-17), the draft Academic Manual Chapter 7: Academic Partnerships Framework.
- Action: the Senior Policy Advisor (Academic Partnerships) to note
- 66 PEER DIALOGUE SCHEME AMENDMENT
- 66.1 Received EDCOM 5-03 (16-17), a paper outlining amendments to the Peer Dialogue Scheme introduced by Dr Jenny Marie, Senior Teaching Fellow, UCL Arena Centre for Research based Education.
- 66.2 Reported : ±Dr Marie outlined two proposals for amendments to the Peer Dialogue scheme:
- (i) An additional option allowing staff to reflect on their educational practice with students who they do not teach and
 - (ii) Extending Option A to allow for a wider diversity of educational practice to be observed.
- The first option was based on a UCL C

- d) It was noted that the FTC Terms of reference currently stipulated that departments report on the numbers of staff undertaking peer dialogue (but not the content of the engagements), under the previous PoT policy. This would need to be amended if monitoring the instances of peer dialogue was no longer part of the policy.
- e) It was suggested that guidance for Heads of Department would be helpful to gauge whether peer dialogue engagements between staff and students would be appropriate. Such engagements could be very beneficial for staff and students and, if linked to SSCCs as suggested in the ChangeMaker project, would produce a rich source of information and

when other areas of UCL were using their modules and felt that they had less control in

- b) Many students reported that they found the large range of modules to choose from confusing and whilst appreciating the opportunities available, wanted reliable information on what modules would be most appropriate for them and whether they were deliverable. Students were often disappointed when their module choices were not allowed due to over-subscription, or withdrawal of the module.
- c) There was much support for the action proposed for the creation of more coherent option choices and guided advice, but noted that there was a risk that this could limit freedom of

68 STUDENT COMPLAINTS REPORT 2017

68.1 Received EDCOM 5-05 (16-17), the Students Complaints Report 2016-17, introduced by the Casework Manager, AS.

recognised by students interested in this area and the HESA data indicated that enrolment numbers on MLA programmes elsewhere in the UK had grown by 70% in recent years. The discipline had expanded and was becoming more influential in city and town planning and as such was well placed to meet the UCL Grand Challenges agenda, as well as meeting research-based educational criteria for the connected curriculum. The proposal had strong support from the School of Architecture as well as in the Faculty.

69.3 The Registrar noted that careful scrutiny was necessary before granting the use of a new award title at UCL, to ensure that the title had weight in wider academia and that it was likely to be still be relevant and in use in a few . The Registrar was supportive of this request and noted that the Bartlett School of Architecture had presented a coherent case properly and through the correct processes. There were no concerns with adding this qualification to the list of UCL Masters programmes.

69.4 Agreed: that EdCom recommend approval of the new MLA qualification to AC. It was noted that the Bartlett School of Architecture may wish to seek AC Chair last AC meeting of the session was to be held in the next few days.

Action: Mr Oliver Wilton to notify the AC Secretary.

70 APPROVAL OF NEW PROGRAMMES OF STUDY

70.1 Approved the programmes recommended by Programme and Module Approval Panel for approval at EDCOM 5-07 (16-17).

71 APPROVAL OF NEW ACADEMIC PARTNERSHIPS

71.1 Approved the new academic partnerships recommended by Academic Partnerships Review Group for approval at EDCOM 5-08 (16-17).

72 MINUTES OF SUB COMMITTEES AND WORKING GROUPS

72A Received Minutes of the Academic Regulations and Quality Assurance Sub Committee EDCOM 5-09 (16-17)
13 March 2017

72B Received Minutes of the Academic Partnerships Review Group EDCOM 5-10 (16-17).
6 April 2017 and 5 May 2017

72C Received Minutes of the Programme and Module Approval Panel EDCOM 5-11 (16-17).
3 April 2017 and 27 April 2017

72D Received Minutes of the Quality Review Sub Committee EDCOM 5-12 (16-17).
30 March 2017 and 15 May 2017

73 SUSPENSIONS OF REGULATIONS

73.1 Approved The anonymised suspensions of regulations report at EDCOM 5-13 (16-17).

74 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

74A ASER Intensive Update

74A.1

- c) The Chair noted that ASER was also useful in providing evidence for UCL to the TEF Assessors of how departments with academic difficulties were identified and addressed.
- d) It was suggested that it would be helpful if Faculty Tutors were also included in the outcomes of the ASER Intensive engagements, especially the work on curriculum and assessment changes.

75 DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS:

25 July 2017, 2.00 - 4.30, Haldane Room, Wilkins Building

ROB TRAYNOR, on behalf of

LIZZIE VINTON

Secretary to Education Committee

Assessment Regulations and Governance Manager | Academic Services | Student and Registry Services

Email: l.vinton@ucl.ac.uk

19 July 2017