Education Committee
Room 822, Institute of Education

25 April 2023

Confirmed Minutes

Present:
Professor Kathy Armour (Chair)

Dr Ali Abolfathi; Professor Simon Banks; Ms Karen Barnard; Dr Nicole Brown; Dr Parama Chaudhury; Ms Sarah Cowls; Professor Sally Day; Mr Ashley Doolan; Dr Julie Evans; Professor Arne Hofmann; Ms Harriet Israel; Mr Zak Liddell; Ms Blathnaid Mahony; Dr Margaret Mayston; Ms Mary McHarg; Professor Norbert Pachler; Professor Paola Pedarzani; Professor Mary Richardson; Professor Aeli Roberts; Mr Mike Rowson; Dr Fiona Strawbridge; Dr Hazel Smith; Professor Olga Thomas; Ms Lizzie Vinton; Dr Nalini Vittal; Professor Nicola Walshe and Ms Julia Wojciechowska

In attendance: Ms Evi Katsapi (for Dr Jo Fraser-Pearce), Ms Lindsay Ure (for Ms June Hedges), Ms Sally Mackenzie (Minute 79), Mr Carl Salton-Brooks (Minutes 82) and Mr Rob Traynor (Interim Secretary).

Apologies: Mr Hamza Ahmed; Mr Ian Davis; Dr Jo Fraser-Pearce, Ms June Hedges; Dr Elvira

Šã : ã^ÁXḁ̃ ¢ } ̇ÈV @̊Á•|ã̃^•Á̦ ^¦^Á&[||æ^å/̥̊ã ¢ /̥æ̊Á• ã̃ * |^Ḁ́å[&̌ { ^} ỡ̊Q̥d[å̆ &ḁ̃ã̦ } Ḁ́[Á̌/̌ÔŠ̥ą
Strategic Education Projects 2022-27

research councils and industry and overseas student recruitment near its limit. Home student fee income was also unlikely to increase, despite improved demographics, due to the economic situation and increasing student scrutiny of the cost of education. Careful consideration would be required of the current resources and how they might be used more effectively, drawing on prior experience and successes both within UCL and from the sector.

79.8. ⟨garbled text⟩ encourage discussions on these emerging ideas across faculties, professional services and with the SU. A conversation paper had been circulated to faculties to elicit collective responses (deadline for comment 31 May) and consultation events with the SU and professional services were also scheduled in May. It was intended that the draft Framework would be submitted to EdCom in June and July for review. It would then be formally submitted to Academic Committee for approval.

80. Introduction to Programme Architecture

80.1. Received - a presentation and discussion paper at EDCOM 6-02 (22-23) introduced by Ms Lizzie Vinton, Project manager: Programme Architecture. The slides are included in the ⟨garbled text⟩ Strategic Education Projects 2022-27 ⟨garbled text⟩ EdCom Teams site and SharePoint.

80.2. EdCom noted that the Programme Architecture framework would replace the current

programmes to align with in a way that is appropriate to their discipline. This will help to alleviate complexity in scheduling and module selection, with new programmes choosing the right template for their requirements. The first two workstreams were intended to free up staff time and resources, to be considered by Workstream 3, Creating Space which will help add value to learning opportunities for all students. This will link with the themes emerging from

Higher Education Development & Support (HEDS) will create HEDS Faculty Partnership Teams (HFTPs), as outlined in the UCL strategic Plan 2022-27. The

83.   Examinations and Assessment Contingency Panel Update

83.1.   Received . a late paper at EDCOM 6-08 (22-23) introduced by Professor Norbert Pachler, Chair of the Examinations and Assessment Contingency Panel (EACP). The paper outlined ÒŒÔÚɋ Á¦[ ] [•æ|Á[¦Áassessment mitigation arising from the continuing University and College Union (UCU) industrial action and specifically, the Marking and Assessment Boycott (MAB). The proposals related to undergraduate (UG) assessments with postgraduate taught (PGT) to follow later. EACP would meet again soon to agree guidance.

83.2.   EdCom was informed that the proposals needed to ensure that academic standards were met and ensure problems arising from the MAB dealt with in a timely manner. This needed to be fair and meet the student expectation to receive the outcomes of their degrees. It was proposed that classification should be given where possible, even where marks might be missing, if the student met the overall programme learning outcomes.

83.3.   The locus of decision making would