University Teaching Committee

[Unconfirmed] Minutes of the Meeting held on 13 July 2023, 9.30-12.30, in HG/21, Heslington Hall and via video conference.

Meeting Attendance

Members present:

Tracy Lightfoot, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching, Learning & Students); Chair
Steve King, Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching, Learning and Students)
Claire Hughes, Associate Dean for Teaching, Learning and Students (Sciences)
Jill Webb, Associate Dean for Teaching, Learning and Students (Social Sciences)
Tom Cantrell, Associate Dean for Teaching, Learning and Students (Arts and Humanities)
Patrick Gallimore, Chair of Standing Committee on Assessment
Wayne Campbell, Academic Registrar
Meely Doherty, YUSU Academic Officer
Tom Banham, Director of SAAA
Jen Wotherspoon, Deputy Director, Student Services
Zoe Devlin, Head of Online Partnerships
Kirsty Lingstadt, Director of Library, Archives and Learning Services
Petros Kafalas, Vice-President Learning and Teaching, CITY College
Lisa O'Malley (co-opted member, School for Business and Society)
Richard McClary (representing Arts and Humanities)
Michael Bate (representing Sciences)
Paul Bishop (representing Sciences)
Simon O'Keefe (representing Sciences)
Matthew Perry (co-opted member, Director of the International Pathway College)
Jane Warne, Head of Academic Quality (Secretary)

In attendance:
David Gent, Academic Quality (Assistant Secretary)
Adrian Lee, Academic Quality Policy Manager
Craig Adams, VLE Transformation Project Manager (for M22-23/120-121)
Nick Glover and Jess Penn, Inclusive Learning Advisors (for M22-23/125- 127)

Apologies: Michelle Alexander, Claire Ball-Smith, Jan Ball-Smith, Hannah Smith, Teng Zhang, Vice-President (Academic), GSA.

Section 1: Standing Items

22-23/113 **Welcome**
The Chair welcomed Meely Doherty, the new YUSU Academic Officer, to the Committee and expressed thanks to Pierrick Roger, the YUSU President, for their work to cover following the resignation of the previous Academic Officer. The Chair thanked Jane Warne, the outgoing Head of Academic Quality, and Teng Zhang, the outgoing GSA Academic Officer, for their contributions.

22-23/114 **Declarations of interest in items on the agenda [oral report]**
Members were invited to declare any potential conflicts of interest relating to the business of the meeting; none were declared.

22-23/115 **Unreserved minutes of the last meeting held on 8 June 2023 [UTC.22-23/89]**
The Committee **confirmed** the minutes of the meeting held on 8 June 2023 as an accurate record.

Action tracking and matters arising from the minutes not covered elsewhere on the agenda [UTC.22-23/90, Open]

22-23/116   The Committee **noted** a log of progress on actions arising from the minutes. It was **reported that:**

1. The action in relation to the YUSU Block Grant had been completed (M22-23/97 refers).

2. The Secretary would shortly circulate a document to the Committee to identify further suggestions for future analyses of degree outcomes (M22-23/93 refers).

3. The Chair and Secretary would review the actions listed as ongoing.

22-23/117   **Report of Chair's action [UTC.22-23/91, Open]**
The Committee **received** a report on decisions taken by Chair's action since the last meeting.

22-23/118   **Chair's report [oral report]**
The Chair **reported** the following:

1. The release of NSS results had been delayed until 10 August 2023.

2. The University would receive the provisional result from TEF 2023 in the week of 7 August. This would be under embargo until the publication of results by the Office for Students in September. The Chair and Communications team had developed a communications plan.

3. Members of Special Cases Committee had been thanked for their work and informed of Senate's decision to disband the Committee; an Academic Advisory Group was being set up.

4. The Chair thanked staff for their efforts on the Marking and Assessment Boycott. It was **reported** that:

    a. Compared to other HEIs, the University was in a relatively good position in terms of impact on students. 85% of undergraduate finalists had been able to graduate as expected with a further 10.4% having a provisional result based on contingency measures. Around 170 finalists did not have a classified award, concentrated in a small number of departments. 92% of undergraduate students had been able to progress without risk. Students were being supported on a case-by-case basis.

    b. Several universities in the sector (particularly the Russell Group) had collectively agreed to accept students going on to further study without a full run of marks, based on trajectory. Students were also being supplied with a letter to explain the situation to potential employers.

    c. All finalists had been invited to a ceremony to celebrate their achievements. The ceremonies would make no distinction between students who had been given an award and those who had not. Certificates would be provided after the ceremony.

22-23/119   **Student Representatives' reports [oral reports]**
Meely Doherty, the YUSU Academic Officer, **reported** that YUSU continued to support students affected by the Marking and Assessment Boycott via its Advice Centre.

Section 2: Strategic Development, Performance Monitoring and Student Insight– items for consideration and/or decision

Update on Turnitin Feedback Studio [UTC.22-23/92, Open]

22-23/120   The Committee **received** a presentation from Craig Adams, VLE Transformation Project Manager. The presentation was informed by the Chair's decision (taken in light of members' comments via written circulation) to continue with anonymous assessment in 2023/24, following assurance that

this would be able to run in Turnitin Feedback Studio without disproportionate burdens. It was **reported** that:

1. The timeline in the presentation had been revised in light of feedback from FLTGs. The Marking and Assessment Boycott was not thought to present risks to the timeline.

2. FLTGs and UTC would be kept informed of progress of this work in Semester 1 of 2023/24.
Action: Secretary to add to UTC schedule of business.

Thanks were expressed to all involved in taking this work forward.

22-23/121   The Committee **observed** that:

1. Colleagues had reported mixed understanding over whether assessment tools in BlackBoard would still be available. It was **reported** that the University's approach was to use Turnitin Feedback Studio in the first instance, but that other tools such as Gradescope would be available for assessment formats not supported by Turnitin Feedback Studio.

2. The project was being communicated via a number of different channels. Given the implications for departmental assessment practices and written policies and statements, it was advised that Chairs of Boards of Examiners should be added to this list.

3. The project was not trying to achieve greater standardisation of feedback forms and practices, but would better showcase variation in practice. The possibility of greater standardisation would be explored as part of the Assessment and Feedback Project and the Faculty of Social Sciences had an active project on standardisation of assessment practice.

22-23/122   **Update on Interdisciplinary Teaching and Proposed Working Group on Electives [UTC.22-23/93, Open]**
The Committee **received** a verbal update on developments in interdisciplinary teaching from Tom Cantrell, Associate Dean for Teaching, Learning and Students (Arts and Humanities), and **considered** proposed terms of reference and membership for a UTC Working Group on Electives. It was **reported** that:

1. The University was due to advertise for a Director of Interdisciplinary Teaching, which would be a 0.4 FTE position available on a buy-out basis. The role-holder would play a key role in driving forward interdisciplinary developments and would Chair the IDT Board of Studies.

2. The first five York Interdisciplinary Modules (YIMs) had been designed and would be delivered via the Environmental Sustainability Academy (ESAY) in 2023/24. Between 200 and 250 students had signed up for the YIMs. These figures included c. 150 students from Environment and Geography taking the established Sustainability Clinic module.

3. The Faculty of Arts and Humanities was developing a Faculty-based BA in Liberal Arts. This would include thematically-clustered modules from within the Faculty in the first instance.

4. The University had appointed a Founding Professor and Head of Department for the new Department of Architecture and the Built Environment. It was intended that the initial undergraduate programme in the Department would include interdisciplinary elements.

5. It was intended to add a representative from Internal Communications to the Working Group on Electives, in addition to the membership proposed in the paper. Academic Quality was included in the Working Group membership for their expertise and not necessarily as the secretariat to the Group. There remained a need to identify who would service the Group.

22-23/123   The Committee **observed** that:
1. Students undertaking modules outside their own department / school often reported problems with understanding of assessment expectations. It was **reported** that this issue was being given active consideration in the design of York Interdisciplinary Modules.

2. A number of UTC Working Groups would operate during 2023/24. There was a need to consider how these could be serviced and to ensure that there was no overlap between the

groups. This should be discussed further over the summer.
Action: PVC (TLS) & Director of SAAA

22-23/124   **Resolved: to approve the terms of reference and membership of the UTC Working Group on Electives, noting the addition of a Communications representative to the Group.**

22-23/125   **Student Staff Partnerships: Statement of Approach [UTC.22-23/94, Open]**
The Committee **considered** a paper proposing a draft Statement of Approach and working definition of Student Staff Partnerships and a set of next steps in this area. Nick Glover and Jess Penn from the Inclusive Learning Team attended the meeting to speak to this item.

22-23/126   The Committee **observed** that:
1. The definitions and next steps identified in the paper were welcome. Student partnerships were important to the working of the University and its strategic vision.

2. It would be important to evaluate the impact of this work. This could also form a useful case study for the next TEF. An update should be included in the UTC schedule for 2023/24.
Action: Secretary

3. Faculties should reflect on how this work might inform Faculty Learning and Teaching Strategies. **Action: Associate Deans (TLS)**

22-23/127   **Resolved: to approve the Statement of Approach and working definition for Student Staff Partnerships, and to endorse the next steps outlined in the paper.**

22-23/128   **Academic Skills Steering Group: Annual Report [UTC.22-23/95, Open]**
The Committee **considered** an annual report from Academic Skills Steering Group.

22-23/129   The Committee **endorsed** the priorities for 2023/24 set out in the paper. The Committee further **observed** that:

1. There was potential for overlap between the Steering Group and the Working Group on Artificial Intelligence. It was important that the groups worked together to avoid duplication.

2. One of the priorities of the Steering Group was to embed data reporting systems, which would support the collection of more refined data on students' use of academic skills services. This data might form part of the annual review system when established.

3. The report noted examples of the use of emerging / immersive technologies. A fuller update on how such technologies were being used in the University should be provided to the PVC for Teaching, Learning and Students, identifying examples of good practice.
Action: Director of Library, Archives and Learning Services

4. The Sciences FLTG had expressed concern at reports that a post in the Maths Skills Centre would not be renewed. This reflected constraints on recruitment in light of the challenging financial situation. UTC recognised the utility of this role in academic and wellbeing support, noting that other posts were similarly affected. If the Faculty of Sciences had specific concerns, these should be raised via the Dean of Faculty to Budget Monitoring Group.

22-23/130   **Artificial Intelligence Working Group [UTC.22-23/96, Open]**
The Committee **considered** proposed terms of reference and membership for a UTC Working Group on Artificial Intelligence (AI) in respect of teaching, learning and assessment for taught students.

22-23/131   The Committee **observed** that:
1. The membership of the Working Group was potentially too large, with some overlap. The Chair of the Group would examine whether it was possible to streamline the membership after the Group had commenced its work. To support this, the Group might be able to draw on the work of other Groups, such as the Employability Strategy Group.

2. The Group was due to consider whether to add a compulsory tutorial module on AI for students. Consideration was also being given to a training module on the use of Turnitin Feedback Studio. The paper envisaged both these sets of training would be part of the Academic Integrity training for first year students, but would be separate for other students. In response, the Committee noted that the University had removed the compulsory status of the Academic Integrity training for this academic year. There would be challenges in making additional training compulsory and this would be challenging to develop for 2023/24. Consideration needed to be given to the demands being placed on students and to distinct requirements for collaborative provision and HYMS. It would be beneficial to consider this issue over the longer-term. Such training could alternatively be embedded into departmental skills modules. The Working Group should ensure that any actions on this issue were proposed to UTC.   **Action: Associate PVC (TLS) / Chair of SCA**

22-23/132   **Resolved: to approve the terms of reference and membership of the Working Group.**

22-23/131   **Access to Names in Anonymous Surveys [UTC.22-23/97, Open]**
              The Committee **considered** a paper from the Department of Computer Science, which requested to be allowed access to the names of students who made discriminatory and / or offensive comments in anonymous internal surveys (such as module evaluations) and set out a mechanism to follow up such comments via the Regulation 7 disciplinary process. It was **reported** that this was a response to a specific incident, but is an ongoing problem in the Department.

22-23/132   The Committee **observed** that:
              1. No member of staff should be subject to sexist or racist comments. Students could be reminded of behavioural expectations at the start of surveys. Work should also be conducted to develop text on the expectation of respectful feedback for inclusion in student handbooks.
                                             Action: Internal Communications / Academic Registrar

              2. In time, advances in technology might facilitate censoring of comments. In some current surveys, such as NSS, offensive comments were manually redacted.

              3. There were challenges in de-anonymising an anonymous survey. There was potential for this approach to deter students from providing feedback. This would need careful thought, with advice from the University's Data Protection Officer. Consideration would also need to be given to the scope of policy (for instance whether it included surveys not run through Qualtrics; comments on Mentimeter; comments that might cause safeguarding concerns).

              4. Given this, there was a need for a University-wide approach rather than a departmental approach in this area. This issue should be considered as part of broader work on module evaluation in 2023/24, picking up the work of the former Module Evaluation Working Group.
                                                                                    Action: PVC (TLS)

22-23/133   **Update from Learning and Teaching Forum [UTC.22-23/98, Open]**
              The Committee **received** an update from Learning and Teaching Forum, including proposals for the 2024 Learning and Teaching Conference. It was **observed** that:

              1. The Chair had sent comments back to the author of the paper. Discussions were ongoing with the other White Rose Universities about the possibility of collaboration on the learning and teaching conferences at the respective universities. These discussions should be taken forward and any actions arising from them conveyed to the Chair of Forum to inform conference planning.   **Action: PVC (TLS) and Associate Deans (TLS)**

              2. The paper proposed dates for the conference of both week 12 in Semester 2 and week commencing 3 June 2023 (which did not align). These dates were both in the revision and assessment period in Semester 2 and so may be inconvenient for staff and students.

Section 3: Policy and Regulatory Matters

22-23/134   **Student Academic Engagement and Wellbeing Policy [UTC.22-23/99, Open]**
The Committee **considered** a proposed Student Academic Engagement and Wellbeing Policy.
Tom Banham, Director of Student Administration and Academic Affairs, **reported** that:

1. The aim of the policy was to identify students who were not engaging with their programmes to facilitate interventions to improve engagement and wellbeing. In the first instance, this would be done via monitoring of attendance at timetabled sessions, engagement with supervision meetings, and submission of assessments and associated follow-up. Equivalent policies and procedures were in place at many other UK universities.

2. The intention was that the policy and procedure (and underlying systems) would develop in time to capture other forms of engagement. This included online engagement with flipped teaching.

3. The policy was aligned to the revisions to the Supervision Policy (M22-23/137 refers).

4. The policy would be accompanied by an underlying procedure [under development], which would set out the thresholds for minimum attendance that would trigger follow-up.

5. Students who were not engaging according to the monitoring system would be contacted, with a check made on their wellbeing and whether they were engaging with studies in other ways. Where such interventions did not work, the Support to Study procedure would be used.

6. The policy would replace the existing Attendance Management Policy for international students, but would apply to all students. It would come into effect on 1 September 2023, dependent on the introduction of the Check-In system.

7. The policy had been informed by comments at Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups and had been endorsed by YGRS and Student Life Committee. It had also been informed by input from the Visa Compliance Team.

22-23/135   The Committee **observed** that:

1. Differences in contact hours between programmes might make a consistent threshold for attendance difficult to establish. Extra-curricular sessions in the timetable (such as Careers sessions) could also complicate monitoring.

2. The policy referred to an expectation that students attend all timetabled teaching sessions. This expectation was thought to be too strong: some sessions were seen as compulsory and some optional, whilst some students preferred to engage with lectures via lecture capture. The policy should be revised to take this into account. It was however noted that the International Pathway College had more stringent attendance requirements.

3. It would be helpful if the policy or procedure could contain further detail on both expectations for students undertaking study abroad and on any differences for part-time students.

4. The provisions around follow-up of non-submission of assessment might require a change in practice in some departments / schools.

5. It would be helpful if the policy was accompanied by student-facing communication. It was **reported** that the Check-In system was supported by a website, which contained answers to student questions.

6. The cost of living crisis was creating some barriers to engagement. As such, it was important that the policy and website emphasised the supportive nature of the policy. The language of the policy should be revised to take this into account.

7. The implementation of the policy should be evaluated, with a paper to be submitted to UTC in the 2023/24 academic year.

Action: Secretary to add to UTC schedule

22-23/136   **Resolved: to approve the proposed policy, subject to the revisions identified by the Committee.**   **Action: Director of SAAA**

[*Secretary's Note: the policy was revised following the meeting, with the final version signed-off by Chair's action on 19 July 2023*]

22-23/137   **Taught Student Supervision Policy [UTC.22-23/100, Open]**
The Committee considered a paper outlining revisions to the Taught Student Supervision Policy for 2023/24. Lisa O'Malley spoke to this item and **reported** that:

1.   The paper represented the outcomes of a light-touch review of the policy to align with the new semester system and the Student Academic Engagement and Wellbeing Policy.

2.   It had not been possible to take forward the full outcomes of the Supervision Working Group in time for implementation in 2023/24. As such, the paper further set out proposed next steps to complete this work during the next academic year in advance of 2024/25. This work would include revisions to the guidance for supervisors and creation of a role descriptor.

22-23/138   The Committee **observed** that:
1.   The revised policy required that supervision meetings should be held twice per semester in Semesters 1 and 2. This represented a decrease in the minimum requirements for supervision meetings in a year for international students (set at two per term), and in practice would likely represent a decrease for all students in many departments. It was **reported** that the policy set out minimum requirements; departments / schools were free to offer additional meetings.

2.   The revisions to the policy established a new requirement that supervision meetings should be recorded in e-vision, following the Student Academic Engagement and Wellbeing policy. Not all departments used e-vision, and this would cause significant additional work in the Department of Mathematics due to its use of Moodle. Further discussions should be held with the Department of Mathematics around this change to establish if a technical workaround was possible or whether to permit an exception or alternative to this aspect of the policy.
                                                                        Action: Director of SAAA & Lisa O'Malley

22-23/139   **Resolved:**

1.   **To approve the revisions to the Taught Student Supervision Policy**, **which should now be communicated to departments / schools.**   **Action: Director of SAAA**

2.   **To endorse the next steps for the outcomes of the Supervision Working Group in 2023/24, as detailed in the paper.**

22-23/140   **Exceptional Circumstances and Self-Certification [UTC.22-23/101, Open]**
The Committee **considered** a paper outlining key principles for the revision of the Exceptional Circumstances affecting Assessment (ECA) policy being undertaken by Standing Committee on Assessment (SCA) ahead of the 2023/24 academic year.

The Chair of SCA **reported** that these included a review of evidence requirements to make these less rigid and allow a wider range of evidence; a review of the wording for bases of claim to make these fairer and more appropriate; the ongoing incorporation of additional adjustments for students in specific identifiable categories; and adjustments for bunched assessments. These had previously been discussed at UTC with many of the provisions approved for 2022/23.

22-23/141   The Committee **observed** that:

1.   YUSU welcomed the retention of provision for addressing bunched assessments.

2.   The Committee supported the retention of limits for self-certification for 2023/24. SCA was exploring whether to split students' self-certification allowance between semesters or (for those not on the semester system) an alternative period of time. This might affect the overall allowance. YUSU would be consulted on this before a decision was made. Programmes not on the semester system should also be identified and their needs taken into account.

3. YUSU noted that some students used self-certification because they had made an ECA claim but this was not processed in time; YUSU would appreciate consideration being given to how this should impact the self-certification allowance for students in that situation.

22-23/142 **Resolved: to endorse the proposals in the paper.**

22-23/143 **Report on OIA Complaints 2022 [UTC.22-23/102, Open]**
The Committee **considered** a paper on the OIA Statement on Complaints for 2022. This summarised the OIA's activity in relation to appeals and complaints involving the University.

22-23/144 The Committee **observed** that:

1. The OIA required the University to award compensation for cases considered by the OIA that the University had not resolved within six months, with an average of £250 per case. There were around 400 active appeals, with an average resolution time of nine to twelve months.

2. Higher Education Partners (HEP) had contributed to the compensation that had been awarded to students involved in a group complaint relating to York Online Computer Science programmes.

22-23/145 **Credit Accumulation Policy Framework [UTC.22-23/103, Open]**
The Committee **considered** a proposed programme design framework for taught postgraduate awards completed by credit accumulation. Adrian Lee, Policy Manager in Academic Quality, spoke to the paper and **reported** that:

1. The University had a small number of PGT programmes where awards were available via credit accumulation, which would be covered by the framework. These were typically CPD programmes. The intention was for these programmes to move to the new policy statement from 2024/25, with new provision able to use the policy from 2023/24.

2. The University did not currently have the systems and processes in place to fully accommodate more flexible forms of postgraduate study represented by the policy. It was intended to conduct discovery work to establish what systems, resources and practical issues affected full implementation of the policy and to propose appropriate solutions.

22-23/146 The Committee expressed its thanks for the significant work that lay behind the policy statement.

22-23/147 **Resolved: to approve the proposed Programme Design Policy Statement for Taught Postgraduate Awards by Credit Accumulation and to endorse the proposed discovery work.**

Section 4: Quality Assurance Processes

22-23/148 **Articulation Agreement and Dual Award: Economics and Southwestern University of Finance and Economics, China [UTC.22-23/104, Open]**
The Committee **considered** a proposal to establish an articulation agreement and dual award between the Department of Economics and Related Studies and Southwestern University of Finance and Economics (SWUFE), China. Adrian Lee, Policy Manager in Academic Quality, spoke to this item and **reported** that:

1. Under the proposal, students from SWUFE would join Stage 2 of undergraduate programmes in the Department of Economics and Related Studies, from 2024/25 onwards. Whilst at York, students would be full students of the University and would fall under York regulations and procedures.

2. The Department had carefully mapped provision at SWUFE with provision at York to ensure alignment. External assessor's comments had been received and were positive about the proposal.

3. Academic Quality and Global Partnerships had developed a taxonomy which defined various forms of collaborative provision and explained their differences.

22-23/149   The Committee **observed** that:
1.   The collaboration was strategically significant and provided a model for future partnerships. Jenny Brotherton in Academic Quality was thanked for their work on the proposal.

2.   The Department of Mathematics had previously had a 3+1+1 collaboration with SWUFE, but this had failed to recruit sufficient numbers to be viable. The Department of Economics and Related Studies was encouraged to liaise with the Department of Mathematics to discuss this experience.
Action: AQ to feedback to Economics and encourage collaboration

3.   The SWUFE programme was partly taught in English, building students' English Language ability. There was, however, potential for SWUFE students to experience challenges with study skills at York. The Department was advised to monitor this and implement any specific study skills support resources that students joining from SWUFE might need.

4.   The collaborative provision process should be amended to ensure that DTEF were consulted on proposals prior to consideration at UTC to provide assurance on accommodation issues.
Action: AQ Policy Manager

22-23/150   **Resolved: to approve the proposed collaboration, subject to the following conditions, which should be completed prior to final sign-off under Chair's action:**

a.   Receipt of an appropriately completed due diligence form from SWUFE

b.   Resolution of an outstanding question about lower awards to be given to students who do not complete the full credit for an undergraduate award.

c.   Clarification of the University's responsibilities towards advising students from SWUFE of the implications for their SWUFE award of non-completion at York.

Action: Department of Economics and Related Studies

22-23/151   **York Maastricht Partnership: Dual Award, Environment [UTC.22-23/105, Open]**
The Committee **considered** a proposal to establish a dual award between the University (Department of Environment and Geography) and Maastricht University from 2024/25, and a related modification to an MSc programme in Environment. Michael Bate and Petros Kefalas had reviewed this proposal on behalf of the Committee. It was **reported** that:

1.   The proposal had been endorsed by the BoS in the Department of Environment and Geography.

2.   Under the proposed collaboration, students would take the first semester at Maastricht and the second semester in York. The capstone project could be conducted at either institution and would be jointly supervised. Accommodation were aware of the need to accommodate students joining from Maastricht in Semester 2.

3.   The workload required of students whilst at Maastricht in Semester 1 was relatively high but reflected European norms. The design of the programme took into account the ECTS system.

4.   The reviewers had made the following recommendations to the Department:

a.   To delay offering the option of a capstone project with placement until at least 2025/26, assuming Maastricht were willing to support this delay.

b.   To rephrase PLO4 for ease of reading and to ensure the PLO is assessable.

c.   To consider adopting a single assessment rubric for co-supervised capstone project assessment, with the Maastricht rubric seen as the simplest option.

d.   To review feedback provided on the module descriptors by the UTC reviewers.

22-23/152   The Committee **observed** that:

1. The UTC reviewers had identified a number of conditions of approval for the dual award. As such, UTC was willing to endorse the proposal but not to approve at this meeting.

2. The dual award would require specific assessment rules to be developed and built into SITS. This would require a significant investment of time in professional services, involving colleagues with specific technical expertise. This work would run alongside the development of revised assessment rules arising from the Modularisation and Semesterisation project. There was a need to provide assurance that the proposal could be delivered for 2024/25. This work could draw on the work of the previous Project Manager for the York Maastricht partnership, who had investigated assessment rules when the partnership was established.

Action: Deputy Director (Student Services)

22-23/153   **Resolved:**

1. **To approve the replacement of the Department of Environment and Geography's MSc in Sustainable Business: Leadership, Innovation and Management with a York-only MSc in Sustainable Business, Environment and Society for 2024/25 onwards, subject to completion of the programme approval form (this should be submitted to the UTC reviewers for review and then the proposal signed-off under Chair's action).**

2. **To endorse the proposed dual award between York and Maastricht University, with the following conditions to be resolved prior to further review by the UTC reviewers and submission to the Chair for sign-off under chair's action:**

    a. To complete the programme approval form for the dual award.

    b. To confirm and clearly document in the programme approval forms and agreement between York and Maastricht under what circumstances dual degree students will be able to obtain awards.

    c. For the Department to work with SCA to agree any bespoke assessment, progression and award rules required for the dual degree, including compensation, reassessment, use and conversion of marks from Maastricht, lower exit awards, dissertation marking and handling of differences between first and second markers.

    d. To confirm arrangements at York for dual degree students' semester 1 resits of Maastricht modules, particularly provision of "a proctored exam room" York was asked to provide. UTC noted that if this involved standard invigilation this would be acceptable but that it would be reluctant to approve disproportionate proctoring arrangements. Consideration should also be given to the timing of reassessments so as to minimise the impact on students' engagement with semester 2 modules.

    e. To confirm in the agreement between the Universities and then explicitly and accurately document and communicate to staff and students: academic misconduct, disciplinary, complaints and academic appeals responsibilities, drawing upon appropriate advice from Student and Academic Services as required.

    f. To confirm in relation to transfers from the dual award to the York-only/ Maastricht-only programmes what is practicable and appropriate, drawing on advice as required from appropriate professional services.

Action: Department of Environment and Geography to submit proposals

Section 5: Sub-committee Summaries and Meeting-related information

22-23/154   **Committee reports (unreserved)**
UTC would receive a written report from the Standing Committee on Assessment meeting held on 7 July 2023 at its meeting in September.

David Gent, Academic Quality Team
19 July 2023