University Teaching Committee

Minutes of the Meeting held on 8 June 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
Tom Banham, Director of SAAA
Jen Wotherspoon, Deputy Director, Student Services
Zoe Devlin, Head of Online Partnerships
Jan Ball-Smith, Head of Apprenticeships and Inclusive Learning
Kirsty Lingstadt, Director of Library, Archives and Learning Services
Hannah Smith, Director of Student Careers and Systems
Petros Kafalas, Vice-President Learning and Teaching, CITY College
Claire Ball-Smith (representing Social Sciences)
Lisa O'Malley (co-opted member, School for Business and Society)
Michelle Alexander (representing Arts and Humanities)
Richard McClary (representing Arts and Humanities)
Michael Bate (representing Sciences)
Simon O'Keefe (representing Sciences)
Matthew Perry (co-opted member, Director of the International Pathway College)

In attendance:

Jane Warne, Head of Academic Quality (Secretary)
David Gent, Academic Quality (Assistant Secretary)
Bethan Ellis, Head of Strategic Insight and Analysis (for M22-23/89-93 only)
Pierrick Roger (YUSU President, attending in lieu of the YUSU Academic Officer)

Apologies: Paul Bishop; Teng Zhang, Vice-President (Academic), GSA

Section 1: Standing Items

Welcome

22-23/80   The Chair welcomed members to the meeting.

Declarations of interest in items on the agenda [oral report]

22-23/81   Members were invited to declare any potential conflicts of interest relating to the business of the meeting; none were declared.

Unreserved minutes of the last meeting held on 30 March 2023 [UTC.22-23/69]

22-23/82   The Committee **confirmed** the minutes of the meeting held on 30 March 2023 as an accurate record.

Action tracking and matters arising from the minutes not covered elsewhere on the agenda [UTC.22-23/70, Open]

22-23/83   The Committee **received** a log of progress in relation to actions arising from the minutes.

1. M.22-23/34 [Academic Supervision]: it was **reported** that further work had been conducted in relation to academic supervision and a paper would be submitted to the next meeting.

Report of Chair's action [UTC.22-23/71, Open]

22-23/84   The Committee **received** a report detailing decisions taken by the Chair on behalf of the Committee since the last meeting. This included approval of an updated set of VLE Site Design Principles (M22-23/44 refers) which took into account the needs of professional programmes (available to members in the Category 2 papers as UTC.22-23/85). The Chair thanked Claire Ball-Smith for assistance in this work. The principles would be reviewed annually and this work should be incorporated into UTC's schedule of business.   **Action: Secretary**

Chair's report [oral report]

22-23/85   The Chair **reported** the following:

1. To address assessment and progression issues arising from the Marking and Assessment Boycott, the University had implemented an institutional Board of Examiners, including the appointment of Professor Becky Huxley-Binns, the PVC (Education) at the University of Hull, as the Institutional External Examiner. .

2. The Chair thanked the Associate Deans for Teaching, Learning and Students; the Chair of SCA; the Deputy Director (Student Services) and student representatives in YUSU and GSA for their work in developing progression rules to be used during the Marking and Assessment Boycott, specifically acknowledging YUSU's help in creating a student-facing version of the rules.

3. The Chair and the Director of SAAA were due to meet the Director of Strategic Planning and Change to ensure that there was sufficient support for the Modularisation and Semesterisation project in the run up to the start of the new semesterised structure.

4. Senate had approved the removal of Special Cases Committee. The Chair thanked the Deputy Director (Student Services) and the Student Services Manager (Special Cases) for their work on this issue. Many of the functions of Special Cases Committee would be transferred to the central Special Cases team, allowing a more agile response. An Academic Advisory group would be established to provide academic input for more complex cases. The policy functions of Special Cases Committee would be transferred to UTC, SCA, Student Life Committee and YGRS: the terms of reference of these committees should be updated if necessary.
Action: UTC, SCA, SLC, YGRS Secretaries

Student Representatives' reports [oral reports]

22-23/86   Pierrick Roger, the YUSU President, **reported** that:

1. YUSU continued to support students affected by the Marking and Assessment Boycott, including via the YUSU Advice Centre.

2. YUSU had conducted focus groups on the international student experience. A report of findings was available to members (Category 2, UTC.22-23/88). The focus groups largely

confirmed existing understanding around international students' needs. This included a demand for information to support adjustment to UK academic study, particularly via face-to-face and drop-in advice. The Committee expressed its thanks to YUSU for this work.

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

Update on the Assessment and Feedback Project [UTC.22-23/72, Open]

22-23/87   The Committee **considered** an update on the Assessment and Feedback project. The Head of Apprenticeships and Inclusive Learning presented this item and **reported** that:

1. Based on the findings of the discovery phase of the project, the paper proposed a series of next steps and key deliverables for the project in 2023/24. These included the development of a revised set of assessment and feedback principles; the review of policies and procedures; the development of guidance (including but not limited to the use of Turnitin Feedback Studio and in relation to assessments flagged for spelling and grammar reasonable adjustments); and the development of good practice case studies.

2. Key principles were likely to include reference to inclusivity, considering reasonable adjustments and alternative assessments.

3. The paper erroneously omitted the Chair of SCA from the list of members of the Project Board.

4. The delivery of the project was dependent on resourcing and prioritisation within the University (including in the Inclusive Learning team). It would be beneficial to have project management support. The Chair of SCA **reported** that resource would also need to be dedicated to a rewrite of the Guide to Assessment.

22-23/88   The Committee **endorsed** the proposed next steps and deliverables set out in the paper, and **observed** the following:

1. This project should be considered a priority for the University. Assessment and feedback was key to the student experience and was an identified priority for improvement in NSS results.

2. Consideration would need to be given to the interface between the project and systems and infrastructure. If a digital solution was identified, this would need to be costed against the benefits gained from employing such a solution.

3. The timeline of key deliverables was very helpful and a model for future papers.

4. A paper on the VLE Transformation Project and the adoption of Turnitin Feedback Studio would be presented to the July meeting of the Committee. The VLE Transformation Project Manager had **reported** that technical guidance on Turnitin Feedback Studio would be issued in June. Professional programmes worked to a different and earlier timescale to other provision, and it was important that the VLE Transformation Project guidance took that into account.

5. The project and the rewrite of the Guide to Assessment should take into account the specific requirements of the International Pathway College, professional programmes, York Online programmes and other non-standard provision. Professional Programmes Forum had indicated a willingness to assist the project.

6. There were a number of departmental and Faculty projects related to teaching, learning and assessment. It was important that these were joined up with central initiatives such as the Assessment and Feedback project. The Associate Deans of Faculty (Teaching, Learning and Students) were asked to collate a list of existing departmental and Faculty projects via FLTGs, to share with the Committee and those involved in the Assessment and Feedback project.

7. A communication should be issued to staff in departments / schools to highlight key central teaching and learning initiatives such as the Assessment and Feedback project. The Chair would work with Internal Communications to consider the best way to achieve this.

Action: PVC (TLS)

8. The project and related deliverables should be included on the schedule of business and key priorities for SCA for 2023/24. These priorities should be presented to UTC at its first meeting of the 2023/24 academic year.

Action: Chair of SCA

Revisions to Policy and Procedure on Annual Review and Periodic Review [UTC.22-23/73, Open]

22-23/89 The Committee **considered** proposed revisions to policy and procedure in relation to annual review and Periodic Review. Bethan Ellis, the Head of Strategic Insight and Analysis, attended the Committee for this item. The Associate PVC (Teaching, Learning and Students) **reported** that:

1. It was proposed to reintroduce an annual review process in departments / schools for 2023/24, reflecting back on the 2022/23 academic year. This would support University and Faculty strategies and external regulatory requirements. There was a significant risk to PSRB accreditation for some programmes if annual review was not re-established.

2. The proposed process would encompass a review of learning, teaching and employability (the latter supported by meetings with Careers and Placements). It was far more streamlined than the former APR process. It would be based on a simple and short form, including a learning, teaching and employability action plan. This would be a holistic action plan, encompassing actions that were formerly recorded in disparate places.

3. The process would be supported by the release of key learning and teaching related data. It was not likely to be possible to 'curate' this data for 2023/24, though it was hoped that this would be a future development.

4. The Head of Strategic Insight and Analysis **reported** that the data was available but fragmentary. The creation of a central data repository would support the curation and analysis of data but was not possible within current resource; it was also thought that data skills training would be helpful.

5. Whilst it was proposed that the annual review be supported by an annual meeting in departments / schools (as had been the case in the APR process), the revised process was significantly different in encouraging reflection and action planning throughout the year, allowing more timely responses to the release of data and other key information.

6. It was also proposed to remove the requirement that departments / schools undertake Periodic Review and to remove the redundant Interim Review procedure. Higher risk programmes would continue to have a 3-Year review, with an external assessor added to the panel; whilst the University or Faculties could instigate a Periodic Review (by approval of the PVC for Teaching, Learning and Students) if there were concerns about quality, standards or the student experience not resolved via the annual review procedure.

22-23/90 The Committee **observed** that:

1. The streamlined nature of the annual review process was welcome, as was the opportunity to capture good practice within the process and report this to FLTGs.

2. Departments with professional accreditation often needed to do detailed annual reflection for PSRBs outside the annual review process, drawing on some of the suggested data. It would be important that the annual review did not duplicate this activity. The Associate PVC (Teaching, Learning and Students) would liaise with Claire Ball-Smith to discuss this.

3. Further work would need to be done to develop the process and communicate this to stakeholders. This work should establish key responsibilities (including for non-Faculty provision); the role of Boards of Studies, including requirements for Board of Studies oversight of reporting beyond the annual meeting; the involvement of students; the data to be released to departments; and arrangements for the storage of documents. The PVC, Associate PVC and Associate Deans (Teaching, Learning and Students) should be consulted on the process.
    Action: Academic Quality

4. Portfolio Management Board had oversight of the financial and strategic case for programmes, and would consider when programmes should be withdrawn.

5. The removal of the requirement to undertake Periodic Review was welcome and a good example of how the University could be made more efficient. This would achieve a significant saving in time and cost relative to the pre-COVID process.

    [*Secretary's Note: it is estimated that this will save approximately £9,000 a year in external assessors' fees and expenses; c. 10 weeks of staff time in Academic Quality; c. 40-45 days a year for internal panel members; and perhaps c. 2 weeks of staff time per department*]

6. The paper proposed that further reviews be held at the 6-year point for York Online programmes in Computer Science and Management, which had recently undertaken 3-year reviews. The Committee supported a further review in Computer Science, but this was not felt to be necessary for Management, for which the 3-Year review had been positive.
    Action: Academic Quality to add further review of York Online: Computer Science to its schedule of business.

22-23/91 **Resolved:**

1. **To approve the proposed revisions to the annual review procedure, creating a new annual review of teaching, learning and employability process.**

2. **To approve the proposed revisions to the policies for Periodic Review and 3-Year review and to remove the Interim Review policy as redundant.**
    Action: Academic Quality to revise policies

Degree Outcomes Analysis [UTC.22-23/74, Open]

22-23/92 The Committee **considered** an analysis of degree outcomes for 2021/22. Bethan Ellis, Head of Strategic Insight and Analysis, spoke to this item and also presented a set of slides which provided additional information, particularly in respect of award gaps as compared to the sector and over time.

22-23/93 The Committee **observed** that:

1. The proportion of good degrees awarded by the University at undergraduate level was lower than that of its immediate comparators. This was due to action by the University to protect its academic standards. This nevertheless had an impact on some league table rankings.

2. Recently developed Tableau workbooks on Access and Participation data had been well received.

3. For future analyses of degree outcomes, it would be helpful if data and reporting could reflect the following:

    a. Intersectionality in student outcomes.
    b. A split of data between international and home students.
    c. Award gap data that went beyond undergraduate home students.
    d. Splitting data between York Online students and other students.

     e.   Whether (for home students) they had received the Pupil Premium, which was a good indicator of social disadvantage.
     f.   The impact of assessment type and volume, if possible
     g.   The impact of exceptional circumstances claims, if possible.
     h.   Students' attainment on entry and the impact of entry criteria.
     i.   For international students, prior English language ability and also whether they had previously studied in the UK.
     j.   The impact of attending the International Pathway College on later degree outcomes.

4.   A document should be circulated to the Committee to ask for further suggestions (capturing those already made). This would then form the basis of further discussion on requirements for future reporting.

Action: Secretary (to circulate document); PVC (TLS) and Head of SIAto establish requirements.

5.   The Head of Strategic Insight and Analysis **reported** that the ability to develop the requested datasets would depend on resourcing within their team. The issue of resourcing for teaching and learning data should be raised as appropriate within Planning and Risk, and UTC updated on resources to support the degree outcomes work.

Action: Head of SIA

6.   Some departments, such as Education and the School for Business and Society, had developed their own reporting on data and it could be helpful for Strategic Insight and Analysis to look at this reporting to help establish departmental data needs.

Revisions to Exceptional Circumstances Process [UTC.22-23/75, Open]

22-23/94   The Committee **considered** a set of proposals to revise the process for considering Exceptional Circumstances affecting Assessment (ECA) claims. Patrick Gallimore, Chair of SCA, spoke to this item and **reported** that:

1.   The key proposal within the paper was to move from responsibility for decisions on ECA claims from ECA Committees to an Exceptional Circumstances Officer (ECO) within a department / school. This would likely be a member of PSS staff, but the proposal was written such that it could also be a member of academic staff. The ECO would likely be supported by other colleagues in the department. A number of departments / schools had already delegated responsibility in this way during COVID, and it was felt to be more efficient.

2.   It was further proposed that, to support the ECO in considering claims, a schedule would be created in each department to specify standard decisions that could be made by the ECO.

22-23/95   The Committee **observed** that:

1.   Academic judgement and knowledge of the programme was not required to consider the validity of an ECA claim. However, it might be required to establish the appropriate outcome of a claim (e.g. a resit), particularly when this impacted on the students' future work or professional requirements. The proposed schedule of delegation could address this.

2.   Members recognised that a number of departments were already operating the proposed process and had found it to be helpful and efficient. Nevertheless, members were concerned that, if this were adopted universally for 2023/24, there might be insufficient resource within departments and the potential for inconsistency in judgement. There were also concerns around placing responsibility for ECA claims on a single individual, with members noting that ECA committees shared burdens and responsibilities and provided continuity.

3.   The Committee was accordingly not in a position to approve the proposal to move responsibility from ECA Committees to ECOs for 2023/24. The ECA policy should however be adapted to continue to allow departments / schools to delegate authority to an ECO if so chosen, provided that this was accompanied by a clear schedule of delegation to set out the

limits of authority, and that responsibility for decision making was clear to students. A revised policy should be presented for approval by chair's action.

Action: Chair of SCA

4. Going forward for 2024/25, the Committee wished to explore the possibility of supporting ECA claims through either Faculty-based or central teams (the latter akin to the Special Cases team). This should take into account provision that sat outside of Faculties and also programme-specific needs, for example in relation to professional programmes and fitness to practise. Costed proposals should be developed and submitted for consideration at a future meeting of UTC.

Action: Deputy Director (SAAA)

5. The paper also asked the Committee to take a view on policy relating to confidentiality of ECA claims. Current policy was open to interpretation, which led to inconsistency in practice in departments. It was thought that there would be pastoral value in allowing the fact of an ECA claim and its outcome (but not the details behind a claim) to be shared with relevant colleagues on a need to know basis. This might include external placement providers, with the consent of the student. Advice should be sought from the University's Data Protection Officer; a clear policy should then be developed and submitted for approval via chair's action.

Action: Chair of SCA

Evaluation of New Student Representation Initiatives [UTC.22-23/76, Open]

22-23/96   The Committee **considered** a paper from YUSU containing an evaluation of new student representation initiatives. Pierrick Roger, the YUSU President, spoke to this item and **reported** that:

1. YUSU had piloted alternative forms of student representation in departments / schools, including a selection model for student representatives (as an alternative to the course representative election system); paid student champions; and a people's assembly model of representation. YUSU was also looking to make additional use of focus groups.

2. Evaluation of the pilot models suggested that they had achieved a positive impact. It was therefore proposed to adapt the Student Representation Policy to allow departments / schools freedom to choose alternative forms of representation, whilst maintaining the possibility of using the elected course representative system. YUSU would support whichever system a given department / school decided to use.

22-23/97   The Committee **observed that:**

1. Student Voice Group had considered the evaluation, and had drawn the conclusion that a year was not sufficiently long to judge the success of the pilot models.

2. There had been positive feedback on the pilots from Social Sciences. One member from a pilot department in another Faculty reported a more mixed experience.

3. There was some concern that the funding for paid student champions had not been extended, which meant that - as it stood - departments would either need to pay for these from their own budgets or withdraw the model. The YUSU President **reported** that it would be possible for departments to use a selection model without a stipend. The Academic Registrar would check to see if the funding for the pilots remained part of the YUSU Block Grant.

Action: Academic Registrar

22-23/98   **Resolved: to approve the recommendations that:**

1. **For 2023/24, departments should be permitted the freedom to use bespoke representation systems (rather than just the elected course representative system).**

2. **That the Student Representation Policy should be amended to reflect this decision and to facilitate continued use of alternative models of representation.**

Oral Update on Interdisciplinary Teaching

22-23/99   The Committee deferred this item to its July meeting, where a paper would be presented.

Section 3: Policy and Regulatory Matters

Revisions to Student Protection Plan [UTC.22-23/77, Open]

22-23/100   The Committee **considered** proposed updates to the University's Student Protection Plan. Jane Warne, the Head of Academic Quality, spoke to this item and **reported** that:

1. The University was required to have a Student Protection Plan as a Condition of Registration set by the Office for Students. The plan had been updated to more clearly identify risks and mitigation of risks, and to avoid time-specific references. It had been subject to widespread consultation.

2. The plan would be reviewed annually and as such should be included in UTC's schedule of business.   **Action: Secretary**

22-23/101   **Resolved: To approve the proposed plan subject to the following revisions:**

     a. **Further information on risks relating to professional accreditation, such as the possibility that a PSRB might unilaterally decide to withdraw accreditation necessitating programme closure.**

     b. **Alignment of the plan to the recently updated guidance on consumer law as applied to universities, which had been issued by the Consumer Markets Authority subsequent to the paper being developed.**

     c. **Clearer information on what was meant by references to 'comparable' provision within the plan.**

     d. **Clearer information on quality assurance and monitoring arrangements in the event that a programme was taught-out.**

     The plan should be edited in light of the edits suggested above and any further edits suggested by members (which should be submitted by no later than 15 June 2023), with the final version submitted to the Chair for approval via chair's action.
        Action: AQ Policy Manager

Assurance Report on Alignment to OfS B Conditions of Registration (UTC.22-23/78)

22-23/102   The Committee considered a paper outlining the University's alignment to the Office for Students (OfS) B Conditions of Registration. David Gent, the Assistant Secretary, spoke to this item and **reported** that:

1. The paper established that the University was aligned to the B Conditions (a number of which had recently been revised by the OfS), and contained recommendations to further assure alignment. The paper would be presented to Senate following consideration at UTC.

2. The paper updated UTC on the latest iteration of the OfS B3 Student Outcomes data, which had been updated to include data pertaining to 2020/21.

     a. As with the previous set of data, the vast majority of the University's provision was above the OfS B3 thresholds for minimum performance.

     b. The only areas that were below threshold to a statistically significant level were Foundation Year Completion and Part-Time Postgraduate Continuation in Computing: UTC had already established actions against both areas.

22-23/103   The Committee **observed** that:

1. The OfS had established a new expectation under Condition B4, that academic regulations should be designed to ensure assessment of technical proficiency in the English language, in a way appropriate to the level and content of a given programme. The OfS did not define what was meant by 'technical proficiency'. University practice was thought to be aligned to this expectation, but the paper identified a need for clearer internal policy in this area to assure this. The Director of the International Pathway College indicated a willingness to assist with this work.

2. The paper recommended a review of policy and process relating to additional costs of learning outside the tuition fee. There was an annual process, run by MRAO, to publicise such costs. Given cost of living challenges for students, it was felt timely to review this area. This work would take into account the expectations set out under condition B2. The PVC (Teaching, Learning and Students) would establish membership of this group.

3. The paper should be revised to include reference to professional accreditation, professional misconduct and fitness to practise issues.

    [*Secretary's note: this was done after the meeting, with helpful input from Claire Ball-Smith, and the revised paper endorsed by the Chair*]

22-23/104   **Resolved: to endorse the paper (subject to the minor revision identified above) and approve the following recommendations:**

1. **That a cross-Directorate Task and Finish Group should be established to review policy and process relating to additional costs of learning.**
   Action: PVC (TLS)

2. **That the development of policy relating to the assessment of technical proficiency in the English language, taking into account Condition B4, should be taken forward by SCA and added to its priorities for 2023/24.**
   Action: Chair of SCA

3. **That discussions be held with CITY College to develop reporting on student outcomes.**
   Action: AQ Policy Manager

4. **That an annual report on continuation and completion should be incorporated into UTC's schedule of business.** **Action: Secretary**

5. **That an annual report on degree outcomes for CITY College should be incorporated into the schedule of business for UTC and SCA.** **Action: Secretary / SCA Secretary**

Progression and Award Rules [UTC.22-23/79, Open]

22-23/105   The Committee **considered** a set of revisions to the University's Progression and Award rules for 2023/24 onwards. Patrick Gallimore, Chair of SCA, spoke to this item and **reported** that:

1. The rules had been revised in light of the move to standard 20-credit modules and the new semester system. SCA had also taken the opportunity to simplify the rules and to adapt them in light of sector practice.

2. The detailed proposals in the paper related to standard undergraduate, integrated masters and taught postgraduate provision. The paper also set out in principle how these rules might be adopted for other forms of provision. When approved, it was intended that the revised rules would be published in the Guide to Assessment.

3. Detailed modelling had been conducted by the former Chair of SCA, Mike Bentley, to assess the impact of the proposed rules.

4. The proposals would come into effect for all students in 2023/24, including continuing students and those on leave of absence.

5. Proposal D in the paper was to remove the current restriction that students could not obtain merits and distinctions with a failed module mark.

6. Proposal L in the paper was that Board of Examiners should hold a formal internal scrutiny panel to review Semester 1 marks before release to students. This would not be a full Examination Board or require external examiner involvement. SCA was also considering whether to hold a Board of Examiners at the end of Semester 2, in light of the removal of the progression point in PGT programmes, but had not yet developed proposals on this issue.

22-23/106   Each of the proposals in the paper was introduced by the Chair of SCA, and the rationale for each one explained as reported in the paper. The Committee **observed** that:

1. Proposal B in the paper was to cap resit marks at the pass mark, as opposed to current policy whereby first attempt marks were used for classification. The proposal reflected common sector practice. This did create a possibility that students who failed at the first attempt and did not receive compensation might 'leapfrog' peers who had received compensation: however, it was felt that this effect would be negligible. Chairs of Boards of Examiners had been consulted on this proposal and the majority had felt it to be fair. It was not thought that the proposal would have a significant inflationary impact on standard provision.

2. Proposal C was to remove the ability to compensate down to a module mark of 10 in the final year of undergraduate and integrated masters programmes, and instead for compensation limits to be set at 30 for C-, I- and H-level modules and 40 for M-level modules, as for other years. This reflected University policy before 2016/17 and was common sector practice. Modelling indicated that the number of students who would be eligible to use the current 10% rule would reduce due to the move to 20-credit modules. Representatives from the Department of Mathematics had opposed the proposal, noting that it was likely to create more resits and thus the need to write resit papers. SCA considered that the proposed rule was proportionate, and had expressed concerns that the current rule allowed students to graduate with low marks in important final year modules such as the capstone project.

3. There would need to be significant work and thus resource to establish the proposals in University systems for 2023/24. This was a key part of the Modularisation and Semesterisation project. The Chair and Director of SAAA would pick up this resourcing issue in a planned meeting with the Director of Strategic Planning and Change.
   Action: PVC (TLS) and Director of SAAA

4. Proposal I, on special PGT exit awards, was redundant as this was already covered in the Taught Postgraduate Programme Design Framework.

5. Thanks were expressed to all those involved in producing the proposals.

6. Further work should be conducted to develop full, formal rules for all forms of provision on the basis of the proposals set out in the paper. Specific consideration should be given to whether proposals B and D should apply to York Online provision as modelling indicated that these may have an inflationary impact. The revised rules should be submitted for approval by Chair's action.
   Action: Chair of SCA

22-23/107   **Resolved:**

1. **To approve Proposals A-H and J-L in the paper as applied to standard undergraduate / integrated masters and taught postgraduate provision.**

2. **To endorse the proposals as the basis for other forms of provision as set out in the paper, noting the need for further consideration relating to York Online provision.**

Section 4: Quality Assurance Processes

Report of the 3-Year Review of York Online Management Provision [UTC.22-23/80, Open]

22-23/108   The Committee **considered** the report and action plan arising from the 3-Year review of York Online: Management programmes within the School for Business and Society. Steve King, APVC TLS, who chaired the review panel, spoke to this item and **reported** that:

1. The review identified a range of good practice relating to the programmes and a number of challenges, including a lack of time and space to reflect on provision due to the carousel model and limited availability of centrally provided data pertaining to online programmes.

2. There was a single recommendation for UTC, which was also a recommendation for the York Online Support team: to work with GSA to promote student representative opportunities within the programmes and ensure the representative structure and timing of elections was more closely integrated with the carousel model. This would be taken forward by the York Online Support team.

3. Thanks were expressed to all involved in the review, including academics, students and PSS staff from the School for Business and Society; colleagues from the York Online Support team; Academic Quality; and panel members.

22-23/109   The Committee **observed** that:

1. Colleagues involved in the programmes were to be commended for their successes, particularly given that the programmes had only run for a short period of time. The programmes made a particularly important contribution to the diversity of the student body.

2. The panel had recommended a full review of the assessment strategy for the programmes. It would be important that this work was joined up with the Assessment and Feedback project.

22-23/110   **Resolved: to approve the action plan arising from the review.**

Summaries of Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate External Examiners' Reports [UTC.22-23/81 and 82, Open]

22-23/111   The Committee **noted** the summaries of undergraduate and taught postgraduate external examiners' reports for 2021-22. These papers provided assurance to the Committee that the external examiners had confirmed the University's academic standards.

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

Committee reports (unreserved)

22-23/112   The Committee **received** notes or summaries from its sub-committees as follows:
● Sciences Faculty Learning and Teaching Group, 4 May 2023 (UTC.22-23/83, Open)
● Standing Committee on Assessment, 12 May 2023 (UTC.22-23/84, Open)

David Gent, Academic Quality Team
14 June 2023