

**EDUCATIONAL QUALITY COMMITTEE
MEETING 1 – 13 FEBRUARY 2018 – CONFIRMED MINUTES**

Name of Member	Mtg 1
Professor David Bolton (Chair)	√
Malek Arab (SU VP Education 2017/18)	√
Professor Susan Blake	√
Dr Margaret Carran	A
Dr Irene Ctori	√
Alison Edridge	√
Dr David Flinton	√
Dr Cristina Gacek	√
Dr Anna Gaio	A
Mary Ann Kernan	√
Dr Rachael-Anne Knight	A
Dr Lauren Knott	A
Professor Pam Parker	√
Dr Simon Parker	√
Dr Martin Rich	√
Professor Stuart Sime	√
Katherine Reece Thomas	√

√ indicates attendance A indicates apologies have been provided # member attends for strategic development items
 --- indicates a period when the member is on extended leave/when the person was not a member

In attendance:

Helen Fitch, Assistant Registrar (Quality), Student and Academic Services (Minutes)
 Professor Anthony Neuberger (elected Senator)
 Megan Butler, Senior Strategy Support Officer
 Adrian Spence (SU Advice Service)

Part 1 - Preliminary Items

1. Welcome and apologies:

The Chair welcomed members to the first meeting of the Educational Quality Committee. This committee (a sub-committee of Senate), together with the revised Education and Student Committee (which will be a sub-committee of ExCo once operational) will supersede the previous joint Education and Student Committee. The previous committee had considered both strategic and academic quality and standards matters, and had been advisory to the Deputy President and Provost.

Apologies were received from Rachael Anne Knight, Margaret Carran, Lauren Knott and Anna Gaio.

2. Terms of Reference and Membership

The terms of reference and membership were **approved**. It was noted that the membership would also extend to up to two elected Senators once selected by Senate.

Educational Quality Committee will oversee, on behalf of Senate, academic quality and standards and the Committee's remit will include supporting enhancement and dissemination of good practice. The Committee will communicate closely with the new Education and Student Committee, Collaborative Provision Committee and Graduate School.

It was confirmed that TEF-related business would be brought to the Committee where relevant, and noted that one of the membership is a TEF Subject Level Panel member.

Postgraduate Research business will be continue to be considered by the Graduate School Committee, and would be reported to this committee as appropriate. This would also include Periodic Review matters.

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Education and Student Committee, the predecessor of Educational Quality Committee, held on 9 November 2017 were **approved**. The November meeting was the last one to take place under the previous governance structure.

4. Matters Arising

The November matters arising have been completed, incorporated into existing activities, or will be taken forward by Educational Quality Committee or Education and Student Committee as noted on the Schedule.

With regard to the first item on the schedule, it was confirmed that the further work was being undertaken to ensure that consideration of learning and teaching was included in the governance and reporting structure and this would support existing structures in the dissemination of information to academic staff.

5. Annual Calendar 2017/18

The Committee **noted** the annual calendar of business and forthcoming work agreed for this academic year. The calendar outlines the standard timing of reports and includes regular reporting from Education and Student and other committees to support communication and oversight.

The Calendar will be updated as necessary to reflect new and evolving business. The Committee was invited to consider any further additions to the schedule to support its work.

6. Chair's Business

Council

The new Chair of Council, Julia Palca, is now in place. The most recent Council meeting had included consideration of the impact of Generation Z theory and its impact on the institution.

Office for Students

The publication of the outcome of the OfS consultation on the proposed new regulatory approach is expected on 28 February. The OfS will become operational on 1 April 2018 and institutions will need to register in order for their students to be eligible for student loans. In the meantime, the OfS has accepted sector recommendations that HESA and QAA will have the official designations for data and quality respectively. The OIA will continue in its current form.

TEF

City's subject level data had now been received and analysis is currently taking place. The data has been provided by HEFCE and is benchmarked – it will enable us to contribute fully to the forthcoming consultation on whether the TEF should be extended to subject level. It will also give us insight into the relative performance of programmes across City. TEF subject level reviewers are currently undergoing training.

Part 2 - City Developments, Priorities and Standing Reports

7. Education and Student Committee

A summary paper setting out brief details of the status of current Education and Student Strategy projects and work was received.

The paper also outlined proposed arrangements for communications between Educational Quality Committee and the Education and Student Committee. The proposed approach will encompass:

- short briefings on key business discussed of mutual relevance (full minutes will be available on the intranet)
- standing reports normally tailored to the Committee with cross-referencing where necessary
- items which require both committees having a clearly structured overview, and presented to show what is for information and what is for decision

In discussion, it was acknowledged that TEF would be a major strategic driver and this would need to be reflected both in the communications between the committees and within policy. Consideration of assessment and employability, for instance, would be made more transparent through the current review of academic policy and guidance. The Chair advised that he was confident from recent discussions with

Programme Directors that they are positively engaging with City's KPIs and working to ensure positive outcomes for our students. The City strategy is broader than the TEF requirements and members asked for clarification on how these are applied at all levels within Schools; the Chair confirmed that he is meeting Deans to ensure that roles and responsibilities are clarified.

8. Students' Union Standing Report

The SU VP Education reported on SU activity. He advised that the SU are considering how the new NSS question relating to student academic impact can be translated into current activities and incorporated into campaign work. An example of how outcomes from the Union Advice Service have had a positive impact on students was considered, together with the SU's pre-examination and StudyWell campaign work. The Learning Enhancement Awards have been re-branded as the Academic Impact Awards, and it was noted that student societies were further examples of activity that could be promoted.

9. Student and Academic Services Standing Report

The Assistant Director (Quality and Academic Development) confirmed that the outcomes of current activities had been included as agenda items,

10. LEaD Standing Report

The Deputy Director of LEaD advised that additional capacity had been made available on key MA Academic Practice modules to keep pace with demand. With regard to programme approval activity, she requested that Schools engage with LEaD at an earlier stage in development to enable sufficient time to support the activity to be factored in, and also to avoid the necessity of conditions of approval relating to engagement with LEaD being imposed by Panels later.

11. Undergraduate Assessment Strategy Review

Significant work had been undertaken to progress the project and a written report would be provided to the April meeting. Some programmes had greatly reduced their assessment load where it had been found to be excessive. Learning Development Fellows would continue to meet to consider assessment feedback and to collate an Assessment Toolkit over the summer.

Part 3 - Educational Quality

12. Annual Assurance Report to Senate and Council

The action plan from the 2016/17 Annual Assurance Report submitted to Council in October was reviewed. The Committee will oversee the monitoring of progress and would be the formal producer of the next report, which will include both Senate business and areas of work defined by Council. An update on progress on the actions will be received at the next meeting. The action plan format would also be updated to detail the designated owners of each activity, and to illustrate which committees are responsible for oversight.

Preparation for the 2017/18 Report would commence in the Spring; areas of coverage would include those activities for which regular reporting to Senate takes place (for instance, complaints and appeals data) and developments such as Modernising Administration for Students and the Distinctive Officer projects. With regard to regular reports such as complaints and appeals, it was agreed that there should also be evidence of how actions are being taken to improve, such as enhancements being made to policy and guidance. A request for information to be included on how complaint outcomes and best practice are disseminated, and how staff are trained to handle complaints, was made.

- **Action: Student Experience Team to note request in relation to enhancements to the annual Complaints and Appeals report (June 2018)**

The Committee agreed that the bringing together of key quality and standards and strategy development work was very beneficial in providing oversight of City's work in these areas.

13. Senate Assessment Regulations

The Committee considered and **approved** a Board of Studies consultation paper for circulation. This paper followed discussion on feedback on the Assessment Regulations relating to Section 4.7 Failure of a Module. Boards of Studies and the SU will be invited to consult on whether the Regulations should be revised to enable students without ECs to trail a limited number of assessments or repeat a year, and on the criteria that should be applied with regard to programmes/modules and students.

14. Senate Policies

Programme Approval, Amendment and Suspension and Periodic Review Policy Review

An update on the Board of Studies and SU consultation process on the policy and guidance review was received and the next steps discussed. Board of Studies, School and SU responses to the consultation and comments from E&S Committee have been analysed, and revised policy and guidance are being drafted. Proposals will be discussed with ADEs and Quality Teams before being presented to the Committee in April. Once approved, briefing sessions, workshops and short guides for stakeholders will be made available.

With regard to the Programme Approval, committee members agreed that a hybrid of the existing and pilot methods would be preferable.

Extensions and Late Work Consultation

The consultation had commenced and the collated responses would be brought to the next meeting for discussion. The SU VP Education and the Union Advice Manager welcomed the work and advised that a fair and transparent extensions policy was a priority for students.

Admissions Policy

Revisions have been made to the Policy to meet CMA requirements and include equality, diversity and safeguarding statements. The Committee **agreed** to recommend to Senate that updates to the Policy should be approved, subject to the addition of further text relating to clarify that students under the age of 18 would not be able to go into practice due to legal restrictions.

Extensions and Late Work

The Assistant Registrar (Quality) advised that the consultation has now closed and responses from Boards of Studies and the SU are being submitted. Once analysed, a summary would be shared for discussion.

15. Programme Developments

Programme Approval

An overview of UPAC Stage 1&2 activity was received outlining events completed to date and planned. The key observations were noted; these related to the timing and completeness of documentation, common conditions received at Stage 1 and 2, as well as the commendations and an outline of further enhancements.

It was noted that the Programme Approval can be completed within 3 weeks if the documentation is complete and submitted on time. Paperwork that is incomplete or of poor quality is not accepted, as the rationale, aims and purpose of any new provision must be clear before approval can take place.

As noted in a previous item, it was important that staff engage with LEaD at an earlier stage in development to avoid the necessity of conditions of approval relating to engagement with LEaD being imposed by Panels later. Good practice was noted where programmes have included a member of LEaD on their development team. These areas will be emphasised in the review of policy and guidance.

Periodic Review

An overview of the periodic review process was received, together with an outline of activity to date and planned for this year. The Committee noted the key observations such as the high quality of student panel members, and common conditions (most commonly those relating to improvements to Action Plans being required).

16. Annual Programme Evaluation (APE)

APE Overview

An overview and update on the APE process was considered. The paper outlined a review of the annual timeline and reporting in response to feedback from programme teams and School quality staff, and changes in institutional governance arrangements. It also notes the rationale for the thematic focus for 2017/18 - "internationalisation in the curriculum" to align with the 'distinctive offer' strand of the ESS (the previous year's themes were Assessment and Progression. Employability had been included in the year prior to that).

The paper includes the outcomes of the Internal Audit and recommendations together with the planned actions.

The Committee **approved** the four recommendations:

- reporting to Senate will continue to be separate for UG and PG to respond to the respective annual cycles of activity
- the Committee structure will include provision for Associate Deans Education to identify and disseminate good practice
- the overall timelines for the process would be revised to enable time for peer review of APEs within Schools prior to submission **subject to** action plans being implemented immediately to ensure appropriate measures are being taken at an early stage so that they can be reported to students at the beginning of the next academic year
- the planned actions following Internal Audit

The Committee also **agreed** that:

- it should be emphasised that Annual Programme Evaluation should start earlier in the academic year – the schedule would be revised further for the next year to reflect this
- more specific reference should be made in the form and guidance to address external examiner feedback and module evaluation results

Action: APE Policy and Guidance to reflect the recommendations agreed by the Committee (S&AS, June 2018)

APE Quality Reports

The Committee considered the quality report for Undergraduate APEs received for the 2016/17 academic year. The paper provided a summary of sampled APEs in terms of completeness of processes and forms, and analysis of statistical data. Observations included the good practice being undertaken such as peer review. They also highlighted areas of variability. The SHS UG APEs had yet to be received, and were pending approval by the Board of Studies.

17. Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies

The SHS Associate Dean Education presented a report from the School of Health Sciences relating to PRSB reporting. The paper outlined the requirements for SHS to report to Health Education England and PSRBs in relation to concerns raised by students in practice. The SHS Board of Studies receives summaries of any concerns reported and considers actions to be taken. The Board had proposed that Educational Quality Committee and Senate receive details of the annual report to:

- consider the escalation of concerns outlined in the report
- approve specific actions undertaken by the School to mitigate against risk to students.
- note the auditing and exceptional reporting to PSRBs and the Care Quality Commission (CQC) in relation to these incidents

The Committee **agreed** the actions taken by the School were appropriate and noted both the impacts of these issues and the considerable work that goes in to production of the report. The need to ensure that placement students have access to appropriate support was also noted, and the contribution that SHS students make to supporting major incidents was acknowledged. The report would now be presented to Senate.

18. External Examiners

The Committee formally **approved** the appointment of the Dr Rachael Anne Knight as Academic Lead for External Examining. The role has delegated authority from Senate to review and grant final approval for appointments. This appointment has been made following an invitation to academic staff to submit expressions of interest.

19. Graduate School

The minutes of the meeting held in September 2017, November 2017 and January 2018 were received. The Committee noted the summary of key actions highlighting those most relevant to oversight of quality and standards.

20. Collaborative Provision Committee

The minutes of the first meeting of Collaborative Provision Committee held in November 2017 were received. The Committee noted the key developments and the report on the Internal Audit Report on Partnerships undertaken in 2016/17. There are 7 recommendations noted in the Audit Report which are being taken forward.

The risks associated with collaborative and partner provision were acknowledged; the Collaborative Provision Committee has been constituted to strengthen oversight in this area.

A request was made to ensure that partner institutions such as Arts Ed should receive a formal welcome in the President's speech during Graduation. This would be taken forward by Student and Academic Services.

Action: Graduation to include formal welcome for partner institutions (S&AS, June 2018)

21. Next Meeting

12 April 2018 – 2.00-4.00 in AG04

 **Secretary: Helen Fitch** **Email: Helen.Fitch.1@city.ac.uk** **Telephone: 020 7040 8793**

¹ City, University of London's Publication Scheme, produced in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000, makes clear that the papers and minutes of meetings of Council and Senate and their committees are routinely published on the web. Restricted and closed papers are exempt under the Scheme. All other papers are Open and are published without hesitation on the web. "Restricted" papers are made available to staff. Staff should treat "Restricted" papers as confidential and not to share or discuss them with anyone other than City staff.² Recommendations included in papers not starred and not discussed will be taken as approved.