EDUCATIONAL QUALITY COMMITTEE
MEETING 3 – 14 JUNE 2018 – UNCONFIRMED MINUTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member</th>
<th>Mtg 1 13.02.18</th>
<th>Mtg 2 12.04.18</th>
<th>Mtg 3 14.06.18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor David Bolton (Chair)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malek Arab (SU VP Education 2017/18)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Susan Blake</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Margaret Carran</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Irene Ctori</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Edridge</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√ (minutes)</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr David Flinton</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Cristina Gacek</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Anna Gaio</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann Kernan</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Rachael-Anne Knight</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Lauren Knott</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Pam Parker</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Simon Parker</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Martin Rich</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Stuart Sime</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Reece Thomas</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ indicates attendance  A indicates apologies have been provided
--- 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 (Secretary)
Steve Stanbury, Director of Internal Audit
Martina Ayendi - (Examinations Officer, Cass UG) observing

Part 1 - Preliminary Items

1. Welcome and apologies:
The Chair welcomed Steve Stanbury (Director of Internal Audit) and Martina Ayendi (Examinations Officer, Cass UG) who was observing the meeting as part of a job shadowing exercise.

   Apologies were received from Malek Arab, Anna Gaio, Mary Ann Kernan.

2. Minutes
The minutes of the meeting on 12 April 2018 were approved.

3. Matters Arising
Verbal updates were provided on the following:

   Industrial Action
The Industrial Action Working Group had approved a set of Guidance Notes for Assessment Boards to promote consistency of practice for programmes impacted by industrial action this year. The notes had been circulated to Deans and Heads of Academic Services. The Working Group had also provided detailed guidance on City’s approach to dealing with student complaints and claims for compensation, which had been approved by ExCo.
Assessment Review
The Deputy Director of LEaD is collecting Boards of Studies comments on the draft guidance for volume of assessment in relation to module credit values.

Programme Approval and Review Committees
Academic Governance Committee had approved a minor change to the PARC terms of reference which would provide oversight of cumulative changes made to programmes each year.

Discussions about the future deadline for programme amendments were taking place with stakeholders and proposals would be made shortly.

Lecture Capture
Details of lecture capture enabled rooms had been recirculated, and guidance would be published in September 2018.

The remaining April matters arising had been completed, or would be discussed as part of the main agenda or at a future meeting.

4. Chair’s Business

HEFCE Assurance Review
HEFCE Assurance Reviews have formed part of a regular cycle of activity for institutions to date. City’s review had been completed in June 2018. Future reviews would be conducted by the Office for Students as part of the new regulatory framework.

Office for Students (OfS)
City’s OfS registration application was submitted on 30 April 2018, and a decision is expected in July. A briefing paper for the committee had been included for discussion as a later agenda item.

Part 2 - City Developments, Priorities and Standing Reports

5. Office for Students (OfS)
The committee received a briefing paper which summarised the background to the OfS, its function, the registration process for institutions and how institutions will be monitored. The paper also highlighted the ongoing conditions of registration, five of which relate to quality and standards in particular.

Institutions must publish an Access and Participation Plan (replacing the previous Access Agreements), as one of the conditions of registration, to demonstrate commitment to access and student success in order to be able to charge fees of up to £9,250. The OfS has access to a greater range of data than was used for the Access Agreements and will be taking a stronger approach monitoring. Feedback had been received on City’s Plan in mid-June and we would need to respond promptly.

In relation to quality and standards processes, the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) will be the designated quality body and will undertake specific quality duties on behalf of the OfS. Further information on the QAA remit will be released during 2018 and considered by Educational Quality Committee and Senate.

6. Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF)
A copy of City’s response to the recent sector consultation was received and noted. Stakeholders were offered an opportunity to respond to a consultation on how subject-level assessment should be carried out. Due to the technical nature of the consultation and the short timescale available there had been limited time to prepare a response.

The current TEF assesses ‘provider-level’ undergraduate provision. There is an intention to extend this to a disciplinary (subject) level from 2020, and pilot projects are being run using two different potential modules. A member of Educational Quality Committee, Mary Ann Kernan, is a member of the Humanities Subject Level Pilot Panel.

Whilst a decision is yet to be made on which subject level method will be utilised, both require a detailed understanding of the benchmark data and both would require a narrative to accompany the submission.
7. **Education and Student Committee**

   The Chair reported that the new Education and Student Committee had met the previous week. The Committee had considered the development of the updated Education and Student Strategy, approved the Terms of Reference for the new City Learning and Teaching Committee and discussed the Student Engagement and Attendance Monitoring (SEAM) work. The Chair would head a separate group which would meet to progress the details of the SEAM policy; this policy would set out City’s approach to supporting progression and the student experience.

   Education and Student Committee had also discussed planning for Subject Level TEF and agreed to set up a Steering Group. The Group would include the Associate Deans (Education) and would be Chaired by Mary Ann Kernan.

8. **Students’ Union Standing Report**

   The Committee noted the Students Union’s Vision 2020 update and implementation plan, which details the vision, values and strategy, together with the SU’s priorities, progress and key projects.

9. **Student and Academic Services Standing Report**

   All updates from Student and Academic Services had been included as separate agenda items.

10. **LEaD Standing Report**

    The Deputy Director of LEaD reported that Year 3 of the DALI project had commenced and 33 rooms would be refurbished over the summer to upgrade technology capabilities and furniture. Written details would be circulated together with videos in September.

11. **Undergraduate Assessment Strategy Review**

    The Deputy Director of LEaD advised that the Learning Development Fellows would be working to the end of July to develop a staff toolkit. The toolkit would offer advice and guidance in areas such as assessment design, marking and engaging with feedback and a new website is being prepared for launch. The Committee welcomed the development and noted that, for instance, inclusive and diverse assessment methods may need different strategies depending on the size of the cohort and/or groups.

    There would be funding available for 2018/19 for the Learning Development Fellows to offer tailored support to Schools.

    In discussion about assessment and its impact on progression, the Chair noted that the Deans had committed to a range of actions to support progression at ExCo in February 2017. The Deans had observed that assessment is often taking place too late in the term to be able to gauge student engagement and ensuring that student were appropriately and earlier would provide valuable insight. This was reflected in the ‘basket of actions’ agreed by ExCo, details of which would be circulated for information.

    The benefits of sharing practice on e.g. constructive alignment between formative and summative assessment, and assessment for learning was noted and details would be included in LEaD’s assessment toolkit. The Associate Dean Education (SHS) offered to share details of strategies used in the School as case studies. The Committee agreed that guidance on threshold criteria to ensure that programmes meet KPI requirements would be useful.

**Action:**

- Student Progression priorities paper to be shared with the Committee (Chair, June 2018)

---

**Part 3 - Educational Quality**

12. **Senate Regulations and Policies**

    The Assistant Registrar (Quality) provided updates on the developments noted below:

    **Student Disciplinary Regulation**

    A paper outlining amendments to the current Regulation 13 (Student Discipline) was received for information. The revisions bring the Regulation into line with City’s current Terms & Conditions, better reflect interactions with other City policy and align the Regulation with City guidance on terminology.
It was confirmed that Academic Governance Committee had approved the amendments for recommendation to Senate in July.

Fitness to Study

The Committee was asked to note the further updates made in response to the review of the Policy and Guidance and recommend their approval to Senate. These current drafts incorporated feedback received from colleagues in Schools, student services (Student Health, Student Mental Health & Counselling, Disability Team) and S&AS, and Academic Governance Committee and Educational Quality Committee.

The updated Regulation had also been received for information. Academic Governance Committee had agreed to recommend its approval to Senate, subject to there being no further significant feedback from the Board of Studies consultation and Educational Quality Committee.

Educational Quality Committee had no further comments on the Regulation, and agreed to recommend the revised Policy and Guidance to Senate. The final versions will go forward to Senate in July 2018 for approval.

Programme Regulations

The Assessment Regulations apply to all taught undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate programmes that lead to a City award. Specific Programme Regulations are required to exempt programmes from aspects of the Assessment Regulations; these are considered by Educational Quality Committee prior to formal approval by Senate.

Educational Quality Committee received proposals made for Programme Regulations from Cass, SHS and LEaD Boards of Studies. Following discussion, the committee agreed to recommend the SHS and LEaD proposals to Senate. The Cass proposals, which include a regulation that prevents Undergraduate Programme Stage 3 students from taking resits (unless they have extenuating circumstances) would be recommended for approval to Senate for 2018/19 only. The Cass regulation also means that any student with ECs has to wait a year for their ‘first’ attempt. This was a historical feature of Cass Undergraduate programmes and the Board of Studies had considered a paper the subject earlier this year and opted to retain the regulation. Educational Quality Committee noted the potential impact on the student experience and satisfaction if students are prevented from taking resits in their final year, and the SU had also drawn attention to this issue which impacts on equality of opportunity. It was agreed that Cass would be asked to revisit the rationale for this Programme Regulation before applying to continue this practice for 2019/20.

The Programme Regulations would be submitted to Senate in July 2018 for approval.

Action:

- Cass Board of Studies to note that the Programme Regulation relating to resits will be recommended for 2018/19 approval only; a satisfactory rationale for continuation into 2019/20 would be required (Cass Board of Studies, January 2019)

Assessment Regulations – Failure of a Module 4.7

In February 2018, Boards of Studies and the Students’ Union were invited to respond to a consultation to consider proposals arising from feedback on the regulation related to failure of a module, and determine whether any changes should be made to the Regulation and associated policy and guidance.

A paper providing a summary of consultation feedback was received, from which it was noted that Schools and the SU would be supportive of an updated to the trailing of a limited number of assessments clause of the Regulations, but not a proposal to extend the complete repeat year option to all students:

- Trailing of Assessments - Overall, there had been support for broadening the offer of trailing a limited amount of resit assessment to students; it was confirmed that this would not offer a third attempt at assessment but would extend to completion of outstanding resits only. This option could therefore be available if a student had had ECs at any point during the academic year, for example if they had ECs at the first sit and are taking their first attempt during the resit period (without ECs) and fail that attempt. Students would not choose to defer an assessment but the option could be offered by an Assessment Board where the nature of assessment permitted. This option could be achieved through minor amendment to the Regulation and development of associated guidance. It was agreed that this proposal should be made to Senate for approval of this amendment.
- **Full Repeat Years** - Currently full repeat years are only available to students with multiple ECs. The consultation had considered whether it might be appropriate to offer repeat years to students who did not have multiple ECs. Overall this proposal was not supported as noted in the paper, with Schools citing a number of considerations and concerns such as the impact on resources and timetabling. The Committee debated the pros and cons of this option, and concurred with the concerns raised by Boards of Studies. It was **agreed** that this option would not be recommended to Senate and that emphasis should instead be placed on supporting students to achieve and progress at their first attempt at assessment.

*Extensions and Late Participation in Assessment*

Further to the consultation with Boards of Studies and the Students’ Union, Quality Forum and Student Case Management Forum, Educational Quality Committee was asked to approve the principles of an outline policy proposal, and consider the proposed process. The Committee **approved** the outline policy and proposed next steps.

Further discussions will take place with stakeholders with regard to the approval process of student requests for extensions. The policy and proposed process will be brought to the next meeting of Educational Quality Committee.

13. **Module Evaluation Process Review**

The Assistant Registrar (Quality) provided a report on City’s module evaluation process and a proposed action plan for comment. The report is based on a detailed evaluation undertaken with colleagues in Schools, LEaD and Student and Academic Services, and feedback from staff and students. The review process evaluated the effectiveness of current practice to identify what is working well, and the challenges and opportunities for enhancement to ensure that module evaluation meets City’s ongoing requirements and align with current priorities and external developments.

A draft of the report had been shared with Associate Deans (Education), LEaD and Heads of Academic Services for comment and the version received by the Committee incorporates their feedback. Educational Quality Committee was invited to consider the key findings and next steps outlined in the main report and the corresponding action plan.

The Committee noted that ExCo’s original intention for module evaluation was two-fold, to evaluation student satisfaction and staff, but noted that teaching quality and student satisfaction are related not the same thing. The Committee **endorsed** the report and action plan and recommended that it is taken forward to ExCo and Senate.

14. **Annual Programme Evaluation (APE)**

Educational Quality Committee had received an overview report on the 2016/17 APE process in February and agreed a set of recommendations including a revised reporting timeline from 2017 which would enable time for peer review of APEs within Schools prior to submission. It was also agreed that a process to support identification and dissemination of good practice within Schools would be developed. A summary of the subsequent discussion at the ADE Forum was provided for information, together with a draft template for identification of good practice for approval. The Committee **approved** the template.

Further to Senate approval of the revised policies for Programme Approval, Programme Amendment, Periodic Review and Programme Termination in May 2018, the APE policy, guidance and form will be revised to align with those updates and ensure alignment with the requirements of KPIs, TEF and NSS. It was noted that some institutions have brought timelines for APEs forward significantly to respond to the outcomes of NSS results. Further proposals for enhancement will be discussed with stakeholders and brought to Educational Quality Committee for consideration at a future meeting.

It was clarified that the School delivery plans comprise of Institutional and School level plans (agreed by the Deputy President and Provost and the Deans), and the Programme level plans (as defined within the APEs and approved by Boards of Studies).

In September, the Committee will be due to to receive the thematic reports from SEED and LEaD on the 2016/17 assessment theme, and good practice from ADEs.
15. **Periodic Review**

The Assistant Director (QUAD) advised that the majority of reviews for 2017/18 had been completed. There were 4 outstanding and it was expected that these would be completed by October.

It was requested that Schools provide details of dates for the 16 reviews taking place for 2018/19 cycle as soon as possible, noting that preliminary planning meetings need to take place by September/October in order to complete the process within the published timescales. Schools had received communications about the 2018/19 schedule and thanks were extended to Committee members who had encouraged School colleagues to become Periodic Review Secretaries.

16. **Complaints and Appeals**

*Admissions Complaints and Appeals Procedure for Applicants*

The Committee reviewed a paper outlining the process applicants should follow (for undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes) should they want to complain about the way in which their application was managed or appeal the decision on their application. It was agreed that a recommendation should be made to Senate for approval of the policy subject to, where there is mention of a particular role title, the words ‘or equivalent’ being added to reflect the variations in title across Schools.

*Fee Assessment Review and Appeals Procedure*

A paper outlining the process by which the University conducts an assessment of an applicant’s fee status was received. This assessment provides the confirmation of the fee level the student pays on enrolment. This process falls outside of Senate’s remit so a recommendation would be made to ExCo on behalf of the Deputy President and Provost.

*Complaints and Appeals Report*

A report detailing activity in relation to student appeals, complaints, academic misconduct and disciplinary cases was considered. The report provides data on cases handled by Schools, Student and Academic Services and the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA). An overview of shared learning and enhancement activities had also been provided. The Committee discussed the volume of cases handled but no particular concerns had been raised.

17. **Internal Audit**

The Director of Internal Audit provided a briefing on the role of internal audit in academic assurance processes, and Educational Quality Committee’s role in providing assurances to Senate on the effectiveness of the quality of the framework and operation of City’s academic regulation, policy and processes as defined in the Quality Manual. Prior to the Committee’s formal designation as a sub-committee of Senate, Academic Governance Committee assumed responsibility for academic elements.

A copy of the forthcoming schedule, which is based on a rolling programme and defined using a risk-based approach, was reviewed. Those to be assigned to Educational Quality Committee are:

- Examinations and Assessment Regulations
- Student Voice
- Student Appeals, Complaints and Discipline
- Performance Indicator Review (e.g. Progression), if included in schedule

Committee members were invited to provide feedback or comments to the Director of Internal Audit or the Assistant Registrar (Quality).

18. **Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRB)**

Educational Quality Committee is responsible for undertaking scrutiny and advising Senate of outcomes from and the effectiveness of academic quality processes, including PSRB and accreditation events. A revised policy and template had been approved for this year and Schools presented their completed templates which provides the Boards of Studies, Educational Quality Committee and Senate an enhanced overview of their PSRB activity. Details of good practice, conditions and recommendations of accreditation had been provided and these ranged across programme, School and Institutional level actions. Boards of Studies are responsible for monitoring the action plans. LEaD accreditation details would follow via a separate circulation.
The Associate Dean Education (SHS) advised that terminology should be amended within the SHS template to reflect the health sector requirements (to not approvals rather than accreditations).

**Action:**
- SHS PSRB template terminology to be updated (SHS Quality Team, July 2018)

19. **Graduate School Committee**

The minutes of the meeting in March 2018 were received and noted.

20. **Collaborative Provision Committee**

The minutes of the meeting in March 2018, together with the Register of Collaborative Provision, were received and noted.

21. **Lecture Capture**

Further to discussions at the last meeting, it was confirmed that the next steps outlined in the April paper had been progressed as far as possible. The Chair of the Learning Environment Committee had noted the complex issues still to be addressed beyond installing hardware within classrooms and the Deputy President and Provost is discussing the barriers with the Deans. It was **agreed** that the broader issues should be explained to students due to the impact on student satisfaction.

**Action:**
- Chair of Learning Environment Committee and Deputy Director LEaD to liaise with the Student Communications Officer to release information of lecture capture to students (September 2018)

22. **Any Other Business**

**Academic Misconduct**

The Assistant Registrar (Quality) advised that, as a continuation of the work to address academic misconduct, a meeting would be arranged to follow up the recent ADE meeting discussion to consider:

- development of online resource to promote good academic practice (to demonstrate commitment to students’ success)
- rolling out Turnitin for all submissions except e.g. performance and other exceptions

Associate Deans (Education) and their nominated School representatives, LEaD and Educational Development colleagues would be invited to attend.

23. **Next Meeting**

September 2018

---

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.