

NSS 2022 results would be released on 6 July 2022 and would be reported to the

There was strong support to bring Arena and Careers together into the new HEDS institute. Feedback indicated that the integration of skills support for students within HEDS would need further consideration and appropriate phasing of this work would be needed.

There was a need to better explain what semesterisation would mean in practice, for example, that semesters would not cut across holidays. Feedback from students indicated that they did not have strong views about how the year should be structured but wanted clear information in advance so that they could make informed decisions and they did want teaching and assessment to be brought closer together. Whilst there was a plan for an institutional framework, it would need to be flexible and accommodate the needs of undergraduate and postgraduate programmes, as well programmes that needed to operate slightly differently. It was agreed that examples to illustrate what the academic year could look like would be useful, and that we should draw on examples from other top universities around the world too.

Some members raised concerns about moving away from end of year assessments to end of semester assessments and that this might result in students only retaining what they had learnt for a short period of time. Further consideration of programme design and linkages and progression through modules would therefore be important. It was noted that the funding model would likely be changing with the proposed introduction of the Lifelong Learning Entitlement and there would be a funding and logistical risk to there being a long period between teaching and assessment.

Student representatives noted that students currently had a large number of assessments, and that feedback was often not received on these in time for subsequent modules. They wanted to be sure that end of semester assessments would address workload challenges. The Chair clarified that the proposals would result in more time being built in for staff to undertake marking before teaching started so that staff would no longer be teaching term 2 whilst marking term 1 assessments as was currently happening.

It was queried where extra-curricular activities would fit within the proposed structure. EdCom was informed that work was being undertaken with the Students' Un3

frameworks in place that would be sufficiently flexible to enable this in the future.

The education components of the strategy were focused on taught provision although there appeared to be a lack of clarity in the feedback about the positioning of postgraduate research (PGR) provision and it had been suggested that this was currently a gap. It was noted that currently PGR students fall clearly into the RIGE portfolio, although there was some concern that they do not get the same level of attention as taught provision with regards to systems and support. It was noted that responsibility for the doctoral student experience sat with the Doctoral School and Research Degrees Committee rather EdCom. The Chair would be discussing the concerns raised with the Vice-Provost (Research, Innovation and Global Engagement).

- 78.3. The Chair summarised the feedback received to date on the draft principles for education, which had been circulated via Faculty Tutors, Vice-Deans Education and the Students' Union for discussion. Overall, there was broad agreement with the draft principles. The following points had been identified for further consideration:

Clarity would be needed about what is meant by academic excellence and what is special about what UCL offers. This would need to be evidenced.

There was not enough 'joy' reflected in the principles and innovation was also missing.

There was a suggestion that education should be reflected in the principles as a transformative and inspirational experience.

The inclusive curriculum health check already existed but was not widely used.

The principles did not appear to cover the student experience holistically.

Some feedback had suggested that the principles should be respectful of staff workload and work-life balance, but it was concerning that this feedback did not mention students.

For Principle 3, there had been concerns raised about what was meant by student partnership. For example, feedback from one faculty had suggested that students should not be seen as equal partners. This did not recognise that whilst staff and students brought different things to the partnership, their importance could and should be seen to have equal value. There was a tension between students being seen as consumers and as partners.

However, this dual relationship did not take away from the expertise that students brought to UCL's education through their experience of learning.

There has been good engagement from the UCL community and useful feedback received. Several discussions have taken place at EdCom, which has agreed that the benefits and disadvantages for staff and students of each project should be clearly identified in the next phase when they are specified in more detail.

Sufficient agreement has been established through the consultation and feedback for a project to review the structure of the academic year.

There should be a project on aspirational principles of teaching and learning at UCL.

There is broad support to bring together staff development and careers within one unit. The integration of student skills development will require further consideration and this project should therefore be undertaken in phases.

There is significant work to be done to develop a programme architecture framework. Any framework will need to be sufficiently enabling to ensure it can be applied flexibly and appropriately at a local level.

The consultation has indicated some concern about a move to centralisation and to impose rigid one-size-fits-all structures. The next stages of development should clarify that the emphasis is on enabling and supporting staff aspirations and student learning, and that we need to retain the best of what we do currently. Offering benefits to staff and students and reducing pain points will be the key driver of all projects.

Assessment and student wellbeing will need to be more explicitly addressed in the projects. Both require further consideration in the next phase.

There are structural issues that make equality, diversity, inclusion (EDI) and wellbeing problematic for students and staff, which need to be addressed, and this is a major aim of two of the projects.

Implications for student support, infrastructure and resources are addressed in the Enablers paper. It would be helpful to emphasise the relationship with that paper as well as ensuring that this is sufficiently captured directly within the Education Priorities and Programmes paper.

It will be important to ensure appropriate engagement of staff at all levels in the management and governance of projects. As well as staff who are members of EdCom and Academic Board, this should include more junior members of academic staff, students and professional services staff.

Engagement with students and effective communications with staff and students must be strongly embedded throughout the next phases of work.

The references to teaching, learning and assessment are narrow in scope and should be broadened to education to encompass a focus on the student experience.

Teaching should be seen as an academic activity and the divide between and disparity for staff on different types of contracts with some not covered by Statute 18 should be addressed.

Feedback from the consultation has identified a gap with regards to governance and oversight of the PGR student experience and EdCom recommends that this be reviewed.

consistent outcomes over time, but that it would be preferable to ensure that marking practices were robust and outcomes transparent rather than resorting to an increased use of scaling to calibrate marks.

- 79.5. Approved – the recommendations in the paper at EDCOM 5-03 (21-22) with the initial focus on the recommendation for statistical analysis at module marks. It was agreed that the provision of comparator benchmarks for subject level data should be explored to support discussions at subject-level, and that further guidance for marking and moderation processes should be developed.

Action: Professor Norbert Pachler (Chair of Degree Outcomes Steering Group) to discuss the provision of comparator data with Planning.

Action: Professor Sam Smidt (Director of Arena Centre) to consider the development of further marking and moderation guidance.

80. Revised Approach to Module and Programme Evaluation

- 80.1. Received – the paper at EDCOM 5-04 (21-22) which proposed replacing the existing requirement for module evaluation questionnaires at the end of each module, with a process of continuous dialogue between teaching staff and students throughout the module. In addition, an annual Programme Evaluation survey would be introduced replacing the current Student Experience Survey. Support for staff receiving poor evaluations would be provided locally or by Arena. It was emphasised that the proposals place a strong emphasis on professionalism and productive dialogue between staff and their students.

- 80.2. The Chair noted that the proposed approach would be introduced from 2022-23 and was intended to address issues raised by students about modules in real time. There would be an expectation of brief pulse surveys at least three to four times during a module, focusing on three questions to check students' understanding of what is being taught, how they will be assessed and whether they can access the learning resources. The intention was to generate immediate results to enable dialogue between the staff member and students and for changes to be made to support student learning before the end of the module. The results would be managed by the staff member within the module rather than being reported elsewhere. A member suggested that it would be useful for there to be a mechanism for module leaders to report changes that had been made to modules as a result of the surveys and the impact of the changes to provide oversight Faculty level, and this was agreed. If students had concerns about a staff member not running the surveys, it was confirmed that they would be able to raise this through the Staff Student Consultative Committee.

- 80.3. A member queried whether the three module survey questions were too basic. It was clarified that they were a starting point and that staff could adjust them or ask other questions as the module progressed. Staff would be able to use a tool of their choosing to administer the surveys but an online pulse tool was recommended which did not require any special equipment.

85. Revised Office for Students Conditions of Registration for Quality and Standards

- 85.1. Received – the paper at EDCOM 5-09 summarising changes to the OfS conditions of registration B1, B2, B4 and B5 that took effect from 1 May 2022. Condition B3 on student outcomes had been subject to a separate consultation alongside the TEF, the

considering flexible education in terms pace, place and mode of study would be helpful. Currently, there was inconsistency in how distance, online and blended provision were referred to across referred U~~L~~008871 0 595.32 841.92 reW*nBT/F1

