

Preliminary Business

48 MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF 3 MARCH 2015

Approved:

48.1 The unconfirmed minutes of the meeting of EdCom held on 3 March 2015 [31-47, 03.03.15].

Noted:

- 50.1.1 The paper highlighted the following major proposals :
- i. To align UCL UG and PGT credits, ECTS credits and learning hours with the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications, where an academic year consists of 1200 learning hours, 120 credits and 60 ECTS
 - ii. To align the threshold requirements for Graduate Certificates and Graduate Diplomas with the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications
 - iii. To credit-rate all taught programmes
 - iv. To define the minimum and maximum credit requirements of each qualification
 - v. To reduce current restrictions on the types of accredited prior learning that might be considered for advanced entry onto a programme
- 50.1.2 The consultation process had included discussion with all the faculty tutors and with the departmental leads for those programmes currently outside the main UCL regulations, with a view to ensuring that the proposals met the needs of all disciplines. The paper emphasised that the proposals were not an instruction to modularise programmes, but framework for the development of programmes and facilitate student mobility within the UK and across international borders.
- 50.1.3 Following discussions with each of the faculties, the paper proposed a threshold of 90 level 7 credits for integrated masters programmes. However, EdCom noted that there was a national move to better align the requirements of an integrated masters with those of a stand-alone masters and ensure that programmes include no fewer than 120 level 7 credits. EdCom agreed that UCL should align with this expectation, but also recognised that some UCL programmes did not currently meet this threshold. There would need to be a transitional year whereby affected programmes were reviewed, with the support of Academic Services.

Approved:

- 50.1.7 EdCom welcomed and endorsed each of the proposals in 49.1.1, subject to the amendments discussed above, and noted that these would be incorporated into the final QCF and submitted for approval at the next meeting.

Discussed:

53.1.2 EdCom warmly welcomed and endorsed the document and thanked the Equality and Diversity team for putting together guidance which would help to raise awareness and

Discussed:

54.1.5 EdCom noted the importance of supporting UCL Australia staff effectively in the run out, ensuring that there was a proactive and supportive relationship with CALT. The UCL Arena scheme could be utilised to provide careers advice for staff, and could provide training for post docs in teaching and the supervision of projects. The Director of CALT would be visiting the campus soon and would work with the local team to put a programme of support in place.

54.1.6 EdCom noted that the PT masters students might refuse to exit their programmes early, in which case UCL would be required to complete delivery of the programme of study. There might also be further complications if a student had extenuating circumstances or needed to interrupt, although provision might also be made for in-session resits to enable students to finish in time. It was noted that the majority of students needed to study locally and would be unable to study in the UK as an alternative.

Resolved:

54.1.7 EdCom formally noted the plans and requested that the faculty submit regular progress updates to the committee so that UCL could be assured of the academic standards of the run-out provision. This should include more detailed information about how academic standards would be managed, for example what arrangements would be put in place for Boards of Examiners, reassessments, moderation, approval of results etc.

Action: Dr Simon Banks

54.1.8 A similar report would need to be submitted to the Research Degrees Committee who would oversee the run-out of the UCL Australia provision for research students.

Action: Dr Simon Banks

55 REFERRALS

these discussions, and that faculties be allowed to offer students referrals where appropriate, until the regulations were reviewed.

Discussed:

- 55.1.3 EdCom noted that faculties would not be required to reinstate referrals the decision would depend on what students had been told and what had been published in student handbooks etc. Where students had already been told that referrals were unavailable, this should remain. However, if students had been told that referrals were in place, this would need to be honoured. The committee agreed that the existing regulations 3.2.4 v) and 3.2.4 vi) would require amendment to reflect that referrals would be optional:

*3.2.4 v) Students who obtain a mark in the referral range for the course unit as a whole **may will** be offered referred assessment of the assessment components that have been failed by the relevant teaching department/division. Students who are successful in all such referred assessments will be given the pass mark of 40 for the course unit overall irrespective of the marks actually obtained in the referral.*

*3.2.4 vi) Students who fail a course unit despite achieving an overall mark of 40 or above because they did not achieve the qualifying mark required for one or more assessment components **may***

