

expressed by EdCom and making UCL's position clearer before referring it back to the Vice-Provost (Academic and International). This had now been done. Comments on the draft had also been received from FTCs and UCL Chaplains.

20E **Four Course Unit Modules**

[EdCom Min. 9.8, 10-11]

Noted

20E.1 EdCom had previously resolved that the four course unit structure should be retained within Civil Engineering subject to further discussion of the issues. A meeting between the Programme Director and the Head of Examinations and Academic Programmes was held on 1 February 2011.

Received

20E.2 An oral report from the **Head of Examinations and Academic Programmes, Ms Paula Speller**.

Reported

20E.3 The Civil Engineering modules had been retained with a number of conditions which had been discussed with the Programme Director. These were currently being drafted and would be circulated to EdCom members when this had been done. **[Action: Ms Paula Speller]**

21 **ENGAGEMENT MONITORING**

Received

21.1 At APPENDIX EDCOM 2/17 (10-11) – a paper from the Director of Student Services.

21.2 An oral report from the **Director of Student Services, Mr David Ashton and the Director of Registry Information and Data Services, Ms Kathleen Nicholls**.

Reported

21.3 UCL undertook engagement monitoring of all its students. In order to ensure that UCL complied with the requirements of engagement monitoring, six points of engagement had been set. The first point of contact was enrolment or re-enrolment. The remaining five points of engagement were set to cover students' period of registration. The methods for monitoring students were determined by departments/divisions. Departments were required to keep an audit trail of their engagement monitoring activities. An online engagement monitoring system had been developed in PORTICO to assist with the reporting of engagement. The Directors of Student Services and Registry Information and Data Services had been monitoring the participation of departments/divisions and faculties in their use of the online facility in PORTICO in order to ensure that engagement monitoring had taken place. Meetings had been held with Faculty representatives before Christmas to

discuss the process and further meetings had been arranged to discuss potential problem areas.

Discussion

21.4 The following points were made:

- The Faculty of Laws (100%) and the Faculty of MAPS (with very few exceptions) had performed excellently in their monitoring.
- Failure to monitor appropriately might jeopardise UCL's 'Highly Trusted Sponsor' status which could result in a downgrading of status and an increase in the number of points of engagement to ten.
- Some 'pockets' within the Faculties of Arts and Humanities and Social and Historical Sciences (particularly within SSEES) seemed to have experienced difficulty in meeting all the points of engagement and the Faculty Tutor had written to all staff to remind them of the importance of this.
- EdCom noted that it was not currently possible to integrate the online use of systems, such as logging into the Library or using ID cards to enter buildings, into the engagement monitoring system on PORTICO. The ISD representative indicated that a bid for funds to use Moodle to assist with this could be submitted, but it was noted that further discussion was needed with those supporting PORTICO before this could be taken forward.
- Some issues were raised concerning the timings of engagement points (eg. one clashed with Reading Week) but it was noted that this was a reporting period not an engagement period. Future communications from Registry on the subject would make this clearer.
- As a number of the issues with non-engagement concerned PGR students, it was resolved that the issue should also be referred to the Research Degrees Committee for its consideration.
- EdCom resolved to receive a further progress report at its meeting of 6 July 2011.

RESOLVED

21.5 That the issue of engagement monitoring should be referred to the Research Degrees Committee for further discussion. **[Action: Ms Sandra Hinton. Professor David Bogle and Ms Karen Wishart to note]**

21.6 That EdCom should receive a further progress report at its meeting of 6 July 2011. **[Action: Mr David Ashton and Ms Kathleen Nicholls]**

22 REPORT ON GRIEVANCES

Noted

22.1 UCL had a Student Grievance Procedure which allowed students to submit cases under a set number of categories. EdCom was asked to note the statistics on the cases considered under UCL's Grievance Procedure in the 2009-10 session and to consider the observations arising from these cases.

Received

22.2 At

reviewed when there was sufficient data available for comparison purposes. EdCom was initially invited to consider this data and to identify any trends that might affect UCL's standards.

Received

- 23.2 At APPENDIX EDCOM 2/19 (10-11) – a note on the Review of the Harmonised Scheme of Award. The Faculty variations were attached as Appendices 3-10.

Discussion

23.3 The following points were made:

- UCL now averaged 81% first and upper second class honours, with even better results in the 'traditional' subjects, since the raising of the pass to 40% and the requirement to pass 12 units. It was noted that results would also have been impacted by the more widespread use, urged upon programmes by the UCLBE and by successive External Examiners, of the full range of marks.
- EdCom welcomed the proposed circulation of a breakdown of the marks by department/division and programme (see 23.4 below).
- The Harmonised Scheme appeared largely to have achieved what was required of it. However, the very large number of variations to the Scheme (more than 100) posed several questions for EdCom; namely:
 - (i) Whether alterations to the Scheme itself were now required.
 - (ii) Whether those still outside the Scheme should be brought into it or remain outside.
 - (iii) Whether the variations to the Scheme should be reviewed to ascertain whether the reasons for those variations remained valid.

RESOLVED

23.4 That departments/divisions should be provided with the programme level data, via the Faculty Tutors, so that the Harmonised Scheme of Award could be reviewed together with Faculty variations on the Harmonised Scheme. **[Action: Ms Irenie Morley]**

23.5 That EdCom should request submission by each Faculty of a collated report on the outcome of its departmental/divisional review to be submitted to the meeting of EdCom to be held on 6 July 2011. **[Action: Ms Irenie Morley & Ms Sandra Hinton]**

24 **EXAMINATION TIMETABLING**

Noted

24.1 A number of issues had arisen this year during the production of the examination timetable. EdCom was also made aware of issues which might arise in session 2011-12.

Received

24.2 An oral report from the **Head of Examinations and Academic Programmes, Ms Paula Speller.**

Reported

24.3

12, requests should be limited, with any requests not concerning clinical placements/field trips etc, being disallowed. The proforma should be modified to reflect this.

- That EdCom should review, at a future meeting, the number of available weeks in the examination period.
- The annual Academic Review process which ended in March was designed to detect issues such as changes to assessment. However, this was, in some areas, being undertaken much less thoroughly than envisaged.

RESOLVED

- 24.5 That, from the beginning of next session 2011-12, departmental requests for special examination arrangements should be limited, with any requests not explicitly stating clinical placements/field trips etc, being disallowed. The proforma should be modified to reflect this.

- That it would be useful if the course were linked to the Key Skills website.
- The UCLU Education and Campaigns Officer noted that students would welcome the course as the message had certainly been absorbed within the

- *MRes in Medical Physics and Bioengineering (subject to approval by the*

to set an examination paper for resit students based on the syllabus the student had originally followed or on the current syllabus. The RRG had recommended to EdCom that, in future, students must be examined on the syllabus which they had studied. However, where students had already been informed that they would be examined on the current syllabus, this would be honoured.

- 28C.4 The question of whether to incorporate questions for resit students on examination papers as an 'either/or' option, or to provide a separate paper should be a matter for departments/divisions to decide.

SANDRA HINTON

Senior Quality Assurance Officer

Academic Services

12 April 2011

[telephone: 020 7679 8590; internal extension 28590; fax 020 7679 8595; e-mail s.hinton@ucl.ac.uk]