University of HUDDERSFIELD
Inspiring global professionals

UTLC_2025_03_19_M

University Teaching and Learning Committee
19 March 2025, 9.30 – 12.30pm

MINUTES	
Venue:	McClelland Suite
Authors:	Jillian Myall and Pam Suman (Regulations and Casework)
Members Present:	Jane Owen-Lynch (Chair), Victoria Arslan, Robert Allan, Claire Aydogan, Rachel Birds, Nic Clear, Andrew Crampton, Jonathan Croall, Joanne Donbavand, Shelley Harrington, Heather Kerrick, Keith Mccabe, Matt Mills, Jo Mitchell, Sean Pryor, Irfan Rather, Ruth Stoker, Theo Stubbs, Nik Taylor, Amanda Tinker
In Attendance:	Jason Smith, Jess Procter, Lydia Blundell, Keri Landeg
Apologies:	Wayne Bailey, Andrew Ball, Sarah Bastow, Georgina Blakeley, Lauren Coetzee, Bob Cryan, Brian Culleton, Leigh Flemming, Haley German, Michael Ginger, Tim Hosker, Alison Jones, Andrew Mandebura, Peter Mather, Lorraine Noel, Krish Pilicudale, Alistair Sambell, Penny Sykes, Tim Thornton

PRELIMINARY ITEMS

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

1.1 None disclosed.

2. MINUTES

UTLC_2025_01_29_M

2.1 **APPROVED**: The committee approved the minutes of the meeting held on 29 January 2025.

3. MATTERS ARISING

3.1 **Timetabling (Minute reference 3.6)**

ACTION: (From November meeting ref 4.6) The Head of BPI to investigate easier ways of recording change monitoring data to improve how schools collect, analyse and present timetable change data

ONGOING – Email update from Head of BPI **–** work was ongoing on collection of changes/change requests and reports are being produced on an ad-hoc basis currently.

During the previous discussions, the Timetabling group reviewed the ongoing changes to the timetables and the monitoring. Data from the last session provided insights into how adjustments were impacting both staff and students. While the timetables had stabilised for the current term, it was noted that future efforts should focus on understanding the reasons behind timetable changes to minimise disruptions.

Key points included:

- Operational reviews and monitoring mechanisms are currently in place to address recurring issues.
- The changes to timetables had been identified as disruptive to both staff and students, making it crucial for strategies to be in place to prevent excessive changes.
- Feedback to be sought for the next timetable release, scheduled for July (staff timetable) or at the latest, September (student timetable).

- The objective was to ensure a more comprehensive and streamlined timetable process moving forward.
- Heather Kerrick was also confirmed as part of the meeting.
- The first meeting was scheduled for the afternoon.
- Head of BPI to provide an update at the next meeting as not complete.

ACTION: Head of BPI to provide an update at the next meeting.

3.2 Inspiring KPI's (Minute reference 4.1)

The Chair presented an overview of proposed KPIs and opened for discussion.
ACTION: The Committee invited to email any feedback to the Chair.

Chair thanked the Committee for the comments which had been sent.

Discussion on KPIs to be covered in the Chair's Business.

3.3 Curriculum Review and Mass Validation (Minute reference 4.1)

On behalf of the Chair, the QA Team would circulate a proforma regarding changes that the Committee may want to make in the process, linked to the meetings conducted before and after Christmas with all course leaders and course teams. The deadline to return the proforma was 14th February 2025.
ACTION: Proforma to be shared and completed.
COMPLETE: Head of QA confirmed proforma had been shared

This progressed as planned. The proforma was distributed, all deadlines had passed, and responses had been received, along with reports from several events that would be put forward to the next validation. Strategic leads in schools were reminded to review curriculum and modules to reduce complexity. The immediate goal, in conjunction with the timetabling project, was to simplify the module portfolio. Reducing complexity in this way was expected to significantly improve timetabling efficiency and provide better choices for students.

Further discussion to be had under Chair's Business.

3.4 CAM Working Group (Minute reference 4.1)

The Director of RAD and the Head of Student Regulations and Course Administration provided an update from the CAM working group.
ACTION: Further input from those with vested interests were requested to feedback via email to the Chair for feedback to the working group

This item to be moved to Chair's Business.

3.5 Use of ICTs (Minute reference 4.1)

The Chair reiterated to academic colleagues that course administration cannot support in-class tests as some colleagues had expected. The approach was being reconsidered to better meet students' needs and comply with retention policies.
ACTION: Head of Student Regulations and Course Administration to add Andrew Crampton to the working group for input regarding the retention plans.
COMPLETE: Andrew Crampton had been invited to the working group.

Ongoing discussions about the purpose and support for in-class tests. Initially revisited the issue of courses not supporting in-class tests, with an aim to have further discussions about the purpose of these tests and their role in assessment. While conversations with some schools been had, not all had been involved yet, so that part was still in progress.

ACTION: Ongoing; Head of Student Regulations and Course Administration to update at the next meeting.

3.6 Update for New UKVI Regulations (Minute reference 4.1)
The Director of International Development advised the Committee on UKVI regulations for students studying on a student visa.
ACTION: Head of QA to add information related to this regulation to the course validation regulations.

The Director of International Development had previously discussed the new UKVI regulations regarding the allowable proportion of online study. While there did not seem to be any major issues, it was necessary to integrate this into the regulations, course validations, and general policies. When consulting the validation team and holding discussions with schools, it was found that only one course exceeded the 20% threshold, but this had been adjusted by switching from face-to-face to online delivery.

At this point, everything appears to align with UKVI requirements. The next step involved formalising these changes. This would be addressed in the regulations update in May, where the relevant documentation will also be added to the QA handbook.

ACTION: Director of International Development to update at the next meeting in May.

3.7 Terms of Reference and Membership (Minute reference 5.2)
ACTION: Nomination for member from Finance Team
COMPLETE: Jonathan Croall had been nominated

APPROVED: It was noted that Jonathan Croall, from the Finance Team, was acknowledged as a member of the UTLC.

3.8 LLE BRIEFING PAPER (Minute reference 12.1 UTLC_2025_01_29_P12.1)
The Committee were asked to consider the LLE Briefing paper for discussion at the next meeting
ACTION: Paper to be a discussion point at the March meeting

This item to be discussed under Chair's Business.

3.9 EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORT FOR 23/24 (Minute reference 19.1 UTLC_2025_01_29_P19.1)
ACTIONS:
1. To confirm when responses had been received from schools. (Head of QA)
2. To bring to SLT's attention the concerns raised in relation to resourcing. (Director of RAD)

The discussions included:
- SLT discussed external examiner reports and their implications.
- SLT asked deans to feedback on actions taken to address concerns.
- Awaiting next set of external examiner comments to see if issues persist.
- Responses received from most courses except 'Marketing Suite" and "Filmmaking'.

The External Examiner's report was discussed in SLT in the context of resourcing and its implications. SLT expressed serious concern after reviewing the reports and asked UTLC to clarify what specific actions they expect from SLT, apart from reiterating their concern and ensuring that Deans are addressing these issues. Feedback had been requested from all schools regarding what actions had been taken to address the external examiners' concerns. SLT hoped that the actions taken so far provided reassurance to UTLC, but they are open to further guidance on additional steps if required.

Moving forward, there is a need to wait for the next set of External Examiner comments to identify if recurring themes persist. Efforts are being made to follow up on the remaining responses, and teams are encouraged to prioritise pursuing these further.

Marking deadlines were discussed, and this will be considered as part of the CAM working groups, with updates to follow as the project progresses.

ACTION: Chair to chase response from “Marketing Suite” and “Filmmaking”

3.10 ANY OTHER BUSINESS (Minute 26.1)

Georgina Blakeley - Refer/defer deadlines this year were very short, and one module had only 3 days to mark and input. The Committee were reminded that the summer timetable was always tight.

ACTION: The Head of Student Regulations and Course Administration would raise with the CAM project working group for consideration.

This item to be discussed under Chair’s Business.

4. CHAIRS BUSINESS

4.1 Tabled at the meeting, PowerPoint presented by Chair

(a) Update on Strategy Development

Workshops focused on strategy development introduced new ideas and prompted discussion. Significant revisions since the last iteration included reducing aims from 18 to 6, simplifying KPIs to 12, and enhancing financial sustainability via TNE apprenticeships, digital learning, and other initiatives.

Key discussion points:

- Challenges and Financial Planning: Sector financial difficulties highlighted the need for strategic approaches.

The Chair left the meeting temporarily, at this point, and Director of Registry covered Minute 6. The Chair returned to the meeting at this point.

- Focus areas included people and culture, graduate outcomes, global engagement (TNE/networks), and digital transformation.
- Vision: support for "To be an inspiring, innovative University of international renown", with consideration of an alternative vision.
- Graduate data: employment outcomes data was delayed by 2-3 years and unreliable, creating challenges for adapting current practices.
- Differential attainment was strongly advocated as a KPI due to its flexibility, regulatory alignment, and ability to drive valuable projects that support students’ success.
- Employment outcomes: despite its issues, employment data was important for solving global challenges and supporting education.

- Discussions considered reducing KPIs to two or retaining three. Differential attainment, graduate outcomes, and student satisfaction were debated.
- Graduate outcomes were highlighted as essential for external reporting and internal alignment with strategic goals.
- Differential attainment was seen as better for adaptability and addressing regulatory expectations.
- NSS (National Student Survey) was critiqued for being overly visible and potentially misdirecting focus. There was a suggestion to focus on differential attainment instead.
- Suggestions were made to use "Transforming Lives" as part of the university strapline, despite concerns about similarities with other institutions.

KPIs and Differential Attainment:

- Discussion on reducing KPIs to two.
- Importance of retaining differential attainment as a KPI due to its impact on assessment and feedback.
- Consideration of how differential attainment influences graduate outcomes.
- Strong support for retaining differential attainment as a KPI due to its broad impact on various projects and its ability to address specific issues.
- Differential attainment drives many useful projects and allows for targeted approaches to problem-solving.
- Differential attainment aligns closely with regulatory assessment metrics.
- Importance of maintaining focus on differential attainment for regulatory and strategic reasons.

Graduate Outcomes Data:

- Challenges with the timeliness of graduate outcomes data.
- Data was collected 15 months after graduation, with results finalised another year later.
- Importance of graduate outcomes as a KPI, despite challenges with the timeliness of data.
- Graduate outcomes are crucial for external reporting and internal strategic conversations.

Balancing KPIs:

- Suggestion to have three KPIs to balance internal and external needs.
- Differential attainment, graduate outcomes, and another KPI to ensure comprehensive coverage.

APPROVED: The Committee unanimously agreed to reduce the number of KPIs to two.
ACTION: Chair to put forward UTLC agreement of the two KPIs.
ACTION: Chair requested the Committee to send feedback to OurFuture@hud.ac.uk

(b) Update TEF

Updates on the test dashboard and future workshops were briefly discussed, with plans to progress these initiatives by April.

(c) Student experience and Timetabling

This item had been discussed earlier in the meeting (Reference Minute 3.1)

(d) NSS current response rates

It was reported that the response rates were slightly lower than last year.

ACTION: Strategic leads encouraged to push for higher response rates before Easter.

(e) Curriculum Review and Mass Validation

The Curriculum Review and Mass Validation Process included discussions on upcoming changes to student regulations. These changes are tied to the efforts of a working party focused on developing and implementing new policies.

(f) Upcoming Changes to OfS Regulations
The working party was addressing upcoming regulations on sexual harassment and sexual violence, set to take effect in September. An update was provided at the SU Executive meeting on Monday. Further developments would be shared with this group in a future session.
It was suggested that the next iteration of these developments should be brought to this group for further discussion, with Director of RAD being involved as part of the process.
ACTION: An update to be shared at the next meeting in May (Director of RAD)

(g) CAM Working Group Updates (Minute reference 4.1)
The Director of RAD and the Head of Student Regulations and Course Administration provided an update from the CAM working group.
ACTION: Further input from those with vested interests and requested feedback to be emailed to the Chair for feedback to the working group

Discussions are ongoing regarding the timing of assessment deadlines, ensuring that those at the end of Term 1 allow sufficient marking time before results are finalised. The working group was satisfied with the current timing framework but would continue to monitor its impact.
Programme Manager, Andrew Raistrick, to be invited to present more details at the next UTLC meeting, including updates on work related to spanning modules, when teaching crosses two terms.

Efforts are underway to refine communications:

- Student-Focused: Highlighting how changes impact their experience.
- Academic-Focused: Ensuring clear and consistent communication within the institution.

ACTION: Andrew Raistrick to be invited and to present more details at the next UTLC meeting in May

The agenda was taken out of order, at this point to allow the Chair to leave the meeting early, and 21.1 University Response to Lifelong Learning Entitlement was discussed.

5. TERMS OF REFERENCE AND MEMBERSHIP (UTLC_2025_01_29_P5.1)
APPROVED: Updated version approved by the committee.

5.1 **APPROVED:** The Committee approved Jonathan Croall as a member from the Finance Team

6. POLICY UPDATES
6.1 There were no policy updates to present at this meeting

7. THEMATIC REVIEW
7.1 The Committee were invited to submit suggestions for Thematic Reviews to Head of Quality Assurance, Jason Smith via email.

The following update given:

- Current Review - preparations were underway for the upcoming Thematic review on Compassionate Communication. A chair to be set up, and document requests would be sent shortly, with the review launching in the next few months.
- Suggestions for next year: there are no confirmed suggestions for the next cycle of Thematic Reviews. Head of QA encouraged the Committee to submit ideas.
- The review on "compassionate communication" was clarified further. There appears to be some overlap with a previously commissioned review around "Abrahart and inclusive practices," which seemed to have shifted focus without consultation. It was noted that compassionate communication encompasses a broader, holistic approach to how students are supported, particularly in terms of processes for reasonable adjustments related to disabilities.
- Emphasis was placed on ensuring that not all adjustments require documentation in Personal Learning Support Plans.
- Future considerations: the group reflected that Compassionate Communication aligns well with thematic reviews. However, broader issues, such as processes for adjustments and their implications, may require a separate working group outside the Thematic Review Framework.
- Head of QA suggested further discussions be held offline to determine the most appropriate approach for addressing these topics.

ACTION: The Committee were invited to submit suggestions for Thematic Reviews to Head of Quality Assurance.

8. QUALITY APPRAISAL

8.1 The Committee were invited to submit suggestions for Quality Appraisals to Head of Quality Assurance via email

9. UPDATED SUBJECT REVIEW SCHEDULE

9.1 There were no matters to note at this meeting as this item was ongoing.

10 EXTERNAL EXAMINER APPLICATIONS

UTLC_2025_03_19_P10.1

10.1 All applications had been reviewed and approved by the committee members or their assigned subsets. No concerns were raised, and the appointments will proceed accordingly.

APPROVED: The External Examiner applications were all approved by the Committee.

The Chair left the meeting at this point.
Director of Registry continued as Chair for the remainder of the meeting.

11. REPORT FROM THE STUDENTS' UNION (UTLC_2025_03_19_P11.1)

11.1 **APPROVED**: The Committee approved the meeting paper.

The following students' views on AI were provided and responses from the committee:

- Student AI Feedback: AI assists research but raises concerns about inconsistent policies, equity, ethics, and critical thinking. Students recommend clearer guidelines, workshops, and fair access.
- Institutional AI Resources: Efforts are underway to improve awareness of AI tools like Brightspace's traffic light system. The QAA project had developed support materials for dissemination.

- Generative AI Updates: A PhD-supported AI tool for assignments received positive feedback. Schools are encouraged to collaborate and share AI case studies.
- Ethical & Environmental Considerations: Discussions addressed AI's data usage, carbon footprint, and comparisons to calculators' academic integration. Staff confidence in AI varies, with preferences shaped by familiarity.
- University AI Strategy: Policies, training, and ethical alignment would be refined. AI use declarations may decline as it becomes more integrated.

Immediate Actions:

- Organise staff workshops on AI issues.
- Improve student communication and staff AI knowledge.
- Address ethical and data protection concerns.

Reports & Administrative Updates:

- AI steering group inactive since January.
- Inclusivity checklist inconsistencies to be resolved.
- AS review to resume post-restructuring.
- Apprenticeships committee reported no major concerns.

Online Teaching & Camera Use:

- Standardised camera policies are needed.
- Privacy concerns must be balanced with engagement strategies.
- Mental Health & Induction Support:
- Confidence-building initiatives can ease students into online interactions.

Action Points to consider:

- Share Human and Health's work with other schools to promote best practices.
- Exploring strategies for improving engagement in online environments while considering diverse needs and barriers.
- Focusing on gradual adaptation and thoughtful communication to balance inclusivity and professional preparation.

ACTION: Director of Strategic Teaching and Learning to take these suggestions back to the course leaders' forum for further development.

12. CHAIRS ACTIONS SINCE LAST MEETING

12.1 There are no Chairs Actions to note since the meeting held on 29 January 2025.

13. REPORTS FROM WORKING GROUPS

13.1 Student Engagement and Attendance Monitoring Steering Group

There were no minutes to note at this meeting

13.2 Institutional Timetable Review Steering Group

There were no minutes to note at this meeting

13.3 GPA Steering Group

There were no minutes to note at this meeting

13.4 Academic Integrity Working Group

There were no minutes to note at this meeting

13.5 Exams Planning Group

There were no minutes to note at this meeting

13.6 Consumer Protection Law Working Group

There were no minutes to note at this meeting

13.7 Data Futures Working Group
There were no minutes to note at this meeting

13.8 Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) Working Group
There were no minutes to note at this meeting

13.9 Distance Learning Steering Group
There were no minutes to note at this meeting

13.10 Learning Platforms Steering Group
There were no minutes to note at this meeting

13.11 Graduate Outcomes Working Group
There were no minutes to note at this meeting

13.12 Advance HE Steering Group
There were no minutes to note at this meeting

13.13 Enrolment Planning Group
There were no minutes to note at this meeting

14. REPORTS FROM PSRBs

14.1 There were no reports from PSRB's for this meeting

15. REPORTS FROM VALIDATION PANELS (UTLC_2025_03_19_P15.1)

15.1 The Committee noted the draft reports from validation panels, which required to be signed off yet.

ACTION: The signed off Validation Panel reports to be brought to the next meeting in May.

16. REPORTS FROM SUBJECT REVIEW PANELS

16.1 There were no reports arising from subject review events for this meeting

17. STANDING COMMITTEE FOR COLLABORATIVE PROVISION

17.1 There are no minutes to note at this meeting.
ACTION: Academic Skills Manager to check for minutes of the GEN AI meeting, held on 30 January 2025.

18. STANDING COMMITTEE FOR APPRENTICESHIPS (UTLC_2025_03_19_P18.1)

18.1 The Committee noted the minutes and any actions for UTLC from their most recent meeting, held on 12 February 2025.

19. SCHOOL TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE MINUTES
UTLC_2025_03_19_P19.4a
UTLC_2025_03_19_P19.4b

19.1 There were no minutes to note at this meeting from **AS**
19.2 There were no minutes to note at this meeting **BEL**
19.3 There were no minutes to note at this meeting **CE**
19.4 The Committee noted the minutes from **HHS**, meeting held on 15 January 2025 and 26 February 2025
19.5 There were no minutes to note at this meeting **SAH**

20. OTHER UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES

20.1 University International Committee

There were no minutes to note at this meeting

20.2 Equality Diversity and Inclusivity Enhancement Committee

There were no minutes to note at this meeting

20.3 Work Integrated Learning Forum

There were no minutes to note at this meeting

20.4 Enterprise and Employability Committee

There were no minutes to note at this meeting

21. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

21.1 The committee noted to notify the Secretary 24 hours in advance of the meeting of any matters they wish to be considered under Any Other Business.

21.2 University Response to Lifelong Learning Entitlement (UTLC_2025_03_19_P21.2)

UTLC was invited to receive and approve the mapping to Principles 1, 2 and 7 of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, published by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education.

The LLE would launch in September 2026, allowing students to study at their own pace, taking between 30 and 180 credits per year. This scheme applies to traditional undergraduate degrees, integrated masters, and foundation degrees, with most institutions seeing entry from September 2027. All modules must be linked to a parent program, and existing students would continue under the current systems.

Modularisation and Curriculum Design:

- Full modularisation was not mandatory, but institutions are exploring bundling options (e.g., 10, 20, 30-credit modules) to meet LLE requirements.
- Modular programs may include CPD, short courses, and vocational offerings to address skills gaps in collaboration with employers.
- Discussions are underway about evening classes and other flexible learning opportunities, as well as how modularisation aligns with strategic goals.

CPD and Skills Training:

- Institutions can offer CPD funded through the LLE, even for students who already hold degrees, enhancing skills across fields like health, life sciences, and business.
- Employers can contribute to CPD and vocational training to address local and national skills shortages, leveraging existing programs without duplicating efforts.

Funding Details:

- Students would have access to four years' worth of funding, totalling approximately £38,134 (£9,533.50 per year).
- Funding can be used for modularised programs, including CPD, to upskill or gain new qualifications.

Operational and Administrative Challenges:

- Dual systems would be required to manage LLE and non-LLE students, increasing the operational burden for finance, registry, admissions, and professional services.
- Recruitment processes must adapt, as modularised students may apply based on credits rather than full courses.

Next Steps:

- Institutions are cautiously considering modularisation and awaiting further government guidance on funding and rules.

- To proceed, it was agreed to set up separate discussions for operational processes and curriculum development. A fixed-term project lead could help manage these areas effectively. As for future quality appraisals or suggestions, no urgent proposals were made during the meeting, but the team remains open to ideas for next year.
- Trials had shown limited uptake for modular courses, prompting institutions to test modularisation in specific areas before committing to large-scale changes.

ACTION: The Chair to set up a working Group.

21.3 Changes to Pre-CAMs (UTLC_2025_03_19_P21.3)

To consider and approve proposal had been put forward to remove the pre-CAM meetings from the cycle.

The proposed changes to Pre-CAMs were reviewed:

- Planning would facilitate automated report production for timely data access.
- QA team would draft communications to external examiners on process changes, with proofreading by Andrew Crampton and Joanne Donbavand.
- Head of Student Regulation and Course Administration's team would distribute updates to academic teams, incorporating input from strategic leads.
- New regulations and processes targeted for completion by 1st August, alongside report revamps, though automation remains under review.
- Course teams must allocate time for quality-focused meetings, provisionally called "QAMEs."
- Strategic leads and academic teams ensuring smooth implementation, with updates expected in May.

Associate Dean (Teaching & Learning) proposed the Quality Assurance and Module Enhancement (QAME) framework as part of the course team meeting cycle. This initiative focuses on evaluating how modules are performing, with a shift from the traditional annual module evaluation survey towards a more insightful mechanism capturing diverse aspects such as:

- Engagement and attainment rates.
- Assessment completion times and difficulties.
- Delivery quality and overall student perceptions.
- Triggered initially by observations on grade inflation and top- and bottom-performing modules, the QAME process would enable timely identification of areas requiring improvements and ensure changes align with student feedback and operational goals.
- Linking QAME with the evaluation of student experiences at a module-specific level.
- Potential challenges in addressing these evaluations within course committees due to time constraints and complexity.
- The need for clear terms of reference and guidance for QAME meetings to standardise practices across schools.

The next steps agreed were:

- Head of QA's team will encapsulate the terms of reference for QAME alongside other groups within the quality structure as part of the work on new regulations and processes.

- Head of QA will collaborate with Associate Dean (Teaching & Learning) and Senior Lecturer Occupational Therapy, using their experience to refine the framework and develop agenda guidelines for meetings.
- The QAME process will eventually be folded into the evaluation cycle and integrated within the developing cultural regulation structure.

APPROVAL: The committee approved the proposal and suggested moving forward with the outlined steps to implement QAME effectively.
ACTION: Committee members to send suggestions to Head of Quality Assurance
ACTION: Head of QA, Associate Dean (Teaching & Learning) and Senior Lecturer Occupational Therapy to meet and establish terms of reference, agenda and guidance for QAME meetings.

21.4 Exams Update
The Committee noted the meeting paper. UTLC approval was required for sign off.

Update on Invigilation support for exams:

- With a high volume of exams, including 78 individual rooms scheduled for PLSP requirements, support was required to manage invigilation.
- An email from the Deputy Vice-Chancellor will be sent to Deans, Directors, and School Operations Managers outlining the need for support. Both academics and professional services staff are encouraged to contribute, similar to team efforts for clearing and graduation.
- A spreadsheet would be circulated for staff to sign up, ensuring proper training and preparedness for invigilation roles. External invigilators would fill any remaining gaps.

22. AVAILABILITY OF AGENDA, PAPERS AND MINUTES

22.1 No items were identified as items to be treated as confidential

23. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

23.1 All meetings commence at 9.30am and are scheduled to end at 12.30pm. Meetings are in person unless otherwise advised.

Meeting Dates for 2024/25

28 May 2025.