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**The University of Huddersfield**

**University Teaching and Learning Committee**

**28 November 2018**

**Present**: Professor C Jarvis (Chair), Dr R Allan, Dr L Bennett, Dr R Birds, Mr S Boyd, Professor A Crampton, Dr P Cullum, Dr E Davies, Mrs T Hart, Mr E Haruna, Professor J Johnes, Professor P Keeley, Dr P Mather, Dr G McGladdery, Professor P Miller, Mr M Mills, Professor K Orr, Professor J Owen-Lynch, Mr J Smith, Ms R Stoker, Dr A Tinker, Dr P Woodcock, Professor S Wu

**In Attendance:** Ms L Blundell, Dr Mike Snowden

**Apologies:** Professor A Ball, Dr D Belton, Professor P Bissell, Ms M Boryslawskyj, Professor R Cryan, Dr S White, Mr A Mandebura, Mrs L Smith, Professor N King, Professor D Taylor, Professor T Thornton, Dr S White, Dr P Youngson

**Actions**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **REGS-UTLC-28NOV18-1. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 26 September 2018** |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | The Committee received and approved the minutes of the meeting held on 26 September 2018. |  |
|  |  |  |
| **REGS-UTLC-28NOV18-2. MATTERS ARISING** |  |
| **2.0** | **MATTERS ARISING** |  |
|  |  |  |
| 2.1 | **Confirmation of the Terms of Reference, Membership and Dates of UTLC for the 2018/19 Session (minute reference 2.3)** |  |
|  | The Committee noted that a nomination for a replacement for Dr Warren Gillibrand as Ethics Representative remained outstanding. An email request had been sent to Associate Deans for Research and Enterprise but no nominations received yet.The Chair requested that efforts continue to identify an appropriate colleague with the Associate Deans for Teaching & Learning be included to help propose a colleague to take on this role.  | ADT&L |
|  |  |  |
| 2.2 | **Reports from Review Panels/Subject Review/Revalidation of Tourism, Transport and Travel (minute reference 2.7)** |  |
|  | The Committee received the Business School response to the issue of the benefits of lecture capture: The School has explained lecture capture to the students about how and when it will be used to ensure inclusivity and confidentiality. The issue is that some staff members choose not to use it - despite being advised of the benefits. This is within their rights according to the Universities and Colleges Union.The Dean of the School confirmed that increasing numbers of staff are engaging and recognising the benefits of Lecture Capture and making use of its facility.  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | **REGS-UTLC-28NOV18-P2.3** |  |
| 2.3 | Inclusive Curriculum FrameworkThe Committee received and noted the School progress report from ADA. Professor Song Wu confirmed that work is continuing into this project with more funding being sought to further promote project allocation and the continued work of a diverse range of speakers. It was noted that two winners of an inclusivity prize were creating posters to identify examples of what diverse materials look like.  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 2.4 | **Annual report on Academic Integrity/SU report on Academic Integrity (minute reference 5.1)** |  |
|  |  |  |
| 2.4.1 | Annual report on Academic IntegrityThe Committee received and considered the new proposals under agenda item 3.2 |  |
|  |  |  |
| 2.4.2 | Student Case ReportThe Committee received a verbal report from Registry about developments to improve statistical reporting in future. The Director of Registry informed the Committee that the service was currently working with the Planning team to expand on the data presented under the student casework statistics remit. Planning had already reviewed the reports produced by Registry and were looking into ways to support Registry on making better use of the data already available in ASIS. It is hoped this information sharing will lead to reports provided to senior Committees being consistently robust and reliable. It was expected that these improvements would be in place for the next round of reports at the beginning of the next academic year.  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 2.4.3 | **SU report on Academic Integrity**  |  |
|  | It was noted that reports under this item would be received under item 3.2. |  |
|  |  |  |
| 2.5 | **Annual report on Appeals against Decisions to Withdraw Students on the basis of Poor Attendance (minute reference 5.4)** |  |
|  | It was confirmed that the Committee would receive the proposals from the working group led by Professor Song Wu following a review under agenda item 4.1. |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | REGS-UTLC-28NOV18-P2.6AREGS-UTLC-28NOV18-P2.6B |  |
| 2.6 | Classification and Use of Discretion (minute reference 6.1) |  |
|  | The Committee received updated Classification statistics and the report on use of discretion.The Chair highlighted, from the paper on classification, that 1. There had been a slight fall in the number of good honours confirmed but that the fall was not significant and the Institution was still hitting the KPI target of 75% good honours rates.
2. The Committee commended the improvement in the percentage of good honours degrees received by overseas students.
3. There were no significant changes presented under the splits for mature and young students
4. There were no significant changes noted for the advantaged and disadvantage group
5. A slight improvement in the classification scores for the BME groups was noted however it was recognised that further analysis was required to scrutinise the remaining gap and the factors that influence it. It was noted that AS currently have a student looking at the figures for their School and are working with Planning to expose more granular detail relating to the contributing factors that impact classification of BME students.
6. Disabled students appear to perform better than non-disabled students although the performance of the disabled students had seen a slight drop from previous years.

The SU asked if there was anything to be learnt from the positive outcomes seen by AS in relation to the attainment gap for BME students. AS confirmed that their current analysis would help to look at modular level granular data to help support key factors they have used to reduce the BME gap. It was agreed this analysis would be fed back to this committee when available. It was recognised that the data used to analyse the performance of students in the identified groups should go down to course and modular level which would expose varying factors that contribute to attainment. Student Services added that the data relating to disabled and non-disabled students should also focus down to modular level to unpick factors that contribute to attainment. It was confirmed that there were no comments relating to the paper on the use of discretion.  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 2.7 | Changes to University Regulations (minute reference 7.1) |  |
|  | The Committee received confirmation from HHS and MHM that no students had been impacted by the changes to the Regulations for this academic year.  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 2.8 | Equality and Diversity (minute reference 14.1) |  |
|  | It was noted that the Teaching and Learning Conference keynote powerpoint presentation by Dr Annie Hughes from Kingston University entitled “Kingston University’s Approach to Attainment Gaps and Inclusive Curricula” had been circulated together with other materials from the Teaching and Learning Conference and a link to further information. |  |
|  |  |  |
| 2.9 | Report from the Students’ Union (minute reference 16.1) |  |
|  | The SU confirmed to the Committee that their review on male and female dominated courses in terms of staffing provision was not being continued in light of challenges around data support.  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | REGS-UTLC-28NOV18-P2.10 |  |
| 2.10 | External Examiners (minute reference 17.2) |  |
|  | The Committee received the report from the Assessment Review Project working party chaired by Professor Pete Sanderson.Three themes occurred from the working group and within the paper which were;1. scrutiny of assessment
2. quality
3. standardisation

Professor Owen-Lynch reported on the paper highlighting to the Committee that presently the University does not refer to or use the process of standardisation. The Committee were advised that standardisation is used regularly at A-Level and promotes markers who collectively mark assessments to come together as a team and agree on criteria to be used broadly across the assessment. The markers then mark their assessments separately and come to a mark which is then subject to moderation. It was noted that the process of standardisation and moderation are different but that standardisation can be helpful where lots of staff mark a lot of work. Professor Owen-Lynch also commented in relation to quality that the working group found it challenging to identify a single document relating to the appointment of External Examiners and so recommended that a review of process documentation be considered to rationalise and streamline the procedural documents supporting quality processes. MHM agreed that the number of quality procedures across the Institution had meant that to find single efficient and effective documents for colleagues was challenging and as a result the School supported a holistic review of regulations, procedures and policies with the aim of streamlining and reducing document drift. CE asked that if additional Quality Assurance procedures were to be introduced then the following points should be considered;1. Where processes become streamlined that guidance is issued to cater to variables that affect the ability to make standard judgments
2. Thought should be given to the amount of time available to academic staff between when marking finishes and the CABs start as the current tight turn around would not permit for an extra step such as standardisation to be included.

It was agreed that the principles of the document were accepted but that QSAG will consider the details of the implementation of the principles, questions and associated guidance to support it.  | QSAG |
|  |  |  |
| 2.10.1 | The need to standardise marking. This item was covered under minute reference 2.10 above.  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 2.10.2 | Overuse of GroupworkThe Committee discussed the comments relating to the use of group work and agreed that it should be made transparent to students how group work will operate, what to do if they wish to query a mark associated to a group assessment and that the use of group work in final years of UGT programmes should be considered thoroughly. It was agreed that the discussions around the use of group work should also inform the considerations of the paper at the next available meeting of QSAG.  | QSAG |
|  |  |  |
| 2.11 | Validation Reports (minute reference 21.1F) |  |
|  | The Committee noted that the BSc (Hons) Nursing Studies International (Top up) (FT) new course put forward by School of Human and Health Sciences on 15 May 2018, for implementation from September 2018 (or January 2019) was still confirmed as ‘Conditions not yet met’ | HHS |
|  |  |  |
| **REGS-UTLC-28NOV18-3. CHAIRS BUSINESS** |
|  |
| **REGS-UTLC-28NOV18-P3.1** |
| 3.1 | TEACHING EXCELLENCE AND STUDENT OUTCOMES FRAMEWORK: TESOF AND SUBJECT TESOF UPDATEThe Committee noted the presentation given by the Chair.The Chair emphasised that Schools and their respective Subject level groupings will need to take responsibility for ensuring they have read and understood the guidance documents published in relation to the subject level TEF assessment. There will be centrally guided support available and submissions will be coordinated centrally but that the primary responsibility for producing submissions will stay with subject areas. The Chair confirmed that the year 2 and 3 awards, that would have expired next year, are being extended to 2021. Despite the extension on timings, it was confirmed that the University would still go ahead with original submission timeline previously publicised in order to allow for a degree of flexibility in terms of the provider and subject level submissions.  The presentation highlighted that both the provider and subject level TEF responses will be compulsory with an emphasis being placed upon the subject-level response and its contribution to the overall assessment of the Institutional submission. The Chair clarified that there is now a definitive list which includes 25 subject groupings which is slightly different from the list previously provided. It was confirmed that the Planning Team are looking into matching the University’s courses into the proposed subject lists in the most appropriate way. The Chair confirmed that the subject-level assessment would be assessed and an outcome reached per subject by reviewing the subject level context material provided by the OfS, the subject metrics and the subject provider submission culminating in a statement of findings (Gold, Silver or Bronze). The individual subject findings will each contribute significantly to the providers overall assessment. The Student Outcomes and Learning Gains would be looking specifically at LEO data including ‘above median earnings’ for 25 to 29 year old graduates to compare them against the average income of people of that age and what the difference in graduate salaries are. This data set would be benchmarked by a number of factors but would not benchmarked by geography. It was noted this could impact the outcome against this metric due to the depressed local economy. The Committee sought clarification as to what the metrics for silver and gold outcomes are. It was confirmed that this information is contained within the technical document and that the Planning Team has configured a model interpreting these criteria which can be used to give schools an indication of the rating they would achieve for subject level.  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | REGS-UTLC-28NOV18-P3.2REGS-UTLC-28NOV18-P3.2A |  |
| 3.2 | ACADEMIC INTEGRITY – ESTABLISHING UNDERLYING PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE:1. Proposals with respect to Academic Integrity changes.
2. Example Information Sheet for Students
3. Background information

The Chair proposed three core principles around Academic Integrity to the Committee to inform a wider review taking place through QSAG. The proposed principles were approved by the Committee with MHM and AS asking that accessible guidance is produced for officers to adopt when considering cases of Academic Integrity cases and that the distinction between poor scholarship and plagiarism be present to demonstrate where poor scholarship may not cover all instances of referencing omissions. It was agreed the papers would be received at the coming QSAG for consideration.  | QSAG |
|  |  |  |
|  | REGS-UTLC-28NOV18-P4.1 |  |
| 4. | REVIEW OF UNIVERSITY ATTENDANCE MONITORING POLICY AND PROCEDURE |  |
| 4.1 | The Committee was asked to consider the proposed recommendations from the paper provided. Professor Wu confirmed to the Committee that feedback had been received in response to the paper from Schools and Registry but that this hadn’t yet been integrated into the document yet. Professor Wu commented that the fundamental recommendation drawn upon from the review was to suggest a recalibration of the attendance policy to a focus around monitoring, engagement and support. The review suggested that the current policy operates under compliance rather than engagement and that the use of attendance monitoring could support student engagement with their programme whilst still recognising the policy could be used for withdrawal where necessary. It was added that the Attendance Monitoring system could be used as a tool to proactively support students and engage them at the earliest point when engagement may falter and the review wished to maintain use of the Attendance Monitoring system but proactively to support engagement. The Committee discussed the recommendations highlighted in the paper and noted that whilst some schools supported the proposals, others had concerns regarding the resourcing of the recommendations, the possibility for varied practice within and between schools and the inconsistent systems support approach which could not be facilitated centrally as the current system is. Members did endorse the proposal of engagement as a separately defined policy alongside attendance monitoring policy which would be used to inform support triggers in the School to maintain student engagement. It was felt that most Schools were currently adopting the principles of active student support in regards to student attendance and engagement but welcomed a more defined approach. The SU agreed with earlier concerns and comments regarding the potential for inconsistent practice but recognised the positives of catering to flexible learning approaches.It was agreed that further discussions would take place, initially at QSAG, to consider the opportunities to enhance student support through attendance monitoring and a newly defined engagement policy. | QSAG |
|  |  |  |
| 4.2 | Attendance Monitoring and Swipe Cards;Professor Phil Keeley raised the matter surrounding the current wording of the letters issued by the Attendance Monitoring System stating that the wording was not suitable when directed towards certain groups of learners, such as part-time, mature or students dealing with challenging personal circumstances. The SU commented that proposed re-wordings of the letters had been provided to the Attendance Monitoring Steering Group before the start of the academic year but had not yet been progressed. It was envisaged that the proposed revisions would address this concern raised by HHS. It was agreed that the Attendance Monitoring Steering Group should progress the amendments previously suggested by the SU. Professor Keeley also raised the issue of the monitoring system not operating effectively in terms of Wi-Fi connections in rooms used by HHS students in alternative School Buildings. HHS has invested in improving the Wi-Fi connection in their own buildings but could not control the connections elsewhere on campus. It was agreed that HHS would send a report containing the affected rooms to the next available meeting of the Attendance Monitoring Steering Group to be considered.  | Att Mon Steering Group |
|  |  |  |
|  | REGS-UTLC-28NOV18-P5.1 |  |
| 5. | PERSONAL ACADEMIC TUTORING POLICY |  |
| 5.1 | The Committee received the revised policy.It was confirmed that the policy was under an annual review cycle and would remain as such during the first years of the dashboard and policy itself being implemented. It was noted that there had only been minor changes made to the policy and these were approved by the Committee.  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | **REGS-UTLC-28NOV18-P6.1** |  |
| 6. | **STUDENT SOCIAL MEDIA AND COMMUNICATIONS POLICY** |  |
| 6.1 | The Committee received the revised policy.It was noted that following a consultation review, changes had been made throughout the document. It was identified, through the consultation that the document did not cater to the needs of researchers and so Registry was working with Research and Enterprise who are proposing wording for section 4.1 around using social media for research. The Committee approved agreeing the document outside of the meeting once the wording had been received from R&E. The BS queried how the policy is used for students who use social media to publicise negative comments about a lecture/teaching session whilst in the session itself. It was confirmed that the policy allowed for progression of this type of behaviour under the disciplinary process or complaint if indeed appropriate and that students can be asked to remove comments if deemed offensive. This should be balanced with allowing students to have opportunities to raise genuine concerns or comments regarding their learning experience. It was agreed that Registry would produce and circulate guidance regarding steps that can be taken to support staff where students may have breached the use of social media in relation to offensive comments made public.  | Registry |
|  |  |  |
|  | **REGS-UTLC-28NOV18-P7.1** |  |
| 7. | **STUDENT SURVEY PROCESS – PROPOSED REVISIONS** |  |
| 7.1 | The Committee was asked to consider a proposal for revisions to the approved Student Survey process.The paper proposed that the questions from the NSS are used to form a survey which will allow for earlier feedback to be gathered from the first year of study on UGT programmes. It is anticipated that this earlier feedback will inform proactive steps to support the student learning experience. The Committee agreed to trial the survey to see if it supports greater return rates on other surveys with the addition of the following question requested by Student Services – “have I been able to access student support services when I needed to?” Professor Owen-Lynch confirmed that the survey would be run towards the end of the academic year, possibly between the end of exams and the publication of results using Brightspace as the site for delivery to aim to capture student attention. The SU asked that identified themes from the survey be fed back to the student body to close the feedback loop.  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | REGS-UTLC-28NOV18-P8.1REGS-UTLC-28NOV18-P8.1A |  |
| 8. | TERM DATES: ACADEMIC YEARS 2019/20 TO 2022/23 |  |
| 8.1 | The Committee considered and confirmed the term dates for 2019/2020, the proposals for the academic years 2020/2021 to 2022/23 and the term dates for 2020/21. |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | REGS-UTLC-28NOV18-P9.1REGS-UTLC-28NOV18-P9.2 |  |
| 9. | EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES |  |
| 9.1 | The Committee received and noted the minutes of the meeting held on 10 October 2018. |  |
|  |  |  |
| 9.2 | The Committee received and approved the proposed revisions to the EC Established Practice document.EPD commented that they saw the move to define when students submit work as the ‘assessment period’ as a positive step as it allows for consideration of the broader impact on assessment preparation, not the single day for submission particularly where students have longer term personal circumstances. CE queried whether the tutors within the schools could make recommendations around the length of an EC required for a student, this related to occasions when students would not be recommended to submit at the next opportunity, but rather to wait longer given the nature of assessment. It was confirmed that this advice would be welcomed by Registry colleagues and be used to support the student, however, it was recognised that not all students would approach a tutor to suggest they were submitting an EC so would rely on more ad hoc information once an EC has already been considered. It was agreed that where this occurred Registry would accommodate the advice of the tutors and remedy the length of the deferral agreed, where necessary and appropriate. |  |
|  |  |  |
| 10. | EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY |  |
| 10.1 | The Committee noted there were no reported issues. |  |
|  |  |  |
| 11. | ETHICS |  |
| 11.1 | The Committee noted there were no reported ethical issues arising from taught courses. |  |
|  |  |  |
| 12. | REPORT FROM THE STUDENTS’ UNION |  |
|  | To receive a progress report on issues raised at the last meeting: |  |
| 12.1 | The ‘Broaden my Bookshelf’ campaign was held w/c 8 October, with a range of events aimed at both students and academics. The most popular event was a keynote by Dr Shola Mos-Shogbamimu, alongside panellists including Trish Cooke and Martin Gill from the University. The week will be evaluated with the aim of improving provision for Black History Month in 2019.It was confirmed that the campaign ran in early October and had been a successful with around 50 new books being suggested and going through the official system. Of being added to the library. The SU were evaluating the campaign to determine how any further campaigns of this nature would look like going forward.  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 12.2 | It was noted that the SU is collaborating with a PGT student in EDP to understand the experiences and barriers of Muslim students on campus, and will bring a future update to UTLC in May 2019 once further research has been undertaken. |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | REGS-UTLC-28NOV18-P13.1 |  |
| 13. | EXTERNAL EXAMINERS |  |
| 13.1 | The Committee considered and approved a summary list of applications for the appointment, allocation, reallocation of duties and extensions of period of office of external examiners. It was noted that CE wished to withdraw their application for appointment for Branislav Vuksanovic. This was approved.  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 13.2 | The Committee noted that in future, all late external examiner applications should be emailed to the UTLC membership  to assure due scrutiny, rather than submitted for UTLC Chair’s action. Applications to commence the following year will be submitted to the committee meetings as the procedure requests and should be done so in a timely enough manner to reduce the volume of late applications. The Chair confirmed that the process requires that applications for appointment of EEs should be presented in time for the next coming UTLC to be scrutinised. This is to ensure that as an academic community the University can ensure it has EEs of the right calibre in place. The Chair asked that appropriate colleagues in the Schools ensure they are familiar with the triggers the EE database can provide to ensure EEs are appointed in a timely manner.  | **All Schools** |
|  |  |  |
| 14. | REPORTS FROM PSRBs |  |
| 14.1 | The Committee noted that no reports from PSRBs were received.  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 15. | REPORTS FROM REVIEW PANELS |  |
| 15.1 | The Committee noted that no reports from Review Panels were received. |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | TO NOTE |  |
|  | REGS-UTLC-28NOV18-P16.1 |  |
| 16. | REPORTS FROM SCCP |  |
| 16.1 | The Committee noted the minutes of the meeting held on 02 October 2018. |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | REGS-UTLC-28NOV18-P17.1 |  |
| 17. | REPORTS FROM VALIDATION PANELS |  |
| 17.1 | The Committee received and noted the reports arising from validation events.It was confirmed that the conditions had now been met for the following validation events listed within the paper;1. BSc (Hons) Optometry
2. MA MSc Product Innovation with Textiles
3. BA (Hons) Events Management with Digital Marketing and the BA (Hons) International Events and Tourism Management
4. MSc Electronic Engineering, MSc Electronic Engineering with Communications, MSc Electronic Engineering with Automotive Systems and MSc Engineering with Control and Instrumentation.
 |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | COMMITTEE MEETINGS  |  |
|  | The Committee noted the reports arising from the following University committees: |  |
|  |  |  |
| 18. | SCHOOL TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE MINUTES |  |
|  | REGS-UTLC-28NOV18-P18.1 |  |
| 18.1 | School of Art, Design and Architecture held on 03 October 2018. |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | **REGS-UTLC-28NOV18-P18.2** |  |
| 18.2 | School of Human and Health Sciences held on 19 September 2018. |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | REGS-UTLC-28NOV18-P18.3 |  |
| 18.3 | School of Music, Humanities and Media held on 24 January 2018Issue for attention of UTLC:18.1 Gender pay walk outIt was confirmed by the Chair that this item had been considered through the business of previous meetings of UTLC and had been progressed through appropriate channels to be fed back and considered as requested. It was noted that the minutes had not been received in a timely enough manner which had led to the re-consideration of items already concluded. The School was reminded to ensure that all minutes should be received within a sensible timescale to address issues raised at the appropriate meeting of this Committee.  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | **REGS-UTLC-28NOV18-P18.4** |  |
| 18.4 | School of Music, Humanities and Media held on 7 March 2018Issue for attention of UTLC:20.1 Communications re University closures due to snow. 20.2 Use of lecture capture footage for disruptive behaviour investigations.All items listed from this meeting of STLC have been discussed and closed at earlier meetings of UTLC. |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | **REGS-UTLC-28NOV18-P18.5** |  |
| 18.5 | School of Music, Humanities and Media held on 2 May 2018Issue for attention of UTLC 11.1 Evaluation of Diversity of External Examiners.Minute 11.1 records that this issue was to be referred to the Equality and Diversity Committee. |  |
|  | The Committee discussed whether the Equality and Diversity Committee was the most appropriate forum to receive this matter but did note that the University’s Equality, Diversity and Inclusivity Committee structure was being reviewed more broadly to consider where items such as this would be most suited. A paper would be received at the next available UTLC to propose how the EDI committee structure would operate going forward.  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 19. | OTHER COMMITTEES |  |
|  | REGS-UTLC-28NOV18-P19.1 |  |
| 19.1 | The Committee noted the minutes of the Equality and Diversity Enhancement Group held on 24 October 2018. |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | REGS-UTLC-28NOV18-P19.2 |  |
| 19.2 | The Committee noted the minutes of the Quality and Standards Advisory Group held on 06 June 2018. |  |
|  |  |  |
| 20. | ANY OTHER BUSINESS |  |
| 20.1 | The Committee offered their thanks and gratitude to the Chair for whom this meeting was her last and applauded the numerous awards received at the Institution under her role as Pro-Vice Chancellor for Teaching and Learning.  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 21. | ACTIONS IDENTIFIED FOR QSAG / OTHER COMMITTEES |  |
| 21.1 | The following agenda items and actions were identified for QSAG;2.103.24.1 |  |
|  |  |  |
| 22. | AVAILABILITY OF AGENDA, PAPERS AND MINUTES |  |
| 22.1 | It was confirmed that there were no items identified as being confidential and excluded from the Library under Standing Order 10.5.  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 23. | DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING |  |
| 23.1 | The next meeting will be held on 23 January 2019 at 9.30 am in The McClelland Suite (SB/7). |  |

*Karen Brough*

*Assistant Registrar*