



University of the  
West of England

## ACADEMIC BOARD

### Learning Teaching and the Student Experience Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 01<sup>st</sup> April 2015 at 2pm in The Dartington Suite,  
Wallscourt Farmhouse, Frenchay Campus

Present: Jane Harrington (Chair), Amelia Campbell (on behalf of JJ Clark) Jackie Chelin, Stephanie Downes, Jenny Dye, JJ Clark, Rachel Cowie, Rhiannon Jenkins, Mandy Lee, James Longhurst, Stuart Marshall, Jo Midgley, Chris Potter (on behalf of John Deane), Peter Rawlings, Gerry Rice, Fiona Tolmie, Karen West, Teresa Wood

In Attendance: Rebecca Smith (Officer), Alastair Osborn, Gail Wilson, Jayne Storey (for LTSEC15.04.20) and Helen Moore (for LTSEC15.04.16)

	<b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b>
LTSEC15.04.01	Jamil Alkalouti, Gaynor Attwood, John Clarke, John Deane, Derek Norris, Neil Willey, Nick Wilton
	<b>MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING</b>
LTSEC15.04.02	<i>Paper AQEC 15.02.M was received.</i> The minutes of the AQEC meeting held on 10 <sup>th</sup> February 2015 were confirmed to be an accurate record of the meeting.
	<b>TERMS OF REFERENCE &amp; MEMBERSHIP</b>
LTSEC15.04.03	<i>Paper LTSEC 15.04.01 was received.</i> The Chair welcomed the new members to the Group, and the new name and re-aligned TOR to the Learning and Research 2020 Strand were noted.
LTSEC15.04.04	The Chair advised that discussions at the Committee would be kept tight to allow time to discuss relevant topics aligned to the TOR. The indicative business plan for the remainder of the year was noted, and any further suggestions for discursive items/topics would be sent to the Chair and Officer.  <b>Action: Committee members</b>
	<b>MATTERS ARISING</b>
LTSEC15.04.05	<b>Graduate Attributes</b> – the headings had been approved at the last meeting of Academic Board, however further work was required around the current format. The Student Representative Stuart Marshal agreed to be involved in this.

LTSEC15.04.06	<p><b>Plagiarism software</b> – Feedback from the meeting due to take place on 10<sup>th</sup> April would be received at the next LTSEC meeting. The Group would tie this into the work currently taking place on assessment offences.</p> <p><b>Action: Plagiarism software working group</b></p>
LTSEC15.04.07	<p><b>IT Outages</b> – The ITS representative had sent apologies for the meeting, however the Committee reiterated the challenges still occurring with regard to communications when there were IT problems.</p> <p><b>Action: Web Applications Manager</b></p>
LTSEC15.04.08	<p><b>Award Board Data</b> – The item was due to be discussed at the next meeting of Academic Board, with further consideration on how they could discharge their responsibilities to LTSEC to ensure actions fed into L+R 2020. The outcome of this would be fed back to LTSEC. It was suggested that a working group of LTSEC could meet to consider this further to report to AB, which already had a huge amount of committee business. Further suggestions could be sent to the Director of Academic Services.</p> <p><b>Action: Director of AS and Committee Members</b></p>
LTSEC15.04.09	<p><b>TEL Strategy</b> – The Technology Enhanced Learning Strategy would be brought into the L+R 2020, however in the meantime minor changes had been agreed by the Chair.</p>
	<b>ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION</b>
	<b>Assessment Cycle Policy</b>
LTSEC15.04.10	<p><i>Paper LTSEC15.04.03 was received.</i></p> <p>The progress to date with regard to implementing the Assessment Cycle Policy was noted. Further work was needed within the QMEF to support stage 1: curriculum design, which would reflect on work taking place regarding the Consumer Rights Legislation. A discussion item had been included in the last round of Faculty ASQC meetings regarding stage 2: assessment setting, and how Faculty processes were agreed and monitored:</p> <p>FBL – there were slightly varying processes; however common principals were to be developed by the Academic Directors for consideration at ASQC.</p> <p>HAS – Similarly the AHoDs and Field Leaders were working on principals as processes across the Faculty may differ.</p> <p>ACE – Work was underway to drill down to assessment setting at programme level.</p> <p>FET – The Learning, Teaching and Student Experience</p>

	<p>colleagues would act as the co-ordinators to discuss this further within the Faculty.</p> <p>The Committee agreed that a common principal based approach would be appropriate, and that this could feed into L+R 2020. Once the work within each Faculty had taken place this would be fed back at ASQCs.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Action: Faculty ASQCs</b></p>
LTSEC15.04.11	<p>Conversations with ITS and the Business Process Board were ongoing with regard to the online marking environment, further updates would be brought to LTSEC.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Action : Director of Academic Services</b></p>
LTSEC15.04.12	<p>The External Examiner's annual report would also be updated to reference the policy and ask whether marking criteria and moderation processes are transparent and sound and meet the requirements as set out in the policy. Members discussed the communications strategy which had been put in place when the policy had originally been approved, but agreed that a further pop up communication, noting the progress to date (what's new/different) and asking Scheme/Academic Directors (or equivalents) to forward this to module leaders, would be useful.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Action: Officer</b></p>
LTSEC15.04.13	<p>A separate video was currently being developed to communicate the policy to students. There were also FAQs online, with an email address for further queries. The Committee agreed that the deadlines as detailed in the paper could be extended.</p>
	<b>Academic Literacy Forum</b>
LTSEC15.04.14	<p><i>Paper LTSEC15.04.04 was received.</i></p> <p>An update on the ALF included a planned half day workshop, with embedding support (i.e. what is meant by 'embedding') as one of the key objectives. The Committee discussed the checking of assessments and students expectations of proof reading, and a guidance document establishing common practice and intention would be useful. Other suggestions included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarification of the different levels of feedback (what to expect, from whom and directing students to PAL leaders) for staff as well as students;</li> <li>• 20 day turn around and how students could get feedback more independently;</li> <li>• Consistency in feedback;</li> <li>• Making a distinction between literature, academic literature and written English;</li> <li>• Guidance on using Office Word software;</li> <li>• Clear signposting and ensuring the management of student and staff expectations (students have a role to play);</li> <li>• Reading before writing (reading for an academic purpose)</li> </ul>

	<p>These, as well as relevant outcomes of the ALF, would be fed into the Student Voice Working Group which is looking at student expectations upon arrival at the University. The paper would be considered within the Assessment Stream of the L+R 2020.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Action: Library representative</b></p>
	<b>Review of the Quality Management and Enhancement Framework (QMEF)</b>
LTSEC15.04.15	<p>The QMEF was currently undergoing a spring clean to ensure the language used throughout was consistent, and to integrate collaborative provision and other processes which existed but sat outside of the framework. Previous reviews had taken place since its implementation in January 2012, including a report to Academic Board and continuous evaluations undertaken within the Learning and Teaching Enhancement Team, however the framework had not been formally reviewed by the University. Current external drivers such as the Election, which had prompted HEFCE and other QA Bodies to review their processes, and UWE's QAA HER could have an impact in the timeline for the review. More would be known in the autumn term and it was agreed that the consideration of the timeframe and process for the review would be brought back for consideration then. The review would include end users, and would consider introducing an enhancement flavour.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Action: LTET Representative</b></p>
	<b>External Examiner's Conference</b>
LTSEC15.04.16	<p><i>Paper LTSEC15.04.05 was received.</i></p> <p>The 2014/15 conference organised for UWE's External Examiner's had been the 3<sup>rd</sup> year running with 54 External Examiners in attendance. The feedback had been positive, and the Committee agreed with the recommendations to continue running the annual conference with a few changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only offer it to new External Examiners;</li> <li>• Develop further online resources to capture the conference for existing or new External Examiners who are unable to attend;</li> <li>• Consider how best to include collaborative provision and other areas which sit outside of the normal modular framework;</li> </ul> <p>The date of the next conference would be confirmed at the next meeting of LTSEC.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Action: LTET</b></p>
	<b>QAA Higher Education Review</b>
LTSEC15.04.17	<p>The University was currently preparing for the trial review which was due to take place in April 2015. The draft Self Evaluation</p>

	<p>Document (SED) had been sent to the External Reviewers, and the outcomes would help set priorities and agendas for work during May and June 2015. The SED would go to the May round of Faculty ASQC's, and suggestions on how best to consider such a huge document would be welcome. Critical readers would then review the SED in June ready for submission to Academic Board at the beginning of July 2015. This, along with supporting evidence, would be sent to the QAA on 20<sup>th</sup> July 2015. The University would receive lines of enquiry from the QAA and confirmation of who they want to see on 14<sup>th</sup> September, and briefings for these staff were being organised for 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> October. September would be a crucial time for staff to be available. There were 2 changes in the Panel; one was a student representative and the other a member of the academic team. There were a few sections of the SED which needed further work, and evidence for partners was being mapped against each partner institution. The Student's Union was also working on the draft student submission, with the first draft going to the May meeting of the Student Representative Committee, and a rolling action plan would capture any new areas of work.</p>
	<b>Consumer Rights Legislation</b>
LTSEC15.04.18	<p>In June 2014 an EU directive had been published around consumer rights, including all consumers spanning many different areas. The legislation had not been written with HE in mind, however the sector had to conform to this as students are consumers. Proposed guidance was being developed around the information we should be giving to students to allow them to make an informed decision, which attempted to find a balance between what we say and how we respond innovatively to student feedback. It would also need to ensure that this did not have a negative effect on the student experience. Work had also taken place to update the student fee's policy, including additional costs which students may have to pay, although further consideration about how this was advertised on the web, and how this would be reviewed each year ensuring it met other relevant policies, was needed. Discussions amongst the sector showed that UWE was ahead in developing this proposal, which would be submitted to the Directorate and then reported to LTSEC. This would also need to feed into the review of the QMEF. From October 2015, the CMA would start to visit Institutions to check how they are conforming to the legislation.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Action: Director of Academic Services</b></p>
	<b>WP and Outreach Strategy</b>
LTSEC15.04.19	<p>The Strategy would come to the next LTSEC meeting, and in the meantime the Committee received a verbal update on development to date. Initial feedback had suggested that the strategy was too focused on pre-entry students, and further work was considering how to feed across all areas of retention and outreach. There had been a wide consultation which had included</p>

	summarising all target groups, with clear aims and objectives emerging for each. Ongoing monitoring was in place, which would feed into the WP Group. Initial evidence had shown that investment was having an impact.
	<b>New Policy – Zero Tolerance to Sexual and Domestic Violence, Abuse and Harassment</b>
LTSEC15.04.20	<p><i>Paper LTSEC15.04.06 was received.</i></p> <p>The report identified what has been happening at UWE in terms of sexual violence, and confirmed that the new policy had been approved by Academic Board in December 2014. There had been a number of instances of sexual violence at UWE with some resulting in criminal convictions. There had also been 25 referrals of sexual violence and abuse that students had been subject to. The new policy did not replace existing policies (i.e. safer spaces and virtual spaces) or the disciplinary statement, but had been put together in response to these allegations as the many conflicting demands meant they could be complex. The terminology of ‘zero tolerance’ was useful, and the suggestion that there was a need for a culture change had initiated a lot of debate. The bystander project (toolkit) had been set up in Law to help students understand sexual violence and to know what to do when it occurred, and ongoing discussions to decide how to roll this out across the University were taking place. Hundreds of students had also taken a pledge to stand against sexual violence. A UWE forum had been set up and the UoB had shown interest in running this as a joint forum, and UWE had also signed up to a city wide zero tolerance campaign led by the Mayor.</p>
LTSEC15.04.21	<p>The Committee agreed that the report was helpful, and suggested that the policy could be linked with other University statements, for example pornography (which itself was linked into the IT Policy), and include some of the information from the investigations from schools. The language of ‘zero tolerance’ was discussed, however UWE had agreed it was appropriate and students had liked the terminology and felt that it clearly reflected this would not be accepted. Further information could also be included regarding intervention, rather than reporting. A communication strategy would need to include international students, and students studying or living off campus. This could also be included as part of student induction, ensuring it was clear where students could go to report this. There had been some debate in the sector on the logistical implications for rolling this out and whether this could be incorporated into the curriculum, which a working group was currently considering.</p>
	<b>Changes to existing Policy - APAL</b>
LTSEC15.04.22	<p>There had been a number of drivers behind revising this existing policy, and a task and finish group had been established to look at how UWE could enhance APAL processes and to update the policy. A number of teams has been consulted (HER Planning Group, International Office, Academic Partnership and</p>

	Development Team and the Graduate School), which had suggested re-introducing Panels to ensure consistent and timely decisions were made, and to ensure differences between letters of recognition and credit recognition agreements were managed.
LTSEC15.04.23	The policy would need to clearly state that the Panel did not award credit, and systems and guidelines for recognising credit would also need to be consistent and robust. Panel members would also need clear training on expectations around mapping, and to clearly identify where and why learning could not be accredited. It would also be useful to cross reference different sections of the policy to the appropriate regulations. Students coming straight in at level 2 after being awarded experiential learning (AEL) would also need some form of induction/bridging into the University learning environment. AEL would be modelled to the negotiated learning plan process within the Shell Award Framework, and guidance to applicants would be based on this. However, further work would be needed to consider how an External Examiner would be involved i.e. through sampling. It would also need to be clear that an AEL Panel did confirm the outcome to an examination board. It was suggested that the processes for AL and AEL were so different that putting them together in the same policy could be confusing.
LTSEC15.04.24	The Equality Analysis was underway but had not yet been completed, and it was therefore agreed that the policy would be brought back to LTSEC in June to reconsider.  <b>Action: Head of the Student Administration Team</b>
	<b>DISCURSIVE ITEMS/TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION</b>
LTSEC15.04.25	<b>National Student Survey –</b>  <b>FET –</b> Within the Faculty a new appointment had been made to the role of NSS Champion, who had the responsibility of taking an overall strategic view considering the mix of disciplines and the wide range of entry points within the Faculty. Evidence had shown that this has had a huge impact as NSS response rates had increased to 73.5% for 2015. The champion had worked with different staff groups to help raise awareness, but with a strategic approach, and had held ‘tactics’ meetings considering where to go and how to engage with students. A number of promotional activities had also been organised: posters for both SES and NSS, engaging with the ‘you said/we did’ campaign and a wide scale use of email and donut stands after the first 2 weeks of initial briefings (and on occasion bringing senior managers onto the donut stand). There had been a substantial increase in programme leaders engaging with students regarding the SES and NSS. With regard to satisfaction rates from the 2014 NSS scores, the programmes with less than 70% satisfaction were identified and a rapid development plan was put in place. Activities were also organised to engage with the programmes i.e. there were 2 main meetings held between the Faculty Executive and

	<p>programme leaders which identified areas for development (for example Weston College students who did not feel like part of the University and therefore enhancement events were organised). The Faculty allocated resource and a budget to these developments, including funding field trips. The Faculty was extremely happy with the work of the champion, and the time resource which everyone had put into the NSS, although it had been felt that this would have been higher if the SES was not promoted at the same time of year.</p>
LTSEC15.04.26	<p><b>ACE</b> – A different approach had been put in place to FET, with a focus on identifying areas of student satisfaction which needed improvement. ‘Hard talk’ meetings had been organised with a 3 pronged outcome; what could be fixed now, what could be improved for the students before Christmas and what couldn’t be fixed before Christmas. In the Department of Education a 100% response rate to the survey had been received before it had been formally opened, and this had mainly been down to promotion to complete the survey before students went on placement. One area which needed further work next year would be more streamlined approaches to engagement and promotion with students, although weekly meetings had been helpful. The similar timeline of the SES and the NSS can be distracting for staff and students, although the importance of the SES was highlighted as this could affect students whilst on their study. One suggestion which had arisen from the weekly meetings had been a text message application which could ask one question at a time with each question being every few days.</p>
LTSEC15.04.27	<p><b>HAS</b> – The SES had been used instead of the ‘you said/we did’ campaign to identify themes and report back to students, although earlier embedding of this would be crucial. Activities such as cream teas, group photos, head massages etc. had been organised to encourage engagement with the NSS, with some working better than others. There were also some discipline focused events. There had been a trial on handing out learning pads to a group of students, and where students had not completed the survey they fed back that they wanted to wait for their assessment feedback first. There was also some consideration needed around the timing of placements and the promotion of the survey, which could be promoted earlier although a different approach would be more appropriate as some students were not on campus for the whole of the survey. One suggestion had been to map engagement to assessment hand in’s. There were some issues with regard to small cohorts not being included; students had been allocated to the incorrect full time/sandwich year cohorts and students which had been on a foundation year. This was an issue across the University, and a cleansing of the data to ensure it was correct was being considered.</p>
LTSEC15.04.28	<p><b>FBL</b> – The Faculty had approached NSS in a similar way to the rest of the University, however the main areas considered were where overall high satisfaction levels had been achieved and likewise areas with a low level of satisfaction. Some large</p>

	programmes had experienced low engagement, therefore briefings had been organised for assessment and feedback, and the 20 day turnaround time was monitored. The donut stand and other activities were organised, and an increase to 50% response rate from 40% had been achieved. There were some shorter term and longer term projects also considering NSS engagement.
LTSEC15.04.29	<p>The chair confirmed that the NSS remained a key priority of the university and as such had set up a task force. The task force would be drawing on best practice within the sector and initially would focus on poor performing programmes and programmes with excellent results – both to share good practice and to focus on issues. There was an issue raised about the data that was being used. It was suggested that AS with Business Planning would look into the issues raised to ensure that the data is as clean as possible before sending out to programme teams for checking.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Action: As with Business Planning, to look into the data issues and report back to LTSEC</b></p>
	<b>REPORTS/UPDATES FROM THE SUB-GROUPS OF AQEC</b>
LTSEC15.04.30	Minutes were received from Faculty ASQCs and other sub-groups and were available <a href="#">here</a> .
	<b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b>
	11 <sup>th</sup> May 2015

*LTSEC Minutes: R Smith*  
*Draft: 7 April 2015*  
*Unconfirmed: 13 April 2015*  
*Confirmed:*

**LTSEC Group Action Sheet from the meeting held on 01<sup>st</sup> April 2015**

<b>Minute</b>	<b>Substance</b>	<b>Actioning Officer</b>	<b>Reporting\other deadline</b>
LTSEC15.04.04	Further suggestions for discursive items/topics to be sent to the Chair and Officer	<b>Committee Members</b>	<b>By the June meeting</b>
LTSEC15.04.06	Feedback from the meeting due to take place on 10 <sup>th</sup> April would be received at the next LTSEC meeting.	<b>Plagiarism software working group</b>	<b>At the June meeting</b>
LTSEC15.04.07	To receive an update regarding communications when there were IT outages.	<b>Web Applications Manager</b>	<b>At the June meeting</b>
LTSEC15.04.08	Further consideration on how AB could discharge their responsibilities with regard to Award Board data to LTSEC to ensure actions fed into L+R 2020. Further suggestions could be sent to the Director of Academic Services.	<b>Director of AS and Committee Members</b>	<b>At the June meeting</b>
LTSEC15.04.10	The Committee agreed that a common principal based approach would be appropriate, and that this could feed into L+R 2020. Once the work within each Faculty had taken place this would be fed back at ASQCs.	<b>Faculty ASQCs</b>	<b>By September 2015</b>
LTSEC15.04.11	Conversations with ITS and the Business Process Board were ongoing with regard to the online marking environment, further updates would be brought to LTSEC.	<b>Director of AS</b>	<b>Ongoing</b>
LTSEC15.04.12	The External Examiner's annual report would be updated. A further pop up communication, noting the progress to date (what's new/different) and asking Scheme/Academic Directors (or equivalents) to forward this to module leaders, would also be useful.	<b>Officer</b>	<b>By the June meeting</b>
LTSEC15.04.14	To ensure feedback from LTSEC is fed into the ongoing work of the Academic Literacy Forum.	<b>Library representative</b>	<b>Ongoing</b>
LTSEC15.04.15	The considerations of the timeframe and process for the QMEF review to be brought back for consideration in autumn. The review would include end users, and would consider introducing an enhancement flavour.	<b>LTET</b>	<b>Autumn term of 2015/16</b>
LTSEC15.04.16	The date of the next EE conference would be confirmed at the next meeting of LTSEC.	<b>LTET</b>	<b>At the June meeting</b>
LTSEC15.04.18	The CMA proposal to be submitted to the Directorate and then reported to LTSEC. This would also need to feed into the review of the QMEF.	<b>Director of AS</b>	<b>Ongoing</b>

**CONFIRMED**

LTSEC15.04.24	The APAL policy would be brought back to LTSEC in June to reconsider, including the Equality Impact Assessment.	<b>Head of SAT</b>	<b>At the June meeting</b>
LTSEC15.04.29	To look into the data issues around the NSS and report back to LTSEC	<b>AS with Business Planning</b>	<b>At the June meeting</b>

**ACADEMIC QUALITY AND ENHANCEMENT GROUP – ACTION SHEET FROM THE MEETING HELD ON 10<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY 2015**

<b>Minute</b>	<b>Substance</b>	<b>Actioning Officer</b>	<b>Reporting\other deadline</b>
AQEC15.02.07	The Plagiarism Software Policy working group (made up of Kevin Lowman, Liz Falconer, Theresa Wood, Mandy Lee, Alastair Osborne, AQEC Student Reps, Faculty Assessment Officers and Delia Fairburn) to report back to AQEC on review of Policy.	Head of Learning and Teaching Enhancement	<b>Next Meeting</b>
AQEC15.02.14	Group (consisting of AQEC Student Reps, Jim Longhurst, Nick Wilton, Karen Lewis and Marie-Annick Gournet) to create a plan for the enhancement session and report back to AQEC.	<b>Working Group</b>	<b>Next Meeting</b>
AQEC15.02.21	To amend Graduate Attributes in line with comments.	<b>Director of Academic Services</b>	<b>Next Meeting</b>
AQEC15.02.26	Communicate the recommendation to Academic Board.	<b>Officer</b>	<b>Complete</b>
AQEC15.02.30	To raise issue of communication around IT outages with IT Services	<b>Web Applications Manager</b>	<b>Next Meeting</b>
AQEC15.02.31	To consider the issue of annual key performance indicators and present proposals to the next regular meeting	<b>Members</b>	<b>Next Meeting</b>

**ACADEMIC QUALITY AND ENHANCEMENT GROUP – ACTION SHEET FROM THE MEETING HELD ON 26<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2014**

<b>Minute</b>	<b>Substance</b>	<b>Actioning Officer</b>	<b>Reporting\other deadline</b>
AQEC14.11.09	QAA HE Review to be added as a standing agenda item.	Officer	Complete
AQEC14.11.14	Recommend to Academic Board that the Hartpury College variant regulations were accepted in principle.	Officer	Complete
AQEC14.11.16	Recommend to Academic Board approval of the Policy and Code of Good Research Conduct	Officer	Complete
AQEC14.11.18	To circulate Faculty specific outcomes	Curriculum Enhancement Manager	Complete
AQEC14.11.32	Issue around the plagiarism software adopted by the University and the lack	Officer	Complete

**CONFIRMED**

	of a policy on its use to be discussed at a future meeting of the Group with the DVC Academic.		
--	--	--	--