

ACADEMIC BOARD

Learning, Teaching and Student Experience Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 6th June 2016 at 2pm in The Dartington Suite, Wallscourt Farmhouse, Frenchay campus.

Present: Jane Harrington (chair), Jackie Chelin, Lauren Conen, Rachel Cowie, Jenny Dye, Mandy Lee, Elyshia Neal, Derek Norris, Sue Yilmaz, Gerry Rice, Jan Richardson, Jackie Rogers, Lucy Dumbell, Fiona Tolmie, Harry West, Neil Willey, Gail Wilson (officer)

Apologies: Lisa Harrison, Brooke Lewis, Karen Lewis, James Longhurst, Jo Midgley, Alastair Osborn, Rosie Scott-Ward, Teresa Wood

In attendance: Sarah Richards, Jane Storey (for LTSEC16.06.4.2), Emma Brown (for LTSEC16.06.4.3)

LTSEC16.06.1	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE
LTSEC16.01.1.1	Apologies for the meeting were recorded.
LTSEC16.06.2	MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING
LTSEC16.06.2.1	The minutes of the last meeting, which was held on the 30 th March 2016, were confirmed as an accurate record of the meeting, aside from a small discrepancy where Gerry Rice was recorded as attending when he had in fact sent apologies.
LTSEC16.06.3	MATTERS ARISING NOT OTHERWISE INCLUDED ON THE AGENDA
LTSEC16.06.3.1	Review of Management of Supervisor Absence and Supervision Record Keeping LTSEC16.03.9.3- the Chair gave an update; the group has met and has agreed to set up a workshop with supervisors to discuss expectations. Discussions around record keeping would be pulled into the APT review, as the two have clear synergies.
LTSEC16.06.3.2	Guidance on Evaluating and Recording Security Sensitive Research LTSEC16.03.10.3- the Chair spoke about the positive work completed through the Prevent workstream. The University has recently received an outcome letter from HEFCE confirming our Prevent action plan has been approved and no further action is required at this time. Very few have been approved so this was seen as a huge positive for the University.

LTSEC16.06.3.3	<p>Item from Faculty ASQCs LTSEC16.03.12.1- The Chair, Deputy Director of Academic Services and Curriculum Enhancement Manager agreed that a communication would be sent to all External Examiners who had raised a concern regarding the early release of marks within their 2014/15 annual report, confirming the rationale for the introduction and the continuation of this process, and clarifying the role of the external examiner within this. An update to the External Examiner's Operational Guide would also be published shortly. The Senior External Examiner Officer in LTET would take this forward.</p>
LTSEC16.06.4	<p>ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION</p>
LTSEC16.06.4.1	<p>Update on developments in the sector</p>
LTSEC16.06.4.1.1	<p>The Chair presented paper <i>LTSEC16.06.01</i> to LTSEC, which gave an overview of recent developments in the sector, including the HE White Paper, the TEF Technical Consultation, developments in Apprenticeships and the STEM Reviews. A few key points were highlighted; firstly the TEF is still subject to consultation so care needs to be taken not to assume too much, but it is happening and submissions for year 2 (2018/19 fees) will be made this autumn. For 2017/18 the University will be eligible for an uplift of 2.8% due to meeting the criteria of TEF year 1 (a positive QAA review and an approved Access Agreement).</p>
LTSEC16.06.4.1.2	<p>Secondly, TEF is very explicit about judging teaching excellence and around the use of metrics, which the University needs to respond to quickly. Developments to collect and analysis module evaluation data centrally are progressing with a decision about which system to use to be made shortly. Other advances around the collection of other data, such as attendance monitoring, are also in the pipeline. By year 3 (2019/20 fees) the TEF will pilot ratings at subject level. The message to faculty colleagues is that the sector is rapidly changing, and things will have to be done differently. However, there is a strong alignment to the 2020 Strategy and the work being done through the strategic programmes which places the University in a good place to respond. NSS will remain a key focus for colleagues as it constitutes a key metric in TEF.</p> <p>Disadvantaged students are also a key focus within the TEF consultation and there will be clear measures in place to stop universities "gaming" the TEF by changing their admissions policy or closing certain programmes.</p>
LTSEC16.06.4.1.3	<p>To help coordinate the University's response a TEF steering group has been set up, which will take a similar approach to the QAA preparations and meet fortnightly.</p> <p>It was reported that there is a wide degree of confusion amongst staff about the TEF, with staff presuming it would be similar to the REF, with a case study approach, and only certain staff included.</p> <p>ACTION: The chair and officer to develop a short briefing for staff and a set of FAQs to help raise awareness of how the TEF will</p>

	work and dispel any myths.
LTSEC16.06.4.1.4	With regards to the recent developments in Apprenticeships the University is in a strong position with apprenticeship frameworks in several subjects approved, or ready to be approved in the near future and John Lanham has been working closely with our local FE colleges. With the proposed changes in the HE Bill to Degree Awarding Powers (DAP) several FE colleges may be looking to build their capacity around HE delivery with an aim to apply for their own DAPs, which will lead to a change in their relationship with the University.
LTSEC16.06.4.1.5	The development and success of STEM subjects is a key priority in government policy, which led to the two recent reviews into STEM. Jackie Rogers reported that UWE staff were involved in both reviews and as such there are no surprises in the final reports, which highlight areas such as students accessing placements and accreditation of courses, which are already priorities for the faculty. In addition the Wakeham review also focused on the need for graduates to have “business ready skills” and the role of universities in developing curricula to support this development.
LTSEC16.06.4.2	Review of the Fitness to Study paper
LTSEC16.06.4.2.1	Jane Storey presented paper <i>LTSEC16.06.02</i> and spoke through the proposed changes to the policy which was due for review. The Fitness to Study policy generally works well, although the cases are very complex and time-consuming, the numbers are relatively low (around 20-30 currently) and so can be managed appropriately. The updated Fitness to Study policy was approved.
LTSEC16.06.4.2.2	Jane Storey then presented paper <i>LTSEC16.06.03</i> which updated LTSEC on various related Fitness to Study issues. The key area was around the introduction of a half-day training workshop for academic staff around student vulnerability. These would be based on a workshop format, learning from case-studies for groups of around 30, rather than larger staff briefing style events. This idea had support from faculty colleagues who reported that staff often lack confidence in this area, however there concerns about staff availability and whether the training could be made available online. Jane Storey replied that it was feel that it is the discussions between staff that add value to the training but they could explore a package of training with supplementary online information. ACTION: Associate Deans to work with Jane Storey to develop the training and identify the best staff to participate in the workshops.
LTSEC16.06.4.2.3	The Students’ Union welcomed the plan to pilot the use of the Fitness to Study policy at level 1 in Accommodation Services as they see many students from this area in the Advice Centre.
LTSEC16.06.4.2.4	Colleagues from Hartpury College reported they already run staff training, particularly around Safeguarding, but there had recently been

	<p>more of a focus on over 18 students and they were interested in linking up with the University to share good practice.</p> <p>ACTION: Jane Storey and Lucy Dumbell to further discuss staff training in this area.</p>
LTSEC16.06.4.3	Student Feedback Overview 2015/16
LTSEC16.06.4.3.1	<p>Emma Brown introduced paper <i>LTSEC16.06.04</i> and spoke through the ongoing activity. In addition, a new set of student representative principles is due to come to LTSEC in July. Module evaluation data is seen as a key priority, firstly the deployment rate needs to be 100%, either through faculties monitoring real time data or by all module surveys being turned on automatically.</p> <p>Secondly, surveys need to engage students in order to increase completion rates. Hartpury College reported that they have returned to paper based module evaluations and reduced the overall number of surveys to try and increase the quality of feedback. Staff also need to give students time and space to fill in surveys (whether paper or online based) and there was a suggestion this should be linked to a session that students value, such as one around revision or assessment.</p>
LTSEC16.06.4.3.2	<p>The timing of module evaluation surveys was seen as crucial. Module leaders want student opinion of assessment and feedback but as the biggest piece of assessment often comes at the end of the module this can cause difficulties for modules with spring assessments. Students often report a lack of perceived value around giving feedback as they don't see any outcome until after they have progressed. FET have introduced a more informal approach which takes place in teaching week 6 in semester 1, this allows changes to be made mid-module or clear feedback to be given to students in good time about why something can't be changed. This approach was endorsed by the student representative from FET who reported it worked well.</p>
LTSEC16.06.4.3.3	<p>There was a suggestion that although a common approach is required, programme leaders should have some flexibility about how surveys are deployed to best engage students.</p> <p>The review of the QMEF will look at a risk-based approach to programme monitoring and review and how staff can best respond to data when it is available.</p> <p>Used correctly, module evaluation can help to engage students in curriculum development and any future system needs to balance the ability to collect quantitative data which feeds into University level metrics and qualitative comments that the module leader can use to constructively engage with students.</p>
LTSEC16.06.4.4	Review of the Assessment Cycle Policy
LTSEC16.06.4.4.1	Fiona Tolmie presented an updated version of the Assessment Cycle

	<p>policy and Implementation Plan (<i>LTSEC16.06.05</i>), which had recently been discussed at ASQCs. It was agreed that the policy needs to feed into the Feedback and Assessment 2020 programme.</p> <p>The updated policy was approved.</p>
LTSEC16.06.4.5	Developments to the Quality Management and Enhancement Framework (QMEF) for introduction in September 2016
LTSEC16.06.4.5.1	<p>Sue Yilmaz presented paper <i>LTSEC16.06.06</i> which presented an overview of some minor changes to the QMEF. There was a query raised around the assessment map, which currently resides in the programme specification, and how this would be combined with the assessment calendar and kept up to date. The assessment map was felt to be a useful tool to programme teams, however the manual intervention to keep them up to date is significant. It was agreed to raise this issue as part of the QMEF Review and the management of programme information.</p> <p>The changes to the QMEF were approved.</p>
LTSEC16.06.4.6	Policy and Strategy for PGR Contribution to Teaching at UWE
LTSEC16.06.4.6.1	<p>Neil Willey presented the updated policy (<i>LTSEC16.06.07</i>) which has been revised and clarified in light of the recommendation from the 2015 QAA Review. As part of the related discussions it has been agreed that faculties will pay for those students eligible to undertake the PG Cert. The committee felt that the revisions were positive and would lead to better recognition of the role that PGRs play in contributing to teaching and allow for better monitoring of the opportunities being made available to students.</p> <p>The policy was approved.</p>
LTSEC16.06.4.7	Hartpury College Quality and Enhancement Framework
LTSEC16.06.4.7.1	<p>Lucy Dumbell presented the new HQEF and Hartpury committee structure (<i>LTSEC16.06.08</i>). The revised committee structure closely echoes the faculty structure, with the addition of Hartpury College meetings where required, and the revised approach has removed around 40 meetings a year for staff. There was interest in the scholarship metric Hartpury have been using, which reports a score based on a number of metrics and is used at a departmental and College level.</p> <p>ACTION: Officer to liaise with Chris Potter about the metric and share with committee members.</p> <p>The committee endorsed the new HQEF and committee structure to Academic Board and approved the variant templates.</p>

LTSEC16.06.4.8	Outcomes of the Academic Personal Tutoring (APT) Working Group
LTSEC16.06.4.8.1	The report from the APT Working Group (<i>LTSEC16.06.10</i>) was presented by Fiona Tolmie as a representative of the group. The group has met four times to consider the APT report produced last year in partnership by the University and Students' Union. There is a huge variety of practice within the University and no single model of APT can accommodate the range of provision and meet student's needs. Therefore the group had concentrated on drafting a set of standards for APT at UWE that faculties could then monitor against.
LTSEC16.06.4.8.2	There was some concern around the resourcing implications of the new standards, particularly around modelling the impact of 1-1 sessions and extending to PGT students. These issues have been discussed by the APT Working Group but have not been resolved. The committee felt that it could not approve the standards without the resourcing being modelled and fully costed. ACTION: The Chair and Fiona Tolmie to discuss the resourcing issues raised by the new APT standards.
LTSEC16.06.4.8.3	There was a feeling from some members of the APT Working Group that not all the feedback from colleagues had been incorporated into the final wording and the standards still required some further work before they were complete. Although LTSEC agreed broadly with the standards presented it was decided that the paper needed further work and should come to the July LTSEC. ACTION: Fiona Tolmie to work further on the paper and ensure all working group members are happy with the final wording.
LTSEC16.06.5	Items from Faculty ASQCs requiring action by LTSEC
LTSEC16.06.5.1	FBL- car parking issues for PGT PT students. ACTION: Fiona Tolmie to investigate further on which course the students are on and why exactly they are having issues.
LTSEC16.06.6	ANY OTHER BUSINESS
LTSEC16.06.6.1	This LTSEC was the last meeting of the VP Education, Lauren Conen. The Chair thanked for her contribution over the last year to various committees and work-streams where she had made a real impact.
LTSEC16.06.7	DATE OF NEXT MEETING 5 th July 2016

Confirmed