University of the
West of England
BRISTOL

ACADEMIC BOARD

Learning Teaching and the Student Experience Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 09 February 2016 at 2pm in The Dartington Suite, Wallscourt Farmhouse, Frenchay Campus

Present:	Jane Harrington (Chair), Gaynor Attwood, Jackie Chelin, John Clarke, Lauren Conen, Lisa Harrison, Mandy Lee, James Longhurst, Sarah Mackie, Stuart Marshall, Jo Midgley, Elyshia Neal, Derek Norris, Alastair Osborn, Jan Richardson, Jackie Rogers, Gerry Rice, Fiona Tolmie, Harry West, Neil Willey, Teresa Wood
Apologies:	Jenny Dye, Brooke Lewis, Karen Lewis, Rosie Scott-Ward, Karen West
In Attendance:	Rebecca Smith (Officer), Delia Bean, Emma Brown (for LTSEC16.02.3.1-4),Tod Burton (for LTSEC16.02.4.2-3), Vicki Campbell (for LTSEC16.02.10) Helen Clark (for LTSEC16.02.6), Christopher Potter, Peter Rawlings (for LTSEC16.02.4.1), Efthimios Malliris (for LTSEC16.02.8), Alyssa Willis (for LTSEC16.02.3.4), Gail Wilson (for LTSEC16.02.5), Susan Yilmaz (for LTSEC16.02.7)

LTSEC16.02.1   **MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

LTSEC16.02.1.1   *Paper LTSEC 15.11.M was received.*
The minutes of the LTSEC meeting held on 25 November 2015 were confirmed to be an accurate record of the meeting.

LTSEC16.02.2   **MATTERS ARISING**

LTSEC16.02.2.1   **IT Outage (minute LTSEC15.7.2.1 refers)**
The Web Applications Manager confirmed that maintenance weekends had been decreased from 6 to 2 per year, and enhanced communications would continue to be developed to ensure planned outages were communicated appropriately. All dates were pre-planned with Academic Services to ensure they didn't happen during key teaching dates; however it was noted that instances of weekend teaching would also require inclusion. Procedures were in place for unplanned IT outages which took place at particular parts of the day.

LTSEC16.02.2.2   **Assessment Offences policy/development of online matching software (minute LTSEC15.11.3.2 refers)**
The Deputy Head of Academic Services confirmed that the outcomes from the recent QAA Higher Education Review recommended the continued roll out SafeAssign within the online marking tool, and for all online assessments to be submitted through this as a default. A pilot had been initiated within the spring term with modules from across the University

being selected for trial. Following the pilot a review would be undertaken prior to full roll out, planned from September 2016. There would also be an opportunity for students to use this as a formative feedback tool through a module in BlackBoard which would facilitate uploading any piece of work to test.

LTSEC16.02.2.3   The committee discussed the following:
  i.   Roll out at partner institutions – the tool could be rolled out for partners which used the online submission and marking tool, however further investigation regarding different partners and submission techniques would be required. This would take place once the initial pilot and review of existing guidance and how this could be interpreted had taken place to ensure this was appropriate;
  ii. Work not submitted online – a small group would be convened, including representation from the SU, to consider further the governance of online submission and SafeAssign.

The committee agreed that the above group would be convened and outcomes reported to LTSEC.

Action: Chair and Officer

LTSEC16.02.2.4   **Programme Assessment Calendar (minute LTSEC15.11.9 refers)**
The Committee noted that a meeting with representation from each Faculty and each Quality Account Manager, had taken place to discuss the potential issues for the ongoing monitoring of a programme assessment calendar once it had been developed during curriculum design. It was agreed that the calendar could roll over on a yearly basis unless changes were proposed. It was recognised however that it would be difficult for the University to devise a process for considering these changes. Representatives had discussed developing a set of university principles which would encourage a programme view of assessment timings, with each Faculty ASQC to agree who would take responsibility in considering changes and subsequently providing the information to Academic Services. This would help identify how much change occurred on an annual basis, and whether this was appropriate.

LTSEC16.02.2.5   The following was discussed and agreed –
  i.   Although Programme Leaders were already extremely busy, it was agreed that they need to have oversight of assessment types and timings at a programme level;
  ii. Different types of marking and instances of shared modules would need to be taken into consideration by ASQCs when discussing how this could be managed;
  iii. An additional question within a programme report could help capture programme leaders awareness of assessment dates, how these had changed over previous years and whether any changes were to be proposed.

The Committee agreed that a discussion paper would be submitted to ASQCs for further consideration.

Action: Associate Dean Learning and Teaching in FBL and Officer

LTSEC16.02.2.6 **Exam Length Policy (minute LTSEC15.11.16.2 refers)**
The Deputy Head of LTET confirmed that the policy was to be reviewed as part of the work in incorporating CETTS into Academic Services, with the aim of ensuring it was led by academic business rather than being driven by process.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

LTSEC16.02.3 **Student Voice and Student Engagement**

LTSEC16.02.3.1 **NSS Taskforce**
Paper LTSEC16.02.01 was received.
The Student-led Enhancement Manager advised that the taskforce had met with colleagues from across the University within September and October 2015. The paper summarised -
  i. Areas of best practice and case studies which had been identified from meetings with programme teams which had scored 90% or over in the NSS. It was noted that there had been many more areas of good practice identified, particularly from practice orientated programmes and research led teaching;
  ii. A set of practical tips had been developed from the above;
  iii. Rapid improvement action plans developed from meetings with programme teams which scored 75% or less had also been grouped under high level themes which linked to the NSS. These had worked well with many areas of change being highlighted;
  iv. A best practice event had been held in January to share the outcomes of the task force;
  v. Pending outcomes from the 2016 NSS survey, the main themes would be progressed.
The student representatives agreed that it was positive to see a set of goals which were being taken forward.

LTSEC16.02.3.2 **Plans for the Undergraduate (UG) and Postgraduate Taught Experience (PTES) surveys**
Paper LTSEC16.02.02 was received.
Members received an update on the development of other student experience surveys within the institution, including the redevelopment of the Student Experience Survey (SES) into a programme focused UG survey, a third of the size of the SES and which mirrored forthcoming changes to the NSS. The SES survey had previously captured PG students, however for 2015/16 UWE had opted into the national PTES.

LTSEC16.02.3.3 During discussion, members noted the following -
  i. TEF – although this still remained a green paper, it was very apparent that outcomes of NSS would play a key role and that a postgraduate equivalent may also become a requirement;
  ii. PGR – initial thoughts confirmed that PTES would be useful. The only concern was the length of the survey, however, having opted in we would now be able to provide feedback on this;
  iii. Target response rate – it would be useful to identify a reasonable response rate to encourage and feed into the outcomes from the

survey, for example last year the aim had been to receive 50% responses by the published date (the same aim as the NSS);

    iv.   Learning days – student representatives agreed that targeting students during learning days had helped encourage responses;

    v.   Timings – this would be key to maximise the impact so that students were able to provide useful feedback to impact on their studies, for example on transition and support when arriving at UWE and progressing through each level of study. This had been a key aim of the working group, and LTSEC specifically requested further feedback on this for the next meeting.

Action: Student voice working group

LTSEC16.02.3.4   Student Communications

The Committee received a verbal update on recent communications to students regarding parking. The following was noted –

    i.   There had been a communications strategy for closing car park 20; however advice to students had been to continue parking there during exam times. Positive aspects of the change were emphasised, including advising that the site had not been well kept and that new spaces would all be on the main campus;

    ii.   The strategy had been successful, with a low number of queries through info point and Twitter;

    iii.   It was felt that students had understood the reasons for this change; however the SU had received some queries through student representatives, highlighting the challenges of encouraging engagement with communications.

LTSEC16.02.4   Learning 2020

LTSEC16.02.4.1   Feedback and Assessment

The Associate Dean for Research in the Faculty of Arts, Creative Industries and Education attended and provided a verbal update to the Committee. Work had begun with academic colleagues to increase understanding of the key principles of feedback and assessment for learning. Two workshops had been held, and the following 6 strands and deliverables had been identified as priority areas –

    i.   Improving staff assessment literacy – building on areas of good practice already identified;

    ii.   Encouraging a culture of continuous feedback;

    iii.   Programmatic assessment – a number of initiatives had been identified for further discussion and for piloting to encourage programme coherence –

        a.   Clearer programme assessment at level 1

        b.   Synoptic assessment, for example assessment free modules

    iv.   Improving feedback literacy – working with students to ensure feedback was co-created, capitalising on peer assessment and student reflection, and building this into assessment;

    v.   Anonymous marking – review of its purpose and different models and approaches. There would be further consultation with the SU and a working group would be put together to move this forward;

    vi.   Online marking process – a review of compliance (in consultation with ITS) and the challenges in the system.

Further workshops would be held with consideration given to adapting some of the modules within the PGCert Teaching and Learning in Higher Education to ensure co-ordinated and timely staff development.

LTSEC16.02.4.2   **Lecture Capture**
The Associate Dean (Resources) within the Faculty of Environment and Technology provided a verbal update to the Committee on recent developments. The recommendation to develop Panopto as the one provider of lecture capture (paper LTSEC15.11.11) had been subsumed within the Learning Environments project, which had been divided into two work streams; the physical environment and the digital environment. A number of projects had been initiated under the digital environment work stream –
     i.   Virtual Learning Environment – consideration of the reconfiguration of BlackBoard to allow a programme view;
     ii.   Online marking tool;
     iii.   Introduction of mobile technologies – for example tablets (there were a number of pilots in place which would be pulled together and reviewed).

LTSEC16.02.4.3   Further information on the implementation timelines for the proposed roll out of Panopto was provided and members noted that –
     iv.   The project leads had met with ITS and the Central AV Team to discuss different aspects of lecture capture, for example camera types and peripheral aspects within a classroom, to ensure there would be a standard approach;
     v.   The standard mechanism for costing would be a licence for uploading and downloading. 3 standard specifications had been provided to get quotations, however a benchmark for typical costings would be needed to allow comparisons;
     vi.   Other aspects other than technological would be considered, for example staff development and further encouragement to engage with lecture capture (highlighting best practice and how this could change pedagogy). Potential regulatory implications would also need further consideration, and how this could be monitored to identify any risk;
     vii.   Further exploration on how technologies could be used to support collaborative working.
LTSEC welcomed the update, and requested some further information on the roll out of staff training at the next meeting.
Action: Associate Dean Resources FET to report to the Learning Environment 2020 Project

LTSEC16.02.4.4   **Teaching Expectations and UKPSF Accreditation**
The Chair provided a verbal update, confirming that –
     i.   Minimum Teaching Expectations had been agreed and distributed;
     ii.   Aspirational Teaching Expectations were currently in development;
     iii.   The reward and recognition scheme would also be considered, for example whether all academic staff should have teaching qualifications and become a member of the Higher Education Academy (HEA).

LTSEC16.02.4.5   **Grade Point Average**
The Chair noted that the HEA had asked all Institutions to confirm whether they planned to roll out the use of Grade Point Average. Having taken part in a recent pilot to model the impact of the introduction of GPA, UWE would be in a strong positon to implement GDP if subsequently required and once a sector standard had been developed. The requirement to support GPA

would be part of the specification for the new student record system to ensure it could be supported if required.

LTSEC16.02.4.6 **Open Door Teams**
The Pro Vice Chancellor Student Experience provided a verbal update, confirming that the first open door team within Q Block had been working well. Initial feedback from students and staff was positive, and further investigations into a second team opening in the City Campus and a virtual team were ongoing.

LTSEC16.02.5 **QAA Higher Education Review Report**

LTSEC16.02.5.1 *Paper LTSEC16.02.03 was received by the Committee.*
The Committee noted the main findings summarised within the report, confirming University met all expectations of the UK Quality Code. In contrast to other providers the University had received only one recommendation (see below). An action plan would be approved by Academic Board and published at the end of March 2016 the plan would capture the University's next steps in relation to the good practice, affirmations and recommendation. The Chair congratulated members on the excellent outcome and reiterated thanks to the staff and students who had taken part in the review and associated preparation.

LTSEC16.02.5.2 **Training for Postgraduate Research (PGR) Students delivering sessions to students.**
Paper LTSEC16.02.04 was received.
The single recommendation received by the University by the QAA focused on the training of PGR students involved in teaching. The University has only a small number of PGR students each year involved in teaching in some way and currently has a policy of a "sliding scale" of training based on their level of involvement in teaching. During review it became clear that this policy was not as well understood as it could be by students. As part of the action plan being complied in response to the QAA the Graduate School were looking how to best address the recommendation and ensure PGR students feel supported in teaching activities.

LTSEC16.02.5.3 The Committee discussed the following –
   i.   Whether existing workshops which were in place and currently run with support from the Learning Development Centre concurrently with students teaching could be incorporated, or mapped against the PGCert Teaching and Learning in HE. This would now need to be front ended to take place before students took part in any teaching;
   ii.   Action plan would note the finalised proposal;
   iii.   The language would need to be reviewed to ensure it was appropriate for PGR students;
   iv.   The proposal would also need to be updated to reflect the PGCert Teaching and Learning in HE rather than the mini ADP.

LTSEC16.02.5.4 The Committee broadly agreed with the proposal, with the revisions and further work to be taken forward prior to sign off by Academic Board.
Action: UWE Graduate School

LTSEC16.02.6 **External Examiners**

LTSEC16.02.6.1 **Annual Thematic Review of External Examiners Annual Reports within**

2014/15
Paper LTSEC16.02.05 was received by the Committee.
The Committee Officer and the Senior External Examiners Officer provided the following introduction –

   i.   The report summarised key themes of good practice and areas of enhancement for the University, including outcomes from qualitative and quantitative data as extracted from External Examiner annual reports;

   ii.   A summary for each Faculty had also been included, along with an update on actions from the 2013/14 report;

   iii.   Overall External Examiners had agreed that academic and professional standards (linking to PSRBs) were comparable to the sector, with many areas of innovative practice identified around assessment strategies and preparation for employment;

   iv.   A summary of main recommendations for the University included lower average scores at some academic partners, consistency of feedback and moderation, opportunities to meet with students, making full use of the marking scheme and academic literacy skills for both home and international students (including direct entrants and students studying at an academic partner).

LTSEC16.02.6.2   Members further discussed –

   i.   The mention within the Hartpury College summary report that standards were generally lower at Weston College – it was felt this was not entirely accurate and further investigation into the External Examiner reports would take place;

   ii.   Whether more quantified numbers to show the level of External Examiners which had commented on a particular theme could be added to reflect whether some areas may be more of a priority than others. However it was also agreed that it was not always as simple as identifying whether a certain number of External Examiners commented on an area before it became a priority;

   iii.   The usefulness of the Faculty summary report for ASQCs - most of these issues were identified through Departmental scrutiny as part of the annual monitoring process. It was therefore agreed that the Faculty level summary would not be included within the 2015/16 report.

LTSEC16.02.6.3   The Committee agreed with the recommendations and owners as noted within the report, and noted that an agenda item had been put on the next meeting of the Collaborative Provision Committee to explore the reason for slightly lower average scores for the University's partnerships.
         Action: Committee Officer (Curriculum Enhancement Manager) and Senior External Examiners Officer
         Action: Update from CPC at the next LTSEC meeting

LTSEC16.02.6.4   **Chief External Examiners (minute LTSEC15.11.7 refers)**
The Committee received a verbal update confirming that the Curriculum Enhancement Manager and Senior External Examiners Officer had met with Associate Deans Teaching and Learning in each Faculty to discuss the proposal, as agreed at the last LTSEC meeting, to discuss a more coherent split of Chief External Examiners –

   i.   Initial discussions identified that this could be at Departmental level, which would provide them with more capacity to undertake the role and more subject/cluster level knowledge;

ii. Further meetings with the Student Administration Team were to be held to discuss whether this would have any implications on the structure and administration of Award Boards;

iii. A further update would be provided at the next meeting of LTSEC.

Action: Committee Officer (Curriculum Enhancement Manager) and Senior External Examiners Officer

LTSEC16.02.6.5 **External Examiner access on BlackBoard (minute LTSEC15.11.16.1 refers)**

The Web Applications Manager confirmed that the External Examiner access was currently being tested to identify any system security issues, once this had been finalised and authenticated it would be ready for deployment at the end of February 2016.

LTSEC16.02.7 **Consumer Markets Authority**

LTSEC16.02.7.1 The Deputy Head of the Learning and Teaching Enhancement Team attended to provide a verbal update to the Committee. The following work streams had been identified for further development –

i. Future students – application and enquiry/offer stages:
   a. work on the defined material provided to home and EU students at application stage had been completed;
   b. further work on additional costs was being progressed;
   c. information provided at offer stage had also been completed, but until a test case had been reviewed it would be difficult to know whether this met the requirements of the CMA;
   d. the 2017 prospectus had been reviewed to ensure it would be CMA compliant, and further work reviewing information for PG and part time students would be conducted;
   e. a review of the information provided to international students, direct entrants and students studying at collaborative partners during the offer stage was also being progressed;
   f. further work was also to be progressed regarding registration and returning students, as currently it was difficult to separate out separate information for the different groups of students;
   g. terms and conditions would be reviewed to provide more context on the above areas.

ii. Material Information –
   a. it had been determined that material information covered everything which was available to students on the courses database, which included a general overview of assessment methods but not detailed information on exact assessments per module; to enable changes to this information, student consultation would be required. Further discussions were taking place to determine the level of student agreement required to enable a change to take place, including reviewing the requirements which other HEIs were putting into place (although current legal advice indicated a 100% agreement may be required). However the number of changes that would fall into this category were likely to be minor and there would be other ways to manage such changes so as not to impact on students
   b. if a change was being driven by an external body, for example a PSRB, then this would not require student

consultation, however students would need to be informed of the change;

    c. further consultation with the SU regarding the material information and changes within this, for example to programme titles and information on core modules, would take place.

    iii. Curriculum Development;
    iv. Partnerships;
    v. Communications Strategy;
    vi. Technical issues – for example archiving;

LTSEC16.02.7.2 The Committee welcomed the update, and agreed that it would be difficult to obtain 100% agreement from the student cohort to enable future change; further deliberations would consider whether no response could be classified as agreement.

LTSEC16.02.8 **PAL Report**

LTSEC16.02.8.1 *Paper LTSEC16.02.07 was received.*
The Director of Peer Learning attended and provided a brief overview of the report –
    i. Over 12000 students per year were trained to be peer leaders, showing how PAL had expanded across the sector;
    ii. There had been a lot of work on online interactions with students;
    iii. Incentivised statistics had been developed which helped consistency with comparing PAL worldwide;
    iv. Challenges had been identified in the areas of –
        a. improving participation and support prior to Higher Education, for example at schools;
        b. awareness and understanding of academic staff to help encourage participation;
        c. obtaining accurate attendance data at the right time.
    v. Interactions with PG students had helped initial understanding of how PAL might work at a post graduate level, including online support;
    vi. There had been a lot of work at City Campus, with a peer learning scheme being designed.

LTSEC16.02.9 **Graduate Destination Report**

LTSEC16.02.9.1 *Paper LTSEC16.02.08 was received.*
The Director of Student Services presented the paper, which had previously been discussed at the Employability and Enterprise Management Group. The paper aimed to look forward towards meeting the aims of the 2020 strategy; to be within the top 30 University's for employability. UWE performed well in this area, however further work in accelerating improvement would be required to meet this ambitious aim, mainly in the areas of resource, support and embedding employability further within the curriculum.

LTSEC16.02.9.2 The Committee welcomed the report, and discussed the timing of pulling graduates into post graduate courses further, agreeing that UWE could improve its performance in continuous study by enhancing this area. DE Montfort University had introduced an incentivised scheme with lower fees/discounts, resulting in a big difference in DHLE results. The Committee

discussed and noted that -
    i.   A group had been put into place to consider this area further, which included international students and collaborative partners;
   ii.   There would be a limit for some programmes due to capacity, but a smaller scale initiative was to be considered from September 2016 with a wider review to be considered for further roll out and review, linking to further changes to post graduate funding and loans.

LTSEC16.02.10   **Alternatives to Notetaking**

LTSEC16.02.10.1   *Paper number LTSEC16.02.09 was received by the Committee.*
The proposal had been drafted in response to discussions during task and finish group meetings, which had included representation from academic staff and students. The report covered –
    i.   The removal of key funding for note takers, which presented an opportunity to consider alternative methods of support;
   ii.   The existing support for note takers would not be removed until an alternative method had been agreed and put into place
  iii.   Key recommendations:
       ○ Lecture capture that complements pedagogy and is supported through staff development and IT infrastructure
       ○ Support and development for Peer Note Banks;
       ○ A great emphasis for investment in study skills to help reduce the need for individual adjustments; specifically investment in the Assistive Technology Service
       ○ Clear criteria and timeline in respect of course materials that should be provided in advance of lectures
Feedback from ASQCs had fed into the development of these recommendations, which had been endorsed by the SU.

LTSEC16.02.10.2   The Committee welcomed the report, and discussed the following –
    i.   Other forms of audio technology would need to be investigated as lecture capture would not cover all types of teaching, for example seminars;
   ii.   Further work would also be needed to identify how this could be rolled out to partners - this would feed into the work being undertaking within the learning environments project;
  iii.   In response to the recommendation for the Professional Expectation Framework (number 25), a suitable lead in time to enable materials to be produced in advance for alternative formats would be needed.

LTSEC16.02.10.3   The Committee welcomed the proposals and agreed that a good range of solutions had been considered and proposed. The Chair confirmed that the Head of Disability Services (or nominee) should be included within the membership of the Learning Environments project, that the other proposals should be shared with relevant University projects/teams, that the framework would be circulated to the wider University, and that a pilot could be set up to support the development of Peer Note Banks.
> **Action: Lead for the Learning Environments 2020 project to ensure Head of Disability Services included in representation regarding Lecture Capture;**
> **Action: Officer to circulate Professional Expectations framework;**
> **Action: Head of Disability Services**

LTSEC16.02.11   **Code of Good Research Conduct**

LTSEC16.02.11.1   The Associate Dean Learning and Teaching from the Faculty of Arts, Creative Industries and Education provided a verbal update, advising that a module level audit had been conducted to review that there was explicit reference to various policies, practice and guidelines where research fed into taught curriculum.

LTSEC16.02.12   **Development of Hartpury Quality Enhancement Framework (HQEF)**

LTSEC16.02.12.1   *The Committee received paper LTSEC16.02.10.*
The proposal highlighted Hartpury College's intended journey to gaining degree awarding powers, including the proposed timeline for the development of a Hartpury Quality Enhancement Framework. This would closely align to the University's Quality Management and Enhancement Framework, with some specific changes to align to the college.

LTSEC16.02.12.2   The development of the Framework was endorsed by the Committee.

LTSEC16.02.13   **PREVENT**

LTSEC16.02.13.1   *The proposed changes to the existing report were received within paper LTSEC16.02.12.*
An update on the University's response to the new counter terrorism act, which now put responsibility on HEIs to prevent individuals from being drawn into terrorism, included -
   i.   Confirmation that a group had been put in place to pull together a response from UWE, which included compliance and roll out;
   ii.   A plan to update existing policies such as Safeguarding and Freedom of Speech;
   iii.   3 high risk areas had been identified around the lack of policy framework for external speakers and events, the identification and referral of individuals who may be deemed vulnerable to radicalisation and arrangements at partner institutions;
   iv.   Student representatives had been consulted and the Board of Governors would be briefed, with a paper being submitted to the next meeting of Academic Board.

LTSEC16.02.13.2   The following discussion took place –
   i.   The Students Union had expressed a concern that students could be wrongfully singled out, and therefore expressed the importance of having explicit policy and training in place to prevent this, to ensure safeguarding and not stigmatisation;
   ii.   The University had a legal obligation to comply with the act, and the Committee agreed this had been progressed in a sensitive manner. that comprehensive training had been planned, that the Governors had been briefed accordingly and consultation taking place between student groups and through the Academic Personal Tutoring Scheme;
   iii.   The SU agreed that UWE feedback had been positive in that UWE had been extremely supportive at representing minority groups.

LTSEC16.02.14   **Safeguarding Policy**

LTSEC16.02.14.1   *Paper LTSEC16.02.13 was received by the Committee.*
The Safeguarding Policy, which had been developed within 2013, had been

revised to include aspects of PREVENT and also reflected the following changes –

    i.   The implementation of the policy had been reviewed, and it was deemed that the role of Deputy Safeguarding Officers had not worked well and therefore had been removed with links incorporated to other management areas;

    ii.   The separate policies for staff and students had been pulled together to reflect the same principles with different procedures underpinning this.

LTSEC16.02.14.2   The Committee welcomed the changes, and agreed the following –

    i.   The Students Union had been extremely positive about the changes, confirming that the new flow chart was helpful and that it pulled together a lot of different aspects which had previously existed in different areas;

    ii.   There would be a big piece of work across the University on raising awareness to cover Safeguarding and PREVENT;

    iii.   There would need to be a revision to the wording within the introduction to student and staff on risk assessments to ensure the risks were the same for individuals who may be at risk and the reporting person who may be the alleged abuser.

LTSEC16.02.14.3   The Committee agreed that the changes to the existing policy could be approved.

LTSEC16.02.15   **REPORTS/UPDATES FROM THE SUB-GROUPS OF LTSEC**

LTSEC16.02.15.1   Minutes were received from Faculty ASQCs and other sub-groups and were available [here](#).

LTSEC16.02.16   DATE OF NEXT MEETING

LTSEC16.02.16.1   30th March 2016.

LTSEC Minutes: R Smith
Draft: 22 February 2016
Unconfirmed: 08 March 2016
Confirmed: 04 April 2016

LTSEC Group Action Sheet from the meeting held on 09th February 2016

Minute	Substance	Actioning Officer	Reporting\other deadline
LTSEC16.02.2.3	Convene a working group (including SU) to consider further the governance of online submission and SafeAssign.	**Chair and Officer**	**Complete**
LTSEC16.02.2.5	Submit a discussion paper for ASQC on whether they could agree who would take responsibility for changes to the programme assessment calendar, and whether an additional question in the annual programme report would be useful.	**AD T+L in FBL and Officer**	**For March round of ASQCs and to feed into review of assessment cycle policy (coming to LTSEC in June 2016)**
LTSEC16.02.3.3	To report to LTSEC on the timings of the new UG and PTES surveys to maximise the impact so that students were able to provide useful feedback to impact on their studies	**Student Voice Working Group**	**At the next meeting**
LTSEC16.02.4.3	To report to LTSEC on the roll out of staff training planned within the Learning Environments project 2020.	**Associate Dean Resources FET for the Learning Environment project**	**At the next meeting**
LTSEC16.02.5.4	To revise the proposal for the training of PGR students based on discussions at LTSEC, and submit to Academic Board for approval.	**UWE Graduate School**	**For the next meeting of Academic Board**
LTSEC16.02.6.3	(i)To take forward the actions arising in the EE Thematic Review paper, and (ii) to request an update from CPC for the next LTSEC meeting.	**Curriculum Enhancement Manager (Committee Officer) and Senior EE Officer**	**(i)By the end of the academic year (ii)Report from CPC at the next meeting**
LTSEC16.02.6.4	To report to LTSEC on discussions with Associate Deans and SAT regarding the proposal to have Departmental Chief EE's and the running of the Award Boards.	**Curriculum Enhancement Manager (Committee Officer) and Senior EE Officer**	**At the next meeting**
LTSEC16.02.10.3	(i)To ensure the Head of Disability Services is included in the membership of the Learning Environments project 2020 around Lecture Capture, (ii)To circulate the Professional Expectations Framework, and (iii)To take forward the recommendations within the proposal for alternatives to notetaking.	**(i)Associate Dean Resources FET for the Learning Environment project (ii)Committee Officer (iii)Head of Disability Services**	**(i)and(ii) By the next meeting (iii)complying with timelines stated within the report**

LTSEC Group Action Sheet from the meeting held on 25ᵗʰ November 2015

Minute	Substance	Actioning Officer	Reporting\other deadline
LTSEC15.11.3.3	The Committee agreed that the pilot should include a department from each faculty, and that a working group should be convened to consider the governance of online assessment.	**Action: Head of LTET**	**Complete**
LTSEC15.11.6.3	A working group with a representative from each Faculty and each Quality Account Manager would meet to discuss a more consistent approach to scrutiny of curriculum approval documentation for ASQC.	**Action: LTET**	**Complete**
LTSEC15.11.7.2	Further consultation with each Faculty would be needed to agree the level of new Chief EE's needed and the split between Departments. These recommendations would also be highlighted to Academic Board.	**Action: Curriculum Enhancement Manager and Senior External Examiners Officer**	**Ongoing – see LTSEC16.02.6.4**
LTSEC15.11.7.4	Further information be provided to Collaborative Provision Committee for consideration on the minor difference in scores between provision delivered by the University and its Partners and also requested further information on the year on year change in Chief External scores.	**Action: Curriculum Enhancement Manager and Chair of CPC**	**Complete**
LTSEC15.11.8.2	Work with ASQC's and their officers to take the recommendations forward. The good practice identified within the report would be shared more widely, and Marketing could be contacted to discuss sharing this with future students. The issues regarding placements could feed into the group being led by the Associate Dean for L+T in HAS which was working on placements and managing student expectations.	**Action: Periodic Curriculum Review and PSRB Manager, ASQCs and Associate Dean T+L in HAS**	**Reccomdations and sharing good practice – mechanisms for taking this forward being discussed in LTET** **Info for Marketing being included in discussions regarding CMA**
LTSEC15.11.9.3	The programme assessment calendar could be located within the design and consultation form but requested that further investigation into the issues regarding ongoing monitoring was needed.	**Action: Curriculum Enhancement Manager and Associate Dean (Learning and Teaching) for FBL**	**Location in design + consultation form from Sept 16 Ongoing – see LTSEC16.02.2.4**
LTSEC15.11.10.3	The recommendation to remove double blind marking for level 2 projects was agreed by the Committee, and the policy would be updated during the review of the Assessment Cycle Policy.	**Action: Associate Dean Student Experience in HAS**	**Ongoing – revised policy will be brought to LTSEC in June 2016**
LTSEC15.11.13.2	There was a recommendation within	**Action: Associate**	**Ongoing – revised**

	the annual review report of complaints and appeals which tied into the Assessment Cycle Policy, and this would feed into the upcoming review.	**Dean Student Experience in HAS**	**policy will be brought to LTSEC in June 2016**
LTSEC15.11.14.3	The Committee agreed that the initial group put together to review lecture capture would be convened again to discuss the above, and an update would be brought back to LTSEC.	**Action: Associate Dean (Learning and Teaching) in HAS**	**Subsumed into the Learning Environments 2020 project – see LTSEC16.02.4.2**
LTSEC15.11.16.1	Further investigation was needed with the Blackboard team to identify whether there would be any system security issues, and if so these would be brought back to LTSEC. If there were no issues, LTSEC were happy to agree this proposal.	**Action: ITS – Strategic Business Partner**	**Complete – see LTSEC16.02.6.5**
LTSEC15.11.16.2	A proposal to review to Exam length policy from FBL ASQC was received, and LTSEC agreed that this should be reviewed.	**Action: Academic Services - Deputy Head of Service/Head of Student Systems and Process Development**	**Closed**
LTSEC15.11.16.3	It was agreed that the rollover of student representatives for the first meeting of the academic year would be communicated more widely.	**Action: Academic Services – Student-led Enhancement Manager**	**Complete**