



## ACADEMIC BOARD

### LEARNING, TEACHING AND STUDENT EXPERIENCE COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> March 2017 at 2pm in the Dartington Suite, Wallscourt Farmhouse, Frenchay campus.

Present: Jane Harrington (chair), Jo Midgley, Lisa Harrison, Gerry Rice, Fiona Tolmie, Jackie Rogers, Jenny Dye, Sarah Mackie, Teresa Wood, Rachel Cowie, Alastair Osborn, Elizabeth Cleaver, John Lanham, Derek Norris, Jackie Chelin, Jamie Jordon, Olivia Evans, Elyshia Neal, Ronnie Mutulili, Joshua Vaughan, Jayne Storey, Gail Wilson (officer)

Apologies: Mandy Lee, Jim Longhurst, Maggie Westgarth, Stephen Draper, Vicky Nash, Jan Richardson

In attendance: Nick Biggs, Nick Hoskins, Edward Burrell (for item LTSEC17.03.5), Jenny Wills (for item LTSEC17.03.6), Suzanne Carrie (for item LTSEC17.03.7), Helen Clark (for item LTSEC17.03.8), Amanda Barson (for item LTSEC17.03.10)

LTSEC17.03.1	<b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b>
LTSEC17.03.1.1	Apologies for the meeting were recorded.
LTSEC17.03.2	<b>MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING</b>
LTSEC17.03.2.1	The minutes of the last meeting, held on the 25 <sup>th</sup> January 2017 were confirmed as an accurate record of the meeting, aside from some minor errors on page 8.
LTSEC17.03.3	<b>MATTERS ARISING NOT OTHERWISE INCLUDED ON THE AGENDA</b>
LTSEC17.03.3.1	LTSEC16.11.17.2- the Chair gave an update on the introduction of SafeAssign. The University is now currently investigating potentially moving to Turnatin for plagiarism detection. The company responsible for Turnatin has presented to the University and integration with Blackboard is now being investigated by ITS. Jane Harrington, Alastair Osborn, Elizabeth Cleaver and Tod Burton will then discuss the issue further based on the ITS findings and then go back out to wider group for discussion around implementation.

LTSEC17.03.3.2	LTSEC17.01.11.1- the Chair and Associate Deans have agreed that the reasonable adjustments policy should use 48 hours instead of 2 working days.
LTSEC17.03.4	<b>LEARNING 2020</b>
LTSEC17.03.4.1	The Chair gave an update on Learning 2020. Work was condensing broadly into 4 main programmes; the Enhancement Framework, Learning Environments, Enterprise 2020 and Inclusivity 2020. A gap analysis will now be carried out to check all projects can be mapped to these 4 areas and nothing has been missed. The Chair went on to say that a workshop has been arranged to consider how best to organise this work.
LTSEC17.03.4.2	Olivia Evans fed back on some initial research into academic societies, which has demonstrated a positive correlation between membership and student retention. The Students' Union will be supporting 4 pilots next year, 3 in HAS and 1 in FET, where various approaches aimed to increase membership will be trialled, including free membership, additional funding societies can bid for and extra support meetings. Strong academic societies are valued by students and the University and the Students' Union are keen to support them, whilst maintaining the balance between student ownership and effective organisation. There are also challenges about how far academic and technical staff should be involved in academic societies and how this is managed and resourced.
LTSEC17.03.4.3	<b>Enhancement Framework</b>
LTSEC17.03.4.3.1	Rachel Cowie and Elizabeth Cleaver presented paper <i>LTSEC17.03.2</i> which gave an update on the progress of the Enhancement Framework. Work is progressing well in the 3 strands; programme enhancement review, continuous improvement and curriculum approval, and the enhancement framework pulls these together into a coherent whole. A question was raised about collaborative provision and ensuring flexibility within the framework to support different types of provision. Having a step prior to the planning cycle for horizon scanning and identifying cross-faculty initiatives was welcomed and in addition there were also a suggestion around facilitating space for student-led ideas for new programmes.  The committee <b>endorsed</b> the direction laid out in the paper.
LTSEC17.03.4.4	<b>Update on the enhanced year</b>
LTSEC17.03.4.4.1	Fiona Tolmie gave a verbal update on the progress of the enhanced year. The project now has a page on the intranet, which provides an overview of the aims and a number of links and resources. Currently

	all programme leaders are being consulted about ideas for how their programme could utilise the enhanced year using a standard template. The next step is then to analyse this feedback and work out what is feasible to do. A working group is also looking at the Futures Award and there are 5 programmes identified which will run a customised award. It was felt by the committee that a common agreement had been reached on the strategic direction of the enhanced year and the project was now moving on to work on the actual detail of how this would work.
LTSEC17.03.5	<b>STUDENT VOICE AND ENGAGEMENT</b>
LTSEC17.03.5.1	<b>UWE Bristol Principles of Academic Representation</b>
LTSEC17.03.5.1.1	Edward Burrell and Alastair Osborn presented paper <i>LTSEC17.03.3</i> , which has been written in response to a request from the Partnership Board to look at a new approach to student representation at the University. With Learning 2020 now taking shape this is a key time to review student representation and look at how the University can reclaim its place at the leading edge of student engagement. The new principles recognise that although the student representation structure is important, this model does not fit all and there are many examples of good practice across the University of staff collecting feedback in others way or working actively with academic societies, PAL Leaders and other student groups to enhance the student experience.
LTSEC17.03.5.1.2	<p>The new model will be supported by a best practice portal and by the new Continuous Improvement tool, which will provide a space for programme teams to record reflections and actions. The paper has been discussed at faculty ASQCs and feedback from the committees has been incorporated into this version of the paper. The committee welcomed the principles and felt they were more sensitive to local environments than the current system. There was a suggestion that the paper needs to articulate further how success will be measured, perhaps by programmes setting out their approach in advance, so that there is something to compare against.</p> <p>The committee <b>endorsed</b> the paper to Academic Board, subject to the points raised above being reflected.</p>
LTSEC17.03.6	<b>Policy on Supervision for Dissertations and Projects by Taught Students</b>
LTSEC17.03.6.1	Jenny Wills presented paper <i>LTSEC17.03.4</i> which had been revised following feedback from the committee in November. The author had met with Sue Yilmaz from the Learning and Teaching Enhancement Team to discuss any implications of the Competition and Markets Authority legislation on the policy. The impact depended on the status of the policy, and whether it was classed as a policy, a code of

	<p>practice or guidance. There was also the expectations of the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) to take into account and how they would view the document, regardless of how the University designated it. The committee supported the idea of the document being guidance, so it could be more flexible and respond to changes, but making it clear through communications that supervisors would be expected to follow it and OIA would use it as a benchmark when considering any student cases.</p>
LTSEC17.03.6.2	<p>The document was welcomed by students who believed it to be a positive step to address issues when supervisors are absent. The following feedback was raised;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion to change title to "on taught programmes"</li> <li>• Point 6- there was a concern that supervisors still have a duty of care and should follow up if a student stops making contact. It was felt by the committee that this should not be listed as a responsibility but should be captured within the document</li> <li>• Point 7 "respond to email contact" should refer to the minimum expectations which covers timeframes for responding to students</li> <li>• Point 12 should be moved to earlier in the document as this is a key part of the policy</li> <li>• Point 12- "the module leader and/or Head of Department" to be updated to Head of Department or nominee</li> </ul> <p>The committee thanked Jenny Wills for her hard work in pulling the guidance together. As this was the second time the document had been considered by the committee, in the interest of efficiency it was agreed that the document could be signed off by chairs action, following final scrutiny by the Associate Deans.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Jenny Wills to update paper based on feedback and circulate to Associate Deans for final scrutiny.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Text to be added to the module handbook template</p>
LTSEC17.03.7	<b>WP faculty action plans and university level responses</b>
LTSEC17.03.7.1	<p>Suzanne Carrie introduced paper <i>LTSEC17.03.5</i> and then the Associate Deans were invited to present their faculty action plans. HAS have worked hard to embed WP across the faculty, with a particular focus on student success and BME students. The faculty has seen particular success with Africa Week, a BME staff/student conference and the work of Paramedic Science with the Somalian community which received a grant from Health Education England. Box Ed has been very successful and staff are committed to retaining the impetus behind the scheme.</p>
LTSEC17.03.7.2	<p>FET have found the new reporting forms very useful, particularly the focus on data which has allowed the faculty to focus on particular</p>

	<p>areas at a programme level in a holistic way, from the curriculum to the images used in marketing. Work continues to encourage more women into engineering and understand the barriers to non-continuation across the faculty. There are also particular challenges with BME graduate outcomes, work is ongoing to help support these students in their careers, such as the use of alumni mentors and 3<sup>rd</sup> year students supporting 1<sup>st</sup> years in an attempt to close gaps in social capital.</p>
LTSEC17.03.7.3	<p>FBL have also focused on the data and have similar issues to FET in terms of gender imbalances in areas such as economics. The focus has been on embedding best practice so that WP activity is not seen as an add on activity. There have also been a series of meetings with programme leaders about TEF metrics so ensure they understand the importance and significance.</p>
LTSEC17.03.7.4	<p>ACE have focused on outreach and recruitment and tied this up with partnership working. The creative industries in particular does not have a diverse workforce so the faculty is working where possible to tie up with schemes from partners, such as the BBC, to enable the best use of resources. The committee thanked the faculties for the updates and highlighting this important area of work. In particular it demonstrates the different challenges across different subjects groups and how there is no single solution.</p>
LTSEC17.03.7.5	<p>Suzanne Carrie then gave an update on the 2018/19 Access Agreement which is due for submission at the end of April. The submission is made up of two parts, a document highlighting the University's commitments and plans for widening participation and a standard spreadsheet setting out student numbers, targets and expenditure. The University will be retaining the percentage of expenditure on bursaries and will also be keeping the structure of bursaries consistent. One of the main challenges is around refining student number predictions to aid in accurate reporting.</p>
LTSEC17.03.8	<p><b>Feedback from ASQCs on External Examiners reports 2015/16</b></p>
LTSEC17.03.8.1	<p>The Associate Deans were asked to feedback any key themes in relation to their 2015-16 External Examiner reports. FET ASQC had considered the departmental actions plan section in relation to feedback from External Examiners and ensured that all comments from External Examiners had been adequately addressed within the action plan. The committee had noted inconsistent practice in the sharing of External Examiner reports with students, where programme leaders made the report relevant to the programme and highlighted any key actions students were able to see the value and it aided in their understanding of how external examining worked. However where this did not happen and reports were shared with no context students struggled to engage. The committee had also considered the scores given by External Examiners and discussed any areas where</p>

	<p>limited or no confidence (scores of 3/4) had been given. Generally these scores were in relation to instances where exam papers had not been shared in advance for scrutiny or where External Examiners were not able to access materials with some limited instances in relation to standards at collaborative partners, which was being addressed actively by the faculty with oversight by the Collaborative Provision Committee.</p>
LTSEC17.03.8.2	<p>HAS ASQC examined a comparison between positive comments from External Examiners on assessment feedback and NSS scores on assessment feedback and found then often did not agree. There were some challenges around standards for collaborative partners but again these are being closely monitored by the faculty and Collaborative Provision Committee and the faculty have also been working with the SAT Partnership Team to improve the moderation template for collaborative provision. The faculty's new shared assessment criteria was well received by the Chief External Examiner.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> FBL and ACE to report at the June meeting.</p>
LTSEC17.03.9	<p><b>"Working together to respond to student vulnerability"- Training Sessions</b></p>
LTSEC17.03.9.1	<p>Jayne Storey provided an update on a series of recent training sessions her team had delivered to academic staff (<i>LTSEC17.03.7</i>). The training had been well received by staff and there was a desire to extend the training to as many staff as possible but there are issues around the resource required in order to do this. There had been push back from some members of staff that student welfare and pastoral issues were not part of their role, and there were concerns about the potential damage this could cause if a student had a made a decision to share personal information with a member of staff who then did not help them.</p>
LTSEC17.03.9.2	<p>The committee felt strongly that staff should be dealing with students in a humane and sensitive way and should be confident in referring students to the appropriate service. There were concerns about the consistency and knowledge of Academic Personal Tutors and that their responsibilities need to be rearticulated in a more nuanced way to make it clear what is expected. The service provided to students and staff out of hours is also being reviewed as part of the 24/7 365 campus project led by Jo Midgley.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> The Chair and Jayne Storey to discuss how the training could be extended and test these ideas with the faculties.</p>
LTSEC17.03.10	<p><b>Enhanced Reading List Project: Update 6</b></p>
LTSEC17.03.10.1	<p>Amanda Barson gave an update on the Enhanced Reading List Project (<i>LTSEC17.03.8</i>) and showed the committee a video highlighting the</p>

	positive student feedback on the software. The introduction of enhanced reading lists has been well received from both staff and students and is progressing well.
LTSEC17.03.11	<b>Feedback from FBL ASQC</b>
LTSEC17.03.11.1	Fiona Tolmie fed back from the FBL ASQC around an issue students had raised about the timing of the publication of the graduation timetable. Academic Services have been working closely with Corporate Events to provide clarity about what data is available when to allow the accurate predictions of student numbers as early as possible in order to publish timetables in a timely fashion. This work is ongoing.
	<b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b> 10 <sup>th</sup> May 2017 (enhancement workshop) 21 <sup>st</sup> June 2017 19 <sup>th</sup> July 2017