

Actions arising from the Student Written Submission [Document for Student Experience Committee – 19 November 2015] Agenda Item A4 Doc E

Para No	Student Written Submission	UEA response
51	<p>The primary channel for PGR representation at UEA is the Research Student Forum (RSF). These currently operate in three out of the four Faculties. These are generally equivalent to an SSLC in format, but with a membership consisting of the whole Faculty. Students' experience of the RSFs in the past academic year has been very positive. They are chaired by students, ensuring a student led agenda, and discussions have been productive. There remains room for improvement, to ensure that all PGR students are heard and that student representatives are supported to communicate effectively with their students. Additionally, there is a gap in the SCI Faculty, where no RSF currently operates. However, we believe that the RSFs are amongst the more well-functioning mechanisms for student engagement at UEA. The working group reviewing the Code of Practice is currently addressing UG and PGT representation, but not PGR representation. We hope that following the completion of the group's work the University will go on to enhance the support for PGR representation.</p>	<p>We will look at this during 2015/16.</p>
66	<p>The ending of annual reports also coincided with the Student Union raising issues about communication with schools (see above). The reports for 2009/10 and 2010/11 are relatively positive about communication between the Union and schools, and the corresponding Student Experience Reports mentioned no particular issues. By 2012, however, the SER flagged up communication as a big problem for the Union's work with course</p>	<p>We will also look again at how the University monitors student engagement through SSLCs and ensure that this is picked up through the implementation of the new Code of Practice on SSLCs.</p>

	<p>representatives. This coincided with the loss of regular annual monitoring by LTC. Our concern is that the process was reliant on individual LTS staff, and staff changes resulted in a failure to keep monitoring schools. The Union continues to experience problems communicating with schools and this stands in contrast to the 2009 Student Submission, where students were relatively positive about the operation of SSLCs. We remain concerned that the University does not have the staff in place to effectively assure the quality of student engagement across the University.</p>	
79	<p>We would like to see a more robust process, which ensures that periodic review is picking up on quality issues, that recommendations are revisited to evaluate progress and that review outcomes are discussed with students. As with external examiners' reports we suggest that the best forum for this is the SSLC, so that students on the programme under review can react to recommendations, or any issues raised at LTC.</p>	<p>We will consider this during 2015/16.</p>
95	<p>We are, at the same time, concerned that the University is over reliant on these Advisers and lacks alternatives for students whose courses do not easily fit with the Personal Adviser model, for instance PGT students, distance learners or students on their year abroad. It is not rare for a student to struggle to make contact with the adviser, on occasion for a year or more. The default suggestion for this solution is for the student to seek to change adviser. However, this process takes time, requires paper forms to be collected, completed and filed with LTS Hubs, and ultimately relies on the student to jump through each stage, something more difficult for disabled students, international students or students with caring responsibilities. We therefore feel that whilst the Adviser system is a valuable tool for super-curricular development, it is not sufficient on its own to effectively support students facing</p>	<p>We will look at personal support for PGT students as part of the review work on PGT and the New Academic Model during 2015/16.</p>

	difficulties. The University's 2015 Student Experience Survey evidenced a significant fall in satisfaction with academic support, from 78% in 2014 to 66% in 2015, and we believe this to be consistent with the increasing exposure of gaps in the Advisory system.	
108	We have had very little involvement with external examiners reports, as these will only have been published online from the summer of 2015. We therefore cannot comment about students' general awareness of reports. We are aware that reports from previous years have not been published and we believe that this will remain the case.	We will look at whether we can publish back copies of external examiners reports and our responses to them
110	We believe that a more appropriate forum for engaging students is the school SSLC, or a lower level group corresponding with the programme. Here, the external reports could be discussed with students on the programme, who can offer direct and valuable insights to enhance quality. From previous years minutes, we believe that the vast majority of SSLCs have not discussed external examiners reports. This is an area where we would welcome greater student engagement.	We will look at how to improve student engagement with external examiners reports, perhaps through SSLCs. Note - there would be a difficulty in seeking to retrospectively host previous years' reports in that the External Examiners would not, at the time, have been aware that the document they were producing might be liable to publication and so we would only be able to publish those where examiners gave permission.
119	UEA is unusual in not having a dedicated week of term for arrivals. Students feel strongly that a separate week would assist student induction and welfare, giving the chance for students to build familiarity with campus before beginning study, and regularly request a separate week when asked about induction. We are not aware of the rationale for not having a specified week, and the issue remains an ongoing student concern despite some progress being made this year due to the introduction of a 3 day induction period.	We will make clear the rationale for not having a full arrivals week.

131	<p>Students welcome a remark process which is distinct from a formal appeal, but we are concerned that the remark policy is not communicated to students. There is very little reference to the remark policy in the recently issued Senate Guidance.³⁹ The main provision is found in the University's policy on Internal Moderation and Double Marking, however we are concerned that students are unlikely to consult this policy to find out about the opportunity to request a remark.⁴⁰ In practice, students find out about remark request through their Personal Adviser or via the Students' Union Advice Centre's online guidance.⁴¹ It is not clear what happens if a significant proportion, e.g. half or more, of a class request a remark.</p>	<p>We will review the approach to promoting understanding of our remarking policy during 2015/16.</p>
-----	---	---