

LTC15D153

Title: *SSF LTQC Minutes*
Author: Heather Reynolds
Date: 25/4/16
Circulation: LTC – 11 May 2016
Agenda: LTC15A005
Version: Final Version
Status: Open

Issue

To receive the Minutes of the SSF LTQC meeting held on 24 February 2016.

Recommendation

None.

Resource Implications

None.

Risk Implications

None.

Equality and Diversity

N/A

Timing of decisions

N/A

Further Information

Contact details: Heather Reynolds, Learning and Teaching Coordinator, telephone 01603 592517, email: h.reynolds@uea.ac.uk, for any queries/further information relating to this document.

Background

N/A

Discussion

N/A

Attachments – Minutes

SSF LTQC 15M005

Minutes of a meeting of the SSF LTQC held on Wednesday 24 February 2016, commencing at 1400, in TPSC 2.24.

Academic Members Present:

Ratula Chakraborty (Chair)
Rob Grant (DEV)
Duncan Watson (ECO)
Lee Beaumont (EDU)
Claudina Richards (LAW)
Naresh Pandit (NBS)
Neil Cooper (PSY)
Jeanette Cossar (SWK)

Student Members Present:

Connor Rand (SU Academic Officer – Undergraduate Representative)
Amber Watson (SU Faculty Convener for Education)
Tony Moore (UUEAS)

With:

Heather Reynolds (Secretary)
Becky Fitt (LTS Manager)

Apologies:

James Merewood (SU Faculty Convener for Engagement)
Liam McCafferty (SU Academic Officer - Postgraduate Representative)

1. MINUTES

Confirmed: the Minutes of the meeting of 13 January 2016.
Document 15M004 available online

2. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

- (a) Assessment & Feedback - Workshop Talk - feedback from Duncan Watson (ECO TD)**
- Student run focus group awaited but hasn't yet occurred.
 - Suggestions welcome but initially thinking about going through CW feedback findings and link to discussion on pedagogy practices.
 - Could also embed with teaching seminar series (Equator) - opportunity for faculty members to sign up – feedback from TDs (how and when?).
 - NBS UG Directors on focus groups with students. Unique insights and could be forwarded to Duncan (Jenny Fairbrass) – Duncan will contact.

- Session for academics – suggested early assessment period before marking commences. Week 1 Assessment Period – 11 May (Wed) p.m. 1400 – 1600 - reflection on what we have done and what we will do in the future will be useful, open to all faculty members.
- (b)** Joint Degree Induction Programme - report relating to good and bad practice to aid developing induction plan for next year - Duncan Watson (ECO TD)
- Issues surrounding PPE.
 - General report on induction – very well received by students, very specific issues (e.g. needing a map for campus).
 - Avoid information overload sessions - move to icebreaking sessions.
 - Issues about joint honours, some addressed and require monitoring.
 - Other issues require further attention, timetabling problems, improvements in admin process.
 - ECO trying to avoid any clashes with HUM so students can attend all events.
 - Issues with communications (changes to induction programmes).
 - Academic induction/transitions working group – ensuring good practice shared and communication throughout schools.
 - Information overload – move away from dry events – info on BB, varied use as not all students have access – induction working group working on web provision – site which does have school specific sections.
 - Joint honours – communications – asking students to double/triple up on events they need to attend.
 - Potential joint honours special events – staff/student led.
 - Induction extra goes beyond official induction timetable.
 - application being developed for students to use on campus to find their way around.
- (c)** Purpose of School Board - clarification of terms of reference – Chair
- Document circulated.
- (d)** TALIS - student feedback - Faculty Conveners
- Taking forward to next meeting

SECTION A: ITEMS FOR REPORT

Documents for these items are available to view on the SSF LTQC Blackboard site in the relevant meeting folder.

A.1 STATEMENTS FROM THE CHAIR

- (a)** Thanks to Teaching Directors for all the work undertaken and support, especially in relation to coursework turnaround which is looking very good for the SSF schools.
- (b)** Connor Rand gave thanks also and noted an incredible improvement across the University.

- (c) Noted enormous increase in student numbers in SSF so incredible response. Thanks to LTS also especially noting they have expedited CW turnaround in cases of illness etc.
- (d) £6000 in the budget for HEA Fellowships. Colleagues encouraged to apply. Workshop taking place on 14 March.
- (e) CSED courses. What would we like to see developed? TDs to consider within schools. Noted one-off workshops taking place for long periods of time during a teaching day – classes overlap so difficult for colleagues to attend. Suggest shorter workshops to make attendance easier.
- (f) Enrichment week – general feeling that it should be one week, week 7, when whole University can take part. SSF – AD Employability will discuss with Schools to see what they would like to achieve in respect of employability. LAW will find their seminars likely disrupted.
- (g) Peer Observation – LAW undertaking this but data not passed on for updating spreadsheet. In process of updating and this will be available shortly.
- (h) NSS/PTEs – improving engagement with this process - LAW tried tea and buns event but due to a power cut students were unable to log on to do this. They have been advised that this type of action may now be seen as direct incentives so will not be possible in future. Chair will investigate whether this is the case and will feed back to members.
- (i) Areas for developing online courses (areas in which schools are very good - NBS Brand Leadership for instance) – short questionnaire will be sent out by Chair to TDs.

A.2 LTC UPDATE

LTC update following meeting on 27 January 2016 (document available online).

The following actions were agreed:

1. *Research Data Management Policy*: Minute 67- **REN Head of Research** to reword the Research Data Policy. **Professor Norris** to discuss with Ethics Committee chairs the need to ensure that students on taught programmes are aware of the requirement to destroy data relating to human subjects.
2. *Coursework Turnaround*: Minute 69- **ADLTE** to work on turnaround time data and feed back to students.
3. *Review of Support for Students between Assessment and Reassessment*: Minute 72- **Associate Deans (L&T)** to reiterate the requirements of the Guidance for Academic Advisers on [Support for Students Undertaking Reassessment](#) to academic colleagues in their Faculty (and note Resolution 2 in the Minutes)

PVC Academic, Heads and Director of LTS, ADTP, ADLTE and Ads (L&T) to discuss the issue support for students who know they have failed autumn semester modules in the spring and related matters, at one of their regular meetings.

4. *Peer Assisted Learning*: Minutes 73- **Head of LET** to produce an evaluation report to LTC in Jan 2018. **Heads of LTS (Systems), Head of LET, ADTP and former PAL Champion** to produce a set of metrics and a framework for evaluating/reviewing the scheme and report these to a meeting of LTC during 2015/16.

5. *Policy on the use of proof readers*: Minute 74- **ADTP and Director of Research Degrees** to undertake further work to ensure the guidance is appropriate for PGR students. **AD (L&T) for HUM and ADTP** to undertake further work on consistency throughout the guidance (including dividing the document into guidance for students and guidance for staff and removing reference to proof reading equations).

6. *2014/15 CSED Annual Report*: Minute 75- **Academic Director of Research Degree Programmes** to take the report to the Research Exec to consider the Head of CSED's suggested points for discussion. **ADTP** to take the paper to TPPG.

Head of CSED to provide more detailed information on the actual numbers of staff engaging in CSED running training. **Head of CSED/PVC Academic** to arrange for Faculty Exec Committees to consider the report and the outcome of the learning needs analysis survey once it has been published and report back to LTC.

7. *Report from the ADLTE*: Minute 76- **AD (L&T) for HUM and FMH** to discuss with **ADLTE** how the number of HEA fellows in their Faculties could be increased.

A.3 TPPG

Summary from the January TPPG meeting available online.

A.4 FACULTY APPEALS & COMPLAINTS COMMITTEE

January 2016 report available online.

A.5 PERIODIC COURSE REVIEW 2015/16

Course Review documentation 2015/16 can be found in the Course Review folder on this Blackboard site including the PGT schedule of Course Review Events. There doesn't appear to be any UG Course Review Events due this academic year.

Course Reviews 2014.15

LAW and DEV PGT 2014.15 Course Reviews - Final CR2s available online. Report to LTC (CR3) on Course Reviews 2014.15 will be completed shortly.

A.6 ANNUAL MONITORING

Deadlines for completion of 2014/15 UG and PGT Annual Course Monitoring:

Annual Course Review (Guidance Notes 4 & 5)		
Deadline for completion of Exam Boards	13/07/2015	30/11/2015
Email 4 to CDs to complete QAR2 Stage 2	31/07/2015	02/12/2015
CD to complete QAR2 Stage 2	14/08/2015	16/12/2015
Email 5 to TD to complete QAR2 Stage 3	14/08/2015	16/12/2015
TD to complete QAR2 Stage 3	28/08/2015	13/01/2016
Deadline for completion of Course Monitoring QAR2 form	28/08/2015	13/01/2016
Email 6 to TD to complete QAR3 Stage 1	31/08/2015	13/01/2016
TD to complete QAR3 Stage 1	14/09/2015	27/01/2016
Email 7 (FLTQC Sec) to AD to complete QAR3 Stage 2	14/09/2015	27/01/2016
ADs to complete QAR3 Stage 2	28/09/2015	10/02/2016

Draft deadlines for completion of 2015/16 UG and PGT Annual Module and Course Monitoring (standard programme schedule):

	Standard UG Timeline 1	Standard PGT Timeline 1
Annual Module Review (Guidance Note 3)		
Module End Date	23/06/2016	23/06/2016
Email 1 to MO	23/06/2016	23/06/2016
Email 2 reminder to MOs to complete Stage 2 of QAR1	01/07/2016	01/07/2016
Deadline for completion of Stage 2 of QAR1	08/07/2016	08/07/2016
Email 3 to TDs to complete Stage 3 of QAR1	08/07/2016	08/07/2016

TDs to complete Stage 3 of QAR1	22/07/2016	22/07/2016
Deadline for completion of Module Review	22/07/2016	22/07/2016
Annual Course Review (Guidance Notes 4 & 5)		
Deadline for completion of Exam Boards	18/07/2016	02/12/2016
Email 4 to CDs to complete QAR2 Stage 2	22/07/2016	09/12/2016
CD to complete QAR2 Stage 2	29/07/2016	16/12/2016
Email 5 to TD to complete QAR2 Stage 3	12/08/2016	16/12/2016
TD to complete QAR2 Stage 3	26/08/2016	13/01/2016
Deadline for completion of Course Monitoring QAR2 form	26/08/2016	13/01/2016
Email 6 to TD to complete QAR3 Stage 1	02/09/2016	13/01/2016
TD to complete QAR3 Stage 1	16/09/2016	27/01/2016
Email 7 (FLTQC Sec) to AD to complete QAR3 Stage 2	16/09/2016	27/01/2016
ADs to complete QAR3 Stage 2	30/09/2016	10/02/2016

SECTION B: ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND ACTION

B.1 NEW COURSES

NBS

- (1) MSc Accounting and Finance and (2) MSc Banking and Finance - Scrutineer Neil Cooper – Academic Case Approved by Chair

Proposal documents available in New Course Proposals and Course Closures folder online.

RESOLVED: When circulating for scrutiny, Secretary will cc documentation to all TDs to enable them to feed into the scrutiny process if they wish.

B.2 CHANGES TO EXISTING PROGRAMMES

PSY

MSc in Developmental Science - Scrutineer Jeanette Cossar's comments:

“I have looked at the minor course change proposal for the MSc in Developmental Science (change of name from MSc in Developmental Psychology).

This looks fine to me. My only query was regarding marketing the course and whether this more general term would make sense to applicants. The external examiner Sara Baker answers this in the form - the change is in line with what is going on in the sector, hence should increase pool of applicants.”

RESOLVED: Academic case approved.

Document 15D020 available online

RESOLVED: When circulating for scrutiny, Secretary will cc documentation to all TDs to enable them to feed into the scrutiny process if they wish.

B.3 EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORTS/RESPONSES

Detailed in Section D of this agenda.

ISSUES FOR THE ATTENTION OF SSF LTQC:

FOX/NBS/UG

“I would have preferred the online material to be viewed on the UEA site with a password rather than sending USB sticks through the post.” - Fox
This is an issue which needs further exploration at University level to ensure any developments foster consistent practice across Schools and Faculties

Noted that this option is now available.

PAGE/DEV/UG

The university should address these issues raised by the external examiner:

Senate marking scale

“I was given access to the Senate Scales, which were interesting and useful and which is clearly used by the colleagues who are marking coursework and exams. I found the term ‘exemplary’ to be an odd one for use in marking criteria as the distinguishing feature of excellent or outstanding work. There are multiple reasons why something can be ‘exemplary’ – not all of them good. I wondered about how these scales were derived and benchmarked against multiple different disciplines – intuitively I wondered how useful it is to have the same marking scale for all the different departments in a University and would like to understand more about the rationale.

I would like to have some information on the basis by which targets for the proportion of ‘good degrees’ are set and benchmarked against comparator institutions.”

DATA on degree classification

“Track trend data on the proportion of different degree classes awarded to men and women, and to the students on the different programmes within the school. (There are limits to what can be done statistically I’m sure because of the small sample sizes on some programmes, but even so it would go good to keep an eye on this)”

Information for externals on self-certification

“I would appreciate clarifications on the policy of self-reporting on extenuating circumstances, which appears to be exploited because it is so much more common in the 3rd year.”

PRENTICE/DEV/UG

To consider the external examiner’s comment on the University’s self-certification procedure

“I was surprised to learn of the high number of students at UEA who submit coursework or essays late because they are able to self-certify an illness or extenuating circumstance that permits them to exceed the deadline. I wonder whether it would not be more fair to allow students extra time only if they can produce a note from a doctor (or similar) as evidence of an extenuating circumstance that has prevented them from being able to submit their work on time.”

ARE THERE ANY GENERAL ISSUES OR THEMES WHICH SHOULD BE RAISED AT SSF LTQC TO INFORM FUTURE PRACTICE?

COOK/ECO/UG

The EE raised several issues relating to learning and teaching some which may impact upon other Schools, specifically:

The proportion of work which is marked by Associate Tutors. The EE appeared to find this practice unusual, however it is relatively common practice in other Schools within UEA. Given this concern, some consideration relating to what might be a reasonable proportion of work at Level 5 and 6 which can be marked by ATs may be worth investigating.

- SU Academic Officer – student concerns around quality of feedback.
- SU Faculty Convener for Education – student concerns relating to inconsistency within team marking.
- Noted that controls are in place to ensure fairness. Marking teams meet prior to marking (all markers regardless of experience) to enable MO to ensure standard of marking between markers and sufficient time for marking process. SU Faculty Convener for Education felt that students may not be aware of this process.

The small number of staff at the exam board. The EE indicated that the numbers of ECO staff attending the board appeared low, however this meeting needs to be efficient and having large numbers of staff may delay proceedings. However, it may be useful to consider the requirements of the range and expertise of Exam board members as the University reviews board structures and procedures.

SESSIONS/ECO/UG

The EE raised the issue of the anonymization of student names at the exam board. The comments made are expressed as a general preference for anonymization. This is an issue which may arise in various UEA meetings and committees, and if this is becoming common practice in other institutions these external examiner comments are worth bearing in mind.

Noted that this opportunity is available.

- SU Faculty Convener for Education concerned that anonymisation of student names at BoEs does not automatically take place in all schools.
- Noted that extenuating circumstances are dealt with at ECP meetings and these cannot be anonymised. Very important that students submit any extenuating circumstances evidence in good time to enable this to be taken into consideration by ECPs.
- Noted that UG BoEs (BIM Regs) have very little opportunity for discretion now so less relevant.

B.4 SSLC UPDATES – FACULTY CONVENORS – Amber Watson

Discussion relating to differing SSLCs within the Faculty and sharing of good practice.

Document 15D021 available online

- This relates to UG apart from DEV.
- General feeling mostly good, generally welcoming,
- NBS very confrontational at times but in transition with SPO incoming.
- Student representatives are volunteers, giving up their time.

Recommendations :

- It is really important that those attending remember it is often not easy for students to feel comfortable with raising issues with staff. Reflect on how students are encouraged to make points and to feel comfortable.
- Important that SSLC representatives raise concerns of their cohort and not their own individual concerns.
- Any relevant recommendations raised will be discussed at LTQC first and then through TD to school if any recommendation is to be taken forward.
- Ideal length of meeting - two hours so that it isn't rushed.
- Agendas need to be focussed and sufficient time allowed for students to submit items for inclusion.
- Membership including all CDs might be too many – students will feel less comfortable. Perhaps a rota of CDs to attend.
- Important that the student representatives understand their role through training. Even if there are small numbers of students attending, embed

culture of welcoming environment – no suggestion of cancelling such an event.

- Post Minutes on BB so that all students have access.
- Provide refreshment (water).

RESOLVED : TDs to take above recommendations back to their schools for consideration.

B.5 ENRICHMENT WEEK

Maximising the value of the two weeks gained from reducing the examination period to four weeks from 2016/17 onwards, to include Week 7 enrichment week (UG students).

At the last AD/LTS meeting with Neil Ward and LTS team it was agreed that HUM and SSF schools will opt for week 6 as 'Enrichment Week'. SCI and FMH week 7.

- See statements.

Document 15D022 available online

B.6 STUDENT MODULE EVALUATION

Maximising student participation in end of module evaluation - monitoring module evaluation participation rates.

- Item deferred.

Document 15D023 available online

B.7 PILOT OF INDIVIDUALISED FEEDBACK ON EXAMINATIONS

- Already in hand so item not discussed.

Document 15D024 available online

B.8 LTC REVIEW OF INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE AND THE SELF-CERTIFICATION WORKING GROUPS

The Learning & Teaching Committee is charged with undertaking a number of scheduled reviews of policy and process each year, in order to ensure that our processes are academically rigorous while continuing to provide a positive experience for students.

It is important that policy reviews are carried out in a timely way, but also that we engage in a dialogue as a University regarding the appropriateness and feasibility of any emerging proposals for regulatory and process changes.

Consequently, I am inviting comment from SSLCs and FLTQCs on the proposals thus far established by the two working groups I am leading in the 2015-16 academic year.

I would be grateful if you would provide me with any comments on either the Self-Certification Working Group or the Internal Quality Assurance Working Group by not later than **10 March 2016**. Comments should be emailed to me by the relevant committee secretary at jon.sharp@uea.ac.uk.

Self-Certification:

Jon Sharp:

- Moved from two to one opportunity per year. Required to be first extension per year is unpopular – this will change.
 - Academic colleagues favour not having self-cert – however that there might be minor incidents which should be remedied. Need to rebrand it (not joker/wildcard). If there is a genuine condition meeting ARC student may use this opportunity without evidencing it.
 - Current period too long (5 working days) – following consultation with University Health Service it was considered that a minor period of ill health would be 72 hours.
 - Based on 72 hour extension an obvious problem is that if a deadline is extended on any day other than Monday and Tuesday, a student would in effect have two extra days (weekend) to complete their work.
 - Noted that where students experience a short illness (diarrhoea and vomiting for instance) the GP will likely indicate ‘the student tells me’ as they won’t have been able to attend their GP whilst ill.
 - Is 72 hours right length of time?
 - Some favour no self-cert and others a 24 hour period. This would lead to extended deadline work being handed in shortly after main cohort which would help markers.
 - FMH insist on students being absent 48 hours if they are sick.
 - SCI concerned that the University might be requiring students to say they are ill when they aren’t. Because of the number of students submitting self-certs it appears that the number with illness has shot through the roof. These may have been illnesses that were not being reported previously or may not. It is irrational not to use an extension if this is available.
 - Longer extension makes it more difficult for markers to manage their marking load and also the moderation exercise.
 - Shorter extension may be problematic for students as they may have recovered from their illness sufficiently to complete their work in such a short period.
 - A lot of institutions do not have self-cert system but having introduced it, it would be very difficult not to continue with it.
 - Very difficult to argue away the need for such a remedy.
-
- NBS TD had no problem with a valid self-certification application but was concerned about abuse of the system and the impact on markers and Module Organisers. Would a lot of students fake going to UMS with illness they don’t have? He felt it is likely that without the self-certification numbers of students abusing the system would be much less. When half a class submits self certs this has to be abuse of the system. Jon Sharp’s personal view was that it seems highly unlikely that the vast number of self-certs were all wholly related to conditions. However, if a decision is taken on the basis of abuse then it is likely that those with genuine need will lose out.
 - SWK TD – Some students feel strongly that other students are taking advantage of self-certification and this is not acceptable.
 - SU Academic Officer was pleased that the working group reached a consensus around the need for self-certification opportunities. He had spoken with students managing chronic illness. Noted some SSLCs decided not to discuss the issues. Felt it is really important that consideration is given to the range of reasons why students might need self-certification.

- NBS TD – preparing students for the real world – still need to meet deadlines even with minor illnesses.
- SU Faculty Convener for Education – variety of reasons why students do self-cert, not necessarily medical – may have personal reasons. Losing self-certification opportunity may force students towards their GP unnecessarily in situations where the GP cannot really support the student with medical evidence.
- Where deadlines being bunched and this is causing a problem then this problem should be dealt with and should not be reliant upon the self-certification system.
- Need to remove the bulk of students who are acting unethically.

RESOLVED: TDs will feed back views from their schools to Jon Sharp.

Internal Quality Assurance

Jon Sharp:

- Looking for transparency, least impact on academic staff and deliverable by administrative staff. Whole set of interlocking processes. Invited thoughts, advice, cautions by email or discussion in person
- New academic model focusses on courses rather than modules.
- Build internal QA around the course, one form to represent the whole process. Module review is part of the review of the course (may mean that schools decide when to review each module so long as all reviewed within 5 year period). Linking timing to events rather than calendar dates. Everything should be online but fully online process may not be available for two years.
- LAW TD - QAR 2 – can these be provided with pre-populated data. Currently spending a lot of time hunting out this data.
- Jon Sharp – guidance will provide data that needs to be considered and any possible lag in timeframe. Working with BIU in terms of how this will be readable, available and clear. Cannot be pre-populated currently – would really like to do this, recognise the need, currently systems cannot deliver this and not able to resource this within LTS.
- Chair questioned the route which is being taken forward by Jon in this respect.
- Jon Sharp – regularly expressing difficulties with systems to LTS Director who takes these difficulties forward. Feels that we need more systems developers and more time with client focussed approach so each Service has dedicated time.
- NBS TD – school currently needs a parallel quality process to improve quality. Module reviews where MOs are asked to produce module data – TD and CD consider and have informal chat with MO and this has produced significant changes. Getting modules right imperative – QAR 1 makes statements not challenged or discussed and this is why parallel process necessary – robust system.
- EDU TD – Old style MM1 was more useful and fed into CU1.
- Jon Sharp – we may have moved too far towards metric and away from discursive and reflective data.
- SCI FLTQC - Module and course update should follow quickly behind module and course review. HUM would prefer a good period of time (some months) inbetween the two processes to reflect.
- Chair – sooner the better provided the timing is right – this would need to change.

- PSY TD – reflection time needed.
- Jon Sharp - would like this to become one process with short reflective period.
- DEV TD – how would we manage modules shared between lots of courses?
- Jon Sharp – every module should have a home but this may not work for all. Joint courses should be managed through course reviews. Suggest adopting system of reviewing cognate courses together.
- PSY TD – feedback needed from senior management about any issues (rooms for instance).
- Jon Sharp – Faculty level flagging up any relevant themes – action plan at end of each review.
- Flow diagram

- RESOLVED:**
- (a) TDs will feed back views from their schools to Jon Sharp.
 - (b) NBS TD will email details of the NBS parallel quality process to Jon Sharp.

UG Enrichment Week

Jon Sharp:

- Jon is the administrative lead.
- Enrichment week **should** be one week, week 7, sem 2, for all UG students. Mixing from different disciplines.
- Avoiding stripping out of enrichment already embedded within schools' curriculum.
- Should be full of activities student wouldn't otherwise engage in.
- Really broad range of activities by academics, students, external agencies, evenings, daytimes, day-long and shorter. Online brochure available well prior to week taking place, first come first served signed up – all events available to all students. Run as an option week. Investment in a good website and good online booking system. Particularly popular events can be run several times.
- Professional courses with placements – unusual timeframes – placements will take precedence. There will be evening and online events.
- Students and academic colleagues will be asked for suggestions as to what they would like available and to deliver.
- Not all events will be on campus – there will be outside events.
- UUEAS representative suggested utilising student societies.

Document 15D025 available online

B.9 PLAGIARISM SOFTWARE – Safe Assign (discussion with Jon Sharp)

- Plagiarism software – Safe Assign considered by Plagiarism Officers as not fit for purpose. Debate raging across POs in UEA resulted in report by NBS Sarah Allen for NBS Teaching EXEC. NBS currently has MOs formulating workarounds to check plagiarism.
- DEV TD – Studies show that Turnitin is slightly better than Safe Assign but not a lot – he is surprised by this. Personal experience is that Turnitin finds more plagiarism than Safe Assign.
- Consultation process – concern that a decision was made prior to completing consultation.

- Chair – LTC investigated Turnitin and Safe Assign – money saving to UEA – working extremely well in other institutions.
 - Requesting audit of how Safe Assign was introduced and also audit of Safe Assign.
 - Suggest POs get together and approach Pro Vice Chancellor directly with concerns.
 - Chair will feed back in respect of consultation process and also that all POs are extremely unhappy with Safe Assign.
-

SECTION C: ONGOING ITEMS FOR REGULAR REPORT

Documents for these items are available to view on the SSF LTQC Blackboard site in the relevant meeting folder.

C.1 COURSE CLOSURES

None to report.

SECTION D: EXTERNAL EXAMINERS REPORTS

Deadlines for the consideration of UG and PGT reports and responses 2014/15:

2014-15 Reports - Receipt from External Examiners:

- Standard UG Programmes – within 4 weeks of Board of Examiners and no later than 31 July 2015
- Standard PGT programmes – within 4 weeks of Board of Examiners and no later than 11 December 2015

School Consideration of Reports and Preparation of Responses

- Preparation of responses by Chair – 4 weeks from availability of report on Faculty Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee (FLTQC) Blackboard site
- Chair confirms teaching executive (or equivalent) approval of responses to Team Leader – within 1 week after meeting

Faculty Consideration of Reports and Approval of Responses

- Scrutiny of reports and responses by FLTQC – 4 weeks from notification of availability of prepared responses.
- Final amendments by Chair following FLTQC scrutiny – 2 weeks from notification of availability of feedback.

Reporting

- Notification of approved responses to External Examiner – 1 week from notification of approval

D.1 EXTERNAL EXAMINERS' REPORTS 2012/13 COMPLETED

Documents for these items are available to view on the SSF LTQC Blackboard site in the External Examiners' folder.

EDU – Ford (PGT)

D.2 EXTERNAL EXAMINERS' REPORTS 2013/14 COMPLETED

Documents for these items are available to view on the SSF LTQC Blackboard site in the External Examiners' folder.

SWK – Murphy (PGT)

EXTERNAL EXAMINERS' REPORTS 2013/14 OUTSTANDING

NBS – Rogers (PGT) – with task group member

PSY– Cook and Vitkovitch (UG) – with task group member

SWK - Nelson (PGT) – with Chair

EXTERNAL EXAMINERS' REPORTS 2014/15 COMPLETED

DEV – Page, Prentice, Maconachie & Kambhampati (UG)

ECO – Sessions & Cook (UG)

EDU – Alexander, Croft, Battersby, Fisher, Swaffield Windross & Wolfenden (PGT)

EXTERNAL EXAMINERS' REPORTS 2014/15 OUTSTANDING

DEV – Hurt, Moen & Singal (PGT) – with Chair

DEV - Sanchez-Ancochea (PGT) - report received 5/2

ECO – Reilly (PGT) – with task group member

EDU – Curtis & Tan (UG) – with task group member

EDU – Perkins (PGT) – returned to Chair for amendment

EDU - Cross & Hinton-Smith (PGT) – with Chair

LAW – Andreangeli, Ashiagbor, & Syrett (PGT) – with Chair

LAW - Dow, Gehring, Nikaki, & Reed (PGT) reports not received

NBS – Barrett, Nikolopoulos, Souchon & Tan (PGT) – with task group member

NBS – Weetman (PGT) – report received 2/2/16

NBS – Veloutsou & Williams (PGT) – report not received

PSY – Johnston (UG) – with Chair

PSY – Cook (UG) – report not received

PSY – Baker, Millings & Tunney (PGT) – with Chair

SWK – Higgs & Lymbery (UG) – with Chair

SWK – Broadhurst, Helm & Murphy (PGT) – with Chair

Documents for these items are available to view on the SSF LTQC Blackboard site in the External Examiners' folder.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING AND FUTURE ITEMS

Wednesday 20 April 2016, commencing at 1400, in TPSC 2.24

Future Items:

**Annual Module Review, Annual Course Monitoring and Course Review +
Annual Review of Assessment and Moderation**

Opportunities will be identified for the wider sharing of best practice and progress in completing action points will be monitored on an annual basis.

April 2016

Alicia McConnell – Electronic Examinations

Adam Longcroft - Future Skills Initiative Working Group

November 2016

Maximising Student Participation in End of Module Evaluation - Monitoring module evaluation participation rates will be a standing item discussed in November and February annually.