

LTC15D208

Title: *SSF LTQC Minutes*
Author: Heather Reynolds
Date: 20/6/16
Circulation: LTC – 6 July 2016
Agenda: LTC15A007
Version: Final Version
Status: Open

Issue

To receive the Minutes of the SSF LTQC meeting held on 20 April 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 20.4.16

**UNIVERSITY OF EAST ANGLIA
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**

SSF LTQC 15M006

Minutes of a meeting of the SSF LTQC held on Wednesday 20 April 2016, commencing at 1400, in TPSC 2.24.

Academic Members:

Ratula Chakraborty (Chair)
Ed Anderson (DEV)
James Watson (ECO)
Lee Beaumont (EDU)
Claudina Richards (LAW) arrived at 1500 B5
Naresh Pandit (NBS)
Neil Cooper (PSY)

Student Members:

Amber Watson (SU Faculty Convener for Education)
Tony Moore (UUEAS)
James Merewood (SU Faculty Convener for Engagement) arrived at 1500 B5

With:

Heather Reynolds (Secretary)

Apologies:

Jeanette Cossar (SWK)
Connor Rand (SU Academic Officer – Undergraduate Representative)
Liam McCafferty (SU Academic Officer - Postgraduate Representative)
Becky Fitt (LTS Manager)

AGENDA

1. MINUTES AND ACTION PLAN

Confirmed: The Minutes of the meeting 24 February 2016

Document 15M005 available online

2. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

1. TALIS - student feedback - Faculty Conveners
 - LIB has a list of UG and PGT modules in each school, how many lists they hold and how many on TALIS: All reading lists LIB has are on TALIS apart from LAW. A lot of the modules though don't have reading lists as far as LIB aware. This may lead to the books not being available in LIB for students. LAW TD explained their situation previously (would prefer not to use TALIS as they wish to ensure that their students develop their research skills by not using TALIS). It is not clear whether LAW students are unhappy with this situation but in order to

help 'level the playing field' suggest at least LAW core textbooks should be put on TALIS. LAW TD will take this matter to their Teaching Day and suggest, in order to help LIB (driving factor), links to recommended key textbooks. LAW databases not compatible. QAA and Joint Statement for academic requirements - finding materials and retrieving are clear benchmarks. Materials used on very specific databases and training provided on how to find them. Law firms expect students to use the two or three main databases. Employability not helped by providing links. LAW students need to understand why the School is not using TALIS. There appears not to be a link with the reading list/module outline/LIB.

- LIB Officers within schools will be asked to liaise with each other and the LIB to share best practice and ensure process in place for the future.
- Each school will follow up with LIB (Carly until July) to see which modules have not provided reading lists.

- RESOLVED:**
- (i) TDs to liaise with their Library Officers to encourage sharing of best practice with each other and LIB.
 - (ii) TDs to ensure Library Officers liaise with LIB to arrange reading lists for each of their modules.
 - (iii) LAW TD will discuss within School, creating links to recommended key textbooks on TALIS.

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

- NSS statistics – encourage students to complete.
- Noted LAW experienced a problem again with system being down when students had an opportunity to complete it. None of the final year students on four year programmes have been included in NSS. Two students currently on YA are scheduled to complete NSS together with some withdrawn students. Some students appear not to be scheduled to complete NSS but they should be.
- PTES open to 16 June.
- Peer Observation – stats circulated. Rolling 2 year period. All staff included in numbers, even those that are not applicable. Needs amendment.
- Joint Honours – smooth induction etc. for all students needs to be given attention.
- PPE – (PPL and ECO) arrangement to draw students together in future so they see who is on their course. Rooms in Union House can be used.
- CW turnaround. Attention to this please. Marks not to be awarded for engagement.
- Support between assessment and reassessment – will be revisited late this academic year once semester completed.
- Workshops Duncan running – encourage colleagues to attend.

- 3 – 5 modules in each school to have learning technologist to help MOs develop modules.

- RESOLVED:**
- (i) TDs to feedback by end of April as to which modules in each School will use learning technologist to help MOs develop modules.
 - (ii) TDs to pursue students to complete NSS.

A.2 LTC UPDATE

LTC draft minutes following meeting on 16 March 2016 (document available online).

The following actions were agreed:

1. Minute 95: Student Surveys- Working group to prepare for the changes to NSS
Becky Price and Helena Gillespie
2. Minute 99:
 - i) Course Monitoring and Review - proposals on presenting good practice and University wide issues to LTC **Jon Sharp**
 - ii) Ensure consideration of CR3 and QAR3 reports are standing items on FLTQC agendas **Associate Deans (L&T) and FLTQC Secretaries**
3. Minute 100: Minor Amendments to Academic Appeals and Complaints Regulations- what is driving the increase in the number of academic appeals being submitted? **Jon Sharp**
4. Minute 101: MRes- dedicated MRes regulations to be written **Vivien Easson & Nick Watmough**
5. Minute 106: Proof Reading Guidance- to be amended as outlined in the minute **Adam Longcroft/Michele Pavey**

A.3 TPPG

Nothing to report

A.4 FACULTY APPEALS & COMPLAINTS COMMITTEE

Report for February and March 2016 available to view online

A.5 PERIODIC COURSE REVIEW 2015/16

Course Review documentation 2015/16 can be found in the Course Review folder on the 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

Document available to view online

A.6 ANNUAL MONITORING

DEV PGT QAR 3 Completed (available online)

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

Annual Course Review (Guidance Notes 4 & 5)	Standard PGT Timeline
Deadline for completion of Exam Boards	30/11/2015
Email 4 to CDs to complete QAR2 Stage 2	02/12/2015
CD to complete QAR2 Stage 2	16/12/2015

Email 5 to TD to complete QAR2 Stage 3	16/12/2015
TD to complete QAR2 Stage 3	13/01/2016
Deadline for completion of Course Monitoring QAR2 form	13/01/2016
Email 6 to TD to complete QAR3 Stage 1	13/01/2016
TD to complete QAR3 Stage 1	27/01/2016
Email 7 (FLTQC Sec) to AD to complete QAR3 Stage 2	27/01/2016
ADs to complete QAR3 Stage 2	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

None to consider

B.2 CHANGES TO EXISTING PROGRAMMES

None to consider

B.3 EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORTS/RESPONSES

Detailed in Section D of this agenda.

No issues for the attention of SSF LTQC to report.

B.4 SSLC UPDATES – FACULTY CONVENORS

None to report.

B.5 NEW COURSE PROPOSAL PROCESS (SFM Eve Dewsnap)

- David Stephens AD SCI leading
- Aim: simplify process and make faster.
- UEA large organisation which is risk averse.
- Currently using one cumbersome form.
- New process uses a short form in the first instance where key stakeholders may be able to input - particularly useful if the initial idea is not worthwhile. This ensures minimum wasted work undertaken.
- Complete process takes 3 years. From the initial idea to marketing of course takes 18 months.
- Printed prospectus is driving this timetable. Could be much quicker if this is uncoupled. ARM adamant that the prospectus is a valuable marketing tool. An electronic prospectus might be more accessible.
- Is there a disadvantage to bringing in a course prior to it being marketed in a prospectus?
- Noted that there were only two academic members on the working group (Chair and Rob Grant) – low level of academic engagement in a process which is initiated and led by academics.
- Application forms still appear to be complicated which might stop interest in creating courses.
- Emphasis on sound business case for new courses. School Manager plays a key role in helping to steer an application through. Forms will be web based with some pre-population. Admin staff within schools will help academic colleagues with forms and process.

- Flow chart with timeframes – SFM will distribute to members. For example, start of process to prospectus takes 11 months.
- Important that stakeholders engage with the process in a timely way.
- High risk categories include YA for instance – Rob Grant was the sole voice against this.
- Concern that category 1 might not seek student representation.
- Would expect SSLC and School TC to consider any proposal prior to it being considered by any other department. Ideas for new courses usually discussed within schools over a period of time. Would expect academic soundness to be agreed prior to any further consideration being given.
- There is an argument for the financial case to be considered sound prior to any further action. Agreed that the idea would be considered within a school but detail would come later.
- Approval by schools – relevant process within school which may vary from school to school.
- Suggesting there needs to be a stronger sense of the school's input.
- It might be more useful if a lot of people are consulted at a very early stage where less investment has been made in the idea. Consultation in parallel, with SSLCs also.
- CP4 – level of detail required – for instance employability strategy – being asked to cut and paste from strategy already available in School. This form appears far more complicated. Copy and pasting just to provide info which is not helpful.
- Feeling of lack of trust in respect of schools where they are being asked to follow this process. Schools already have structures in place to give full thought and consideration to ideas for courses.
- Congratulations to the working group for working on this – vitally important.
- Need a sense of where the ideas of the working group have come from.

RESOLVED : Flow chart with timeframes – SFM will distribute to members.

Document 15D026 available online

B.6 STUDENT MODULE EVALUATION

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

- Students appear happy to do this in lectures (sometimes staff member will review previous year's comments and feedback on these which motivates students to complete the evaluation).
- Key is how evaluation is used.
- Take care when looking at data – some module numbers small. Greater response rate provides better validity of response.
- Module evaluations in week 12 might not be taken up as students may have other commitments.

RESOLVED : TDs to encourage colleagues to pursue students to complete. It might be helpful for those with low response to buddy up with those with good response to share best practice.

Document 15D027 available online

B.7 PILOT OF INDIVIDUALISED FEEDBACK ON EXAMINATIONS

This item was deferred to June meeting.

Document 15D028 available online

B.8 ELECTRONIC EXAMINATIONS – ALICIA McCONNELL (1510)

Practicalities and possible solutions

This item was deferred to June meeting.

B.9 LEARNING /TRAINING NEEDS – ADAM LONGCROFT (1530)

- CSED offering – academic development workshops.
 - (a) Compliance and regulatory training
 - (b) Innovation, pedagogical practice, building excellence and practice into learning.
- Academic engagement in this has tailed off.
- Learning needs and priorities of staff key to improving this situation.
- Format, needs for the future (face to face, blended or flipped). Some courses run at inappropriate times. Enrichment week might be a good opportunity as there will be minimal teaching. Outside of teaching time might be good for some but some colleagues could be researching.
- CSED website can be difficult to navigate.
- Appraisal training – online training does not fulfil the need.
- Sometimes courses only offered a couple of times a year and usually at the same time each year so somebody wanting to do a particular course may never be able to. Offering on different days/times suggested.
- Printed catalogue – electronic catalogue would be most helpful.
- Potential taking of academic colleagues away from enrichment week? No, very few will be contributing to enrichment week. This week focussing entirely on students. This week will provide flexibility for academic colleagues.
- Sessions cross long periods – keeping them to bitesize might enable better attendance. Some topics very difficult to contain in a short session.
- Flip delivery might help – dedicated BB site for every course. Blended approach helpful. Face to face more difficult.

- Personnel – sometimes colleagues feel session not very valuable as the person taking the session isn't sufficiently knowledgeable. Some colleagues in schools very experienced and might be best placed to lead some CSED sessions recommended by TDs. Some of these are already in place.
- Evaluation data received and ADTP reads this. Exceptionally positive feedback on the whole for his sessions. Less positive on sessions where we have outside providers delivering on non-academic type content.
- Online learning for compliance type courses available. A lot of refresher online training also available.
- Three hour introduction course for new colleagues will be available next year. All the basics will be covered and should prove very helpful.
- Workload may prevent colleagues from undertaking courses.
- Maintaining and updating training and coping with day to day tasks need to be balanced.
- University needs a strong commitment and bolder position to CPD for academic colleagues.
- Critical to get message out to colleagues to input and feedback to ADTP on any aspect of this subject.
- Teaching enhancement team could be useful to parachute in to help new academic colleagues.
- CSED could provide tailored responsive demand led support for schools.

- RESOLVED:** (i) When colleagues experience poor workshops please report to ADTP or Head of CSED.
- (ii) Critical to get the message out to colleagues that they should input and feedback to ADTP on any aspect of this subject.

B.10 FLTQC HANDBOOK

- Secretary welcomes any comments.
- Secretary will publish on SSF LTQC BB site (Meeting Papers folder, second item).

Document 15D029 available online

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

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 2013/14 COMPLETED

NBS – Rogers (PGT)

PSY– Cook and Vitkovitch (UG)

EXTERNAL EXAMINERS' REPORTS 2013/14 OUTSTANDING

NBS – Davies (PGT)

EXTERNAL EXAMINERS' REPORTS 2014/15 COMPLETED

LAW – Andreangeli, Ashiagbor, & Syrett (PGT)

EDU – Curtis & Tan (UG)

ECO – Reilly (PGT)

EXTERNAL EXAMINERS' REPORTS 2014/15 OUTSTANDING

DEV – Hurt, Moen & Singal (PGT) – with Task Group Member

DEV - Sanchez-Ancochea (PGT) - with Task Group Member

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

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

LAW - Dow, Gehring (PGT) reports not received

LAW - Reid (PGT) - with Chair

LAW - Nikaki (PGT) - Report received 06/03/16

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

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

NBS - Williams (PGT) – report not received

PSY – Johnston (UG) – with Chair

PSY – Cook (UG) – report not received (External Examiner currently ill)

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

Date of Next Meeting: Wednesday 8 June 2016 1400 - 1600 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.

June 2016

Adam Longcroft 1400 (15 mins) - Future Skills Initiative.

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.