LTC16D069

Title:	***SCI LTQC Minutes***
Author:	Karin Goodby
Date:	13 January 2017
Circulation:	List of recipients
Agenda:	Learning and Teaching Committee – 25 January 2017
Version:	Final
Status:	Open

Issue

To receive minutes of the Faculty of Science Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee meeting held on:

1. 09 November 2016

Recommendation

Recipients are invited to receive the minutes for information.

Resource implications

Not applicable.

Equality and Diversity

Not applicable.

Timing of decisions

Not applicable.

Further information

Contact details: Karin Goodby, Learning and Teaching Coordinator, telephone 01603 593505, email: k.goodby@uea.ac.uk for enquiries about content of the paper.

Background

Not applicable.

Discussion

Not applicable.

Attachments

SCI LTQC Minutes, 09 November 2016

LEARNING, TEACHING AND QUALITY COMMITTEE (LTQC)

Minutes of the meeting held on **Wednesday 09 November 2016 in CMP 2.29.**

Present: David Stevens (Chair), Johannes Siemons (MTH), Anja Mueller (PHA), Mark Coleman (BIO), Paul Dolman (ENV), Nigel Clayden (NAT SCI), Dan Smith (CMP), Ros Boar (TPPG), Laura McGonagle (SCI Senior Faculty Manager), Judith Mayne (Teaching and Related Activities Lab Manager), Lindsay Westgarth (UUEAS SCI Faculty Convenor), and Lauren Kellett (Administrative Assistant, LTS) and Rachel Paley (LTS Hub Manager).

Apologies: Geoff McKeown (CMP), Theo Antoniou-Phillips (UUEAS Academic Officer Undergraduate), David Morales Rodrigues (UUEAS Faculty Engagement Convener), Naomi Carter (UUEAS Research, Policy and Project Coordinator), Madeleine Colledge (UUEAS Academic Officer Postgraduate) and Karin Goodby (Secretary, LTS Coordinator).

A1.   MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Consider
          minutes of the previous meeting held on 21 September 2016 (document A filed in the minute book). Accurate record of the meeting.

Updates and actions from 21 September 2016

Item	Subject	Details
A2	Statements from the Chair (21 Sept)	• **Completed Action:** DS to obtain list of missing reading lists for DLTs to investigate further. • **Action:** Colleagues to send additional requirements and preferences to Sarah Lucas.
A3.1	Statements from members of university groups	• **Outstanding Action:** DS to circulate student handbook proposal when it becomes available. (29 Jun) • **Completed Action:** DS to recommend MC as SCI Faculty Representative**.**
A4	Statements from Student Union Representatives	• **Action:** DS to raise with CTEL.
A5	Improving Student Feedback across Science	• **Outstanding Action:** DS to make reports available to committee members when complete.

		• **Outstanding Action:** DLTs to send any suggestions to DS for other actions or internships to aid enhancement of feedback.
A6.	SCI Faculty Learning/Training Needs (29 Jun)	• **Outstanding Action:** BIO still required to send nomination for training/course leaders.
A7	Clive Matthews Academic Director of Taught Programmes	• **Continuing Action:** Members to email CM examples of best practice. • **Completed Action:** LTS to provide start-of-year timetabling update to DLTs on 22 September.
A8	Improving Student Participation in Module Evaluations (29 Jun)	• **Outstanding Action:** NC to disseminate proposed module evaluation questions at Staff Student Liaison Committees (SSLCs).
A8.	Business Intelligence Unit (BIU) Update on Management Information Supporting	• **Completed Action:** LTS to send current course aggregations, for five yearly reviews, to BIU.
A9.	Changes to Integrated Masters Regulations (29 Jun)	• **Outstanding Action:** Smaller group yet to be convened to discuss Integrated Masters and Year Abroad courses. Laura McGonagle (LM) confirmed this action is urgent and needs to be completed.
A9.	Course Reviews	• **Continuing Action:** DLTs to raise any queries with LTS Coordinator that supports programme.
A10	Module Evaluations and Responses (29 Jun)	• **Outstanding Action:** NC to discuss proposals with Student Staff Liaison Committees (SSLCs) when they arise. • **Outstanding Action:** NC to seek preference of the student body for timing of module evaluations.
A10	Science Faculty's Teaching Strategy	• **Completed Action:** Proposal to be brought to next SCI FLTQC for approval.
A11	Foundation Year Programmes	• **Outstanding Action:** DLTs to review foundation year modules and propose suggestions to DS.
A12	Course Proposals	• **Completed Action:** PD to amend 4.2.8 with appropriate list of overseas universities that are course specific. • **Completed Action:** LM to email PD deadline date for PD to submit proposal in time for LTC. • **Completed Action:** DS to review and confirm approval via Chair's action.

A2.   <u>STATEMENTS FROM THE CHAIR</u>

- Dan Smith (DSM) will be taking over as Teaching Director for CMP at the start of Semester 2.
- David Stevens (DS) will be taking a temporary secondment from the 1st January 2017 for one year, and will return as Associate Dean (AD) in 2018, Ben Milner will return as AD to cover this secondment. DS confirmed that he will continue to chair the Timetabling Working Group and other Working Groups will be assessed on a case by case basis.
- The Taught Programme Policy Group (TPPG) has been suspended for a year on a trial basis with the potential to be abolished, work discussed at the group is disseminated through ad-hoc working groups presently.
- DS has emailed all Teaching Directors (TD) to invite elaboration on National Student Survey (NSS) action plans and bullet points and formalise messages to be sent out to the student body in response to the NSS. Simon Lancaster (SL) has already sent this through. Deadline was 11 November 2016 but Fiona Taylor back in office on 21 November so can all colleagues send this through.
- **Action: TDs to send through action plans and messages for 21 November deadline.**
- Placements Working Group: a new placements working group has formed and SCI needs to send at least two representatives: Year in Industry (YII) representative and Year Abroad (YA) and possible names discussed. Agreed that it would also be helpful for SCI to have a Professional Placement representative from PHA.
- **Action: AM, DSM and PD to send through nominations to DS.**
- Demonstrators: PD raised issues with having a lack of demonstrators able to assist, agreed this was the same for CHE. BIO have a high level of competition and it was discussed whether BIO demonstrators may be able to assist in other schools. Noted that it would be helpful to have a list of each school's demonstrators with their experience and research interests. Laura McGonagle (LM) noted that an 'Expressions of Interest' database already exists and it is School Managers that are responsible for disseminating this information.
- **Action: DLTs to speak to respective School Managers to obtain information.**
- Module Boards: DS asked the committee for their opinions on the removal of Module Boards. AM noted that for PHA Module Boards are irrelevant as everything is done at a course level and mark distributions considered at the Moderation Board. DSM queried whether this would reduce the role of the External Examiner even further also suggesting an integration of the Module Board, Pre-Board and Final Board as a manner of streamlining; other colleagues noted that this would add to an already time-consuming process for Final Boards.
- PD noted that Module Boards form an important part of the Quality Assurance process for ENV as they allow faculty members to discuss triggering modules. Noted that this could happen elsewhere but Module Boards form a prime opportunity.
- Considered that this work could occur at "Moderation Board", but some Schools e.g. ENV and CHE do not have Moderation Boards so not applicable.
- **Action: PD agreed to email Mark Chapman as Chair of Examiners to obtain views and Cc SCI.LTQC@uea.ac.uk**
- Online reading lists- DS noted importance of completing Talis online reading lists, as discussed at 21 September meeting, committee members received lists of outstanding modules, although noted that there are some issues with quality control. Agreed that it is important to publish these lists as it gives the Library an opportunity to purchase e-licences, where outstanding, which gives students the full range of access.

- **Action: DS to distribute Talis outstanding online reading list also via email and to report issues with quality control on outstanding modules.**

A3.   STATEMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF UNIVERSITY GROUPS

A3.1   Timetabling Working Group (attended by Paul Dolman (PD) and DS)
- First meeting of Timetabling Working Group has happened and has been very encouraging, aim is to come together with other faculties to arrange a common approach to slotting of modules.
- Some concerns raised from DSM regarding the slotting of CMP modules, as academics and students have a preference for teaching in daily slots or half days. DS confirmed that all compulsory aspects of modules should be in slot, but events such as labs running simultaneously, whilst one lab has to be in slot the others can be run out of slot.
- PD confirmed that a new slotting system would take into account different school and faculty requirements to try and address these concerns.
- The committee agreed that it was important to modify or change the current slotting system as it was outdated and not fit for purpose, and highlighted the importance of moving towards a universal system that works for all. Whilst this is not always possible for postgraduate it is key for undergraduate to move forward.
- DS highlighted that Nigel Shed (NS) is currently working to have some course profiles looked at and work on the slotting system. DS asked for colleagues to send course profiles of particular importance (e.g. cross-degree programmes) to him so he can forward these to NS.
- RB highlighted some concerns regarding the 'Unslotted' slot used by DEV as this leads to confusion from students as to whether they can take a module without a clash occurring. Agreed that 'U' slot should be for mainly project modules, and this should lead to a lack of clash, but this is not always the case and something that needs to be addressed.

A4.   STATEMENTS FROM STUDENT UNION REPRESENTATIVES

Noted:
- Course Representatives All training for course reps has been completed and new reps seem very enthusiastic.
- Some concerns raised that there are only 60 reps to represent 3000+ students. Lindsay Westgarth planning to meet with officers to try and deduce whether lack of representation is due to lack of support or lack of enthusiasm from students.
- DS questioned whether lack of attendance and engagement was due to heightened contact hours in SCI, LW noted that Student Union (SU) have run two sessions.

A5.   IMPROVING STUDENT FEEDBACK ACROSS SCIENCE

Noted:
- BIO are rolling out a standard proforma in 2016-7.
- PHA have introduced an anonymous feedback box for students to comment on their expectations for feedback. PHA also have an intern working on implementing a "mock project report feedback" document, this is aimed to manage student expectation but also to educate students on what they can, and cannot expect.

- PD raised concerns with students feeling feedback not matching the mock feedback and finding difficulty to speak to supervisor (marking their project) about this discrepancy. AM confirmed that as **MO** students are informed that if they have an issue with their supervisor this issue will be reported to her for her to investigate.
- Effectiveness will be assessed after trial is completed but committee members displayed a positive response to this implementation.
- Noted that if demonstrator budget allowed, it may be possible for demonstrators to assess drafts of student work to provide feedback.
- Members discussed the importance of strategic feedback, with formative feedback being suggested as the most important as it feeds forward. Some disagreement and was noted that summative work can also act as formative pieces to prepare for examinations.
- Formalising standards of feedback was considered pertinent.

A6.   STUDENT MODULE EVALUATIONS

Noted:
- How do we close the loop on student evaluations to provide both feed-forward and feed-backwards commentary?
- Currently significant variation in practice, discussion around how SCI could take a standard approach and what this should be.
- Difference of practice was established, with some MOs choosing to publish on Blackboard (Bb) and other schools collating feedback and publishing on Student Staff Liaison (SSLC) Bb.
- Publishing on Module Bb sites was considered non-optimal as only students who have taken the module can see this (feed-backwards) but may be unlikely to check, and prospective students cannot see as they are not yet enrolled, where this may help otherwise to inform module choices.
- Agreed students will only take module evaluation seriously if colleagues are seen to be being responsive to evaluations and can demonstrate implementation of changes.
- A possible means of publishing was considered by collating School documents and publishing these on the SCI Student Information Zone Bb, this would allow students on joint programmes (e.g. Biochemistry) to access all feedback, and would allow both feed-forward and back. MC raised concerns over students having to explore to find their own school feedback.
- Committee agreed that there must be a closed loop for students making module choices and evaluations informing such choices, this can be problematic as students are utilising feedback from 2014-5 evaluation to inform 2016-7 choices due to the timing of module evaluations and choices. Confirmed that the timing of module evaluations is being discussed, but this will not be implemented in 2016-7.
- DSM raised concerns over modules being locked in a downward spiral, with low rated modules locked in, and students not able to obtain information, due to timing, if positive changes have been implemented (as reflecting on previous year).
- Whilst there is no solid evidence towards module evaluations and responses contributing to student choice, RB noted that when students talk about their experiences at SSLC there is a positive response, but closing loop is integral for feed-forward.

- Lauren Kellett (LK) noted that NBS collate MO responses which is approved by the Head of School before being sent to all students; which allows for feed-forward and back. Committee agreed that this would be a positive move for publishing evaluations. Also suggested evaluation responses could be sent via email and students also linked to SCI Information Zone Bb.
- It was considered whether to include student response numbers, some disagreement whether this would be encouraging or discouraging to students. Noted that if MOs include a comment in their response and lack of deduction due to low numbers this may encourage more students to participate in evaluation.
- MC highlighted disagreement with online modulation evaluation and expressed preference for paper evaluations.
- Concluded that Module Feedback needs to be the most recent – i.e. the current year and student engagement with evaluation responses needs to be trackable (e.g. number of clicks to Blackboard site).

Resolved: LTS to collate MO feedback for 2016/17 into a single document by School in the summer (i.e. the NBS model) and once approved by the Teaching Director, to be published on SCI Student Zone and an email sent to all students with a link to the Blackboard student Zone. RP to liaise with Sarah Lucas over location of the documents on the Student Zone.

A7.   MID-MODULE FEEDBACK

Noted:
- The Union of University of East Anglia Students (UUEAS) are collating a document to represent how many Module Organisers (MOs) engage in mid-module feedback to see if there is a relationship between mid-module feedback and enhanced student satisfaction.
- LW asked the committee for a list of Module Organisers (MOs) who were currently undertaking mid-module feedback reviews. Staff considered this problematic as mid-module feedback is informal by nature and no records are kept.
- Committee members also noted that there are many variables that could lead to positive student satisfaction, in addition to mid-module feedback, diligent MOs are likely to regularly communicate with students and be available for questions, complete mid-module review, etc.
- Agreed that it would be beneficial to UUEAS and interesting for committee to reflect on staff engaging in this process.
- **Action: LTS to ask all MOs to ask if they undertake mid-module feedback simple "Yes/No" response and compile into spreadsheet to report back to LW and SCI LTQC.**

A8.   PEER OBSERVATION

Noted:
- Process is to complete Peer Observation 2 (PO2) and then Peer Observation 3 (PO3) report is completed by AD, BIO and CMP outstanding.
- **Action: MC to send BIO PO2 to SCI.LTQC@uea.ac.uk**
- **Action: DSM to prompt Geoff McKeown (GM) to send CMP PO2.**
- DS noted that ENV Teaching Guide is considered good practice, and it would be beneficial for members to have access to this to spread good practice.
- **Action: PD to disseminate ENV Teaching Guide.**

- DS noted that DLTs had commented on rooming issues in PO2s but he had not done so within the PO3, and that it was considered best practice for faculty members to use other channels to discuss rooming issues.
- DS noted that initially that compliance is 100& within BIO, ENV, MTH and CHE with CMP missing one peer observation; very positive as a faculty.

A9.   SENIOR ADVISER REPORTS 2015-6

Noted:
- Mark Coleman (MC) noted that the Senior Adviser had changed and he would chase this. Anja Mueller (AM) noted she would send through the SA report for PHA.
- **Action: MC and AM to send through SA Report to SCI.LTQC@uea.ac.uk inbox.**
- Members raised concerns that the form only highlighted compliance with practice and did not specify engagement with advisers within schools to draw comments.
- DS noted that the eVision task for Advisee meetings with Tier 4 students was now mandatory and colleagues should be recording this on eVision.
- Members noted that completing the online form often interfered with directly engaging in meaningful conversations with students, and the form only allowed for 250 characters of description, before restarting which was problematic.
- Another glitch within the system occurs when pressing the back button, creating a duplicate report for the student.
- Discussed problems that students can make meetings also, without regard for adviser availability.
- Staff often find it onerous to find out student availability, a direct link to the student's timetable would be beneficial.

A10.   MARKING TIME FOR DISSERTATIONS/PROJECTS

Noted:

- Proposal to introduce 30 day turnaround for projects and dissertations. Agreement to endorse this proposal.
- **Action: secretary to report back to Becky Fitt.**

A11.   SCI LEARNING AND TEACHING STRATEGY

Noted:
- Revised version of SCI Learning and Teaching Strategy is now available, Head of Schools (HOS) will be discussing this next week.
- Deadline for School Strategy is 10 November 2016.
- New Strategy is a combination of UEA existing strategy, UEA's corporate plan, Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) goals and Ben Milner's previous Strategy as AD for SCI.
- Agreed change first line of document to 'educated and employable'.
- **Action: DS to amend SCI Learning and Teaching Strategy document.**

- <u>Generic Exam Feedback -</u> Some concerns were raised regarding the target for generic exam feedback, however, noted that this is current UEA policy and some level will have to be provided. ENV noted that they had received a lot of uptake for individual feedback on exams in 2015-6.
- DS noted that the reasoning behind generic feedback is so that this can then accompany past papers on the LTS website, to enhance student's revision..
- <u>Formative -</u>Concerns also raised regarding the current requirement to set a piece of formative to be submitted and feedback returned within three weeks of the academic year in students' first year. Noted in discussion that the formative work could take many forms, MC noted that in BIO students are set a reflective piece on a paper and textbook comparison. Formative work could be a diagnostic test.
- <u>Peer Assisted Learning (PAL) -</u> Some concerns raised over the continuation of PAL due to mixed reviews, and concerns around funding. LM confirmed that SCI Faculty have already contributed financially to the continuation of PAL. DS confirmed UEA still discussing this. MTH have their own adaptation of PAL and this has been successful within the school, DS confirmed he will share the details of MTH system.
- **Action: DS to disseminate MTH practice with Peer Assisted System.**
- **Action: DS to investigate PAL funding**
- <u>Student Staff Ratio (SSR)</u>
- **Action: DS to liaise with colleagues to confirm effective SSR numbers.**

A12.   <u>COURSE AND MODULE UPDATE</u>

Noted:
- DS checked progress with DLTs, agreed progress being made.

A13.   <u>MONITORING UPDATE</u>

Noted:
- DS encouraged DLTs to chase outstanding items. Noted that efforts to streamline the process will be progressed through a working group once the new Head of Learning and Teaching (Quality) starts in January.

A14.   <u>COURSE PROPOSALS</u>

Noted:
- <u>SCI with EDU –</u> suite of programmes that is coming to LTQC for approval, the new programmes aim to give SCI students a pathway into teaching through two modules in the second and third year that act as placement modules for students to be directly exposed to teaching in the classroom.
- ARM have confirmed they are positive towards the proposal. Concerns raised over accreditation of the BSc in given subject, LM confirmed accreditation will still be possible (e.g. CHE degrees will still be accredited with Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)).
- New proposal should give BSc students an advantage over others into the pathway of a Postgraduate Certificate of Education (PGCE) or other teacher training courses as students will have been directly exposed to teaching in the classroom.

- Concerns also raised regarding the Bursary students may currently receive when they apply for Teacher Training and if the course would affect this financial assistance, DS confirmed students should still be eligible for government bursary. Committee agreed for approval of the proposal.
- **Action: SCI LTQC approval for the proposal to go to Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC).**
- **Action: Secretary to inform Kay Yeoman (KY) of LTC meeting date for preparation.**
- ENV Dual Degree with Ocean University (OU), China – new degree proposal being formulated by **Xiaoming Zhai** (XZ) to create a four year Environmental Sciences degree with dual teaching in China and UEA.
- Provisional course outline suggests one third of teaching will be carried out at OU, with UEA ENV faculty members delivering three-four week modules; all modules will be taught in English.
- Research links with OU should be appealing to faculty members and with recruitment of faculty members, which is expected to be six members of staff. Fifty students are expected to be recruited per academic year, which may raise to 100 dependent on popularity.
- Members raised concerns over the module mapping and mark allocation between the two universities and the importance of getting this correct. Concerns also raised over the delivery of short versus generic modules. Assessment was considered a problematic issue, PD confirmed examinations would form the large amount of assessment and both universities would be expected to carry out dual Examination Boards with members of OU and UEA attending the Board at OU.
- Committee agreed positive proposal, but some concerns will need to be addressed such as: assessment, module delivery, staff recruitment and differences of learning cultures. Also noted that other universities who have adopted this approach such as Queen Mary, who have connections with Chinese Universities have been very successful, and the Chinese Government is very positive towards dual degrees.

A15.   ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Noted:
- No further business.