

LTC16D099

Title: *Faculty Learning, Teaching and Quality Committees*
Author: Dawn Goff
Date: 1st March 2017
Circulation: Learning and Teaching Committee – 15 March 2017
Agenda: LTC16A004
Version: Final
Status: Open

Issue

Faculty of Arts and Humanities minutes of LTQC meetings from 11th January 2017

Recommendation

Recipients are invited:
To receive the minutes

Resource Implications

None

Risk Implications

None

Equality and Diversity

N/A

Timing of decisions

N/A

Further Information

Dawn Goff, Coordinator & HUM LTQC Secretary, Arts Hub. Tel: 01603 592157, email: d.goff@uea.ac.uk

Background

Please find attached the confirmed minutes of the HUM LTQC meetings held on the 11th January 2017

Discussion

None

Attachments

Minutes

**UNIVERSITY OF EAST ANGLIA
FACULTY OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES**

Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee

Minutes of the meeting of the HUM LTQC held on 11th January 2017

Present: Professor N Selby (Chair), Dr S Inthorn, Dr J Poppleton, Dr F Costa, Dr J Sharkey, Dr M Gough

Secretary: Miss Dawn Goff (PGT Co-ordinator, Arts Hub)

Apologies for absence: Mr J Tully

In attendance: Dr Clive Matthews, Academic Director of Taught Programmes (ATPG)
Minute 32, Ms Michele Pavey, Mrs J Wilkinson

42. Minutes

Confirmed

The minutes of the meeting held on 9th November 2016 were confirmed subject to an amendment to Minute 36. 1) to reflect the deadline for returning feedback on the 30 day dissertation turnaround proposal was now Friday 13th January.

43. Statements from the Chair

The Chair reported orally on the following;

- 1) QARS: All QAR3s were completed and went to LTC on 25th November. Non-compliance will be reported on all outstanding QAR1's and QAR2's at the LTC meeting on January 25th and we will await the response of LTC.

Resolved

The Secretary will arrange for Dr Gough to be provided with a list of QAR1's and QAR2's which are still outstanding for PPL.

- 2) Faculty Executive: A consideration is taking place of MA courses which are attracting low numbers and whether it would be appropriate for some courses to be consolidated. Teaching Directors may therefore be asked by their Heads of School to give an up-date on the current situation with MA courses.
- 3) Informal meetings with Chair and Teaching Directors. Discussed whether Thursdays at 10am would be an appropriate time to hold these meetings during the Spring semester.

Resolved

the Chair will send out meeting invitations to all members.

44. **BIM Consultation Memo**

Considered

Questions below from Caroline Sauverin, Head of LTS, on the proposal to allow compensation under BIM:

Compensation for Finalists

Q1 *Do you agree with the principle of compensation between modules for final-year students who have met a minimum set of criteria or do you think that students should be required to pass all modules?*

Q2 *Should there be an expectation that students should achieve at least the pass mark for the whole stage to be eligible for compensation, or should the stage aggregate mark be set at a point higher than the pass mark (if so, what?)*

Q3: *Should the amount of compensation be restricted to a certain number of credits and/or number of modules and what should that number be? For example, if compensation were restricted to 20 credits (and 100 credits had to be passed), would that mean students doing a 30-credit or 40-credit module could not be compensated in that module? If it were restricted to one module, would that mean two students with the same academic achievement may be treated differently e.g. one had failed three module totalling 60 credits (not compensated) and the other had failed one 60-credit module (was compensated)?*

Q4: *Should a minimum mark be obtained in the failed module to be eligible for compensation, and if so, what would you suggest would be an appropriate threshold? (BIM regulations already allows for prevention of an automatic right to reassessment in any module with a mark of 20% or below in Year 2 and beyond; a mark of 30% or 35% would be more of a 'near miss').*

Q5: *Would it be appropriate to make compensation compulsory for those modules/students meeting the criteria, in the absence of extenuating circumstances. i.e. that compensation would be applied at first sit, and there would be no right to reassessment in the compensated module. (This would encourage finalists to graduate with their cohort, and get into the job market as soon as possible).*

Compensation at level 4 (Year One)

Q6: *Do you agree that compensation should be allowable at the end of Year One (level 4)?*

Q7: *If so, would any of the parameters as set out in Q2-5 be different? For example, the threshold mark may be higher; if a mark of 20% was required for finalists, it may be appropriate for it to be at least 35% in the preceding years, to ensure that students are not disadvantaged by not passing the module. (This could be in terms of transcript, but more importantly perhaps in terms of attaining the learning outcomes of the module to prepare them for the next year of study).*

Q8 *Should any compensation awarded in non-final years be capped, so that there is a total maximum credit/number of modules that any student can be compensated in? How would this be managed across the years?*

Compensation at level 3 (Foundation Year)

Q9: *If your School delivers courses with foundation years, what is your opinion about passing all modules at level 3? Could this be managed through judicious use of 'core' if all modules were required to be passed?*

Compensation at Honours-level progressing years

Q10: *Do you agree that compensation should be allowable at the end of level 5 and 6 (for integrated masters?) If yes, what eligibility criteria would be appropriate?*

- 44.1 In discussion on Question 1 'Do you agree with the principle of compensation between modules for final-year students' the Chair noted that with the introduction of the BIM regulations UEA was now out of line with most other institutions. There was no full agreement from the members in response to this question but a general consensus that they were happy to consider this as a way forward as long as there was clear guidance on compensation.
- 44.2 For Question 2 the members agreed that there should be an expectation that students should achieve at least the pass mark for the whole stage to be eligible for compensation.
- 44.3 For Question 3 'Should the amount of compensation be restricted to a certain number of credits and/or number of modules' the members agreed that the maximum compensation should be 30 credits in the final year and 20 credits in all other years.
- 44.4 For Question 8 'Should any compensation awarded in non-final years be capped, so that there is a total maximum credit/number of modules that any student can be compensated in?' the members queried what would happen given the years are weighted differently (40-60).
- 44.5 For Question 9 'If your School delivers courses with foundation years, what is your opinion about passing all modules at level 3?' the members agreed that it was important that students passed all modules. However in the event that a student failed a language module, which is not an essential component to any HUM Foundation degree programmes, there should be the ability to seek a concession to allow students to progress.
- 44.6 Additional comments on Question 9 were also received after the meeting by Stephen Bennett, HUM PGT Director and tutor on the HUM Foundation programme. Stephen agreed with the view of LTQC but added that he supported also allowing optional modules in the non-progression subject Spring semester module to be condoned or compensated because the Foundation Year is interdisciplinary and is all about trying a range of subjects out. The current BIM regulations disadvantage students who would like to experiment or stretch themselves by studying a new language or other

previously unfamiliar subject, and encourage 'playing it safe' at a time (Level 3) which is perhaps the ideal one of all undergraduate years to conduct such experimentation.

45. **B2. Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey**

Considered

School's provisional responses to Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey results

Resolved

that as the deadline for Schools to submit their reports is 28th February Teaching Directors will ensure that PGT Teaching Directors are aware of this deadline and provide a progress report at the next HUM LTQC on 15th February.

46. **TEF Preparedness Meetings**

To consider

An oral report from the AMA and HIS Teaching Directors, to reflect on their experiences of the TEF Preparedness meeting.

46.1 AMA: Dr Inthorn reported that it had been important that the key role holders in the School were present because they had an overview of the strengths and weaknesses within the School. Overall it had been a very useful and supportive process as the School felt that they had been listened to and they had then received the recommendations from that meetings quite quickly. Dr Inthorn concluded by saying that she would recommend other Schools to encourage all their staff to attend even if they are not key role holders.

46.2 HIS: Dr Sharkey said colleagues had been nervous but it was a positive experience as it gave the School a chance to reflect on what they do well and get some constructive feedback. Dr Sharkey also noted that the report they received following the event was really useful with some good recommendations.

Resolved:

Ms Pavey, in her capacity as secretary to the TEF preparedness meetings, will ask for clarification on the deadlines for completing action plans, ensure priority tasks are highlighted and how and when Schools need to report back.

47. **Module and Course Up-date**

To consider

School progress on module and course up-date.

Dr Inthorn raised the issue of ARM having a much earlier deadline than LTS for advertising course information and asked whether it was possible for the LTS and ARM deadlines to be the same moving forward.

Resolved:

Ms Pavey will liaise with colleagues in ARM to discuss the issue of differing deadlines.

48. Update from Dr Clive Matthews on his agenda as Academic Director of Taught Programmes

Received:

An oral report from the Academic Director of Taught Programmes

48.1 Dr Matthews advised the committee that in the short to medium term he would focus on embedding and reviewing existing policies/procedures. At the end of his tenure as Academic Director of Taught Programmes he wants to see movement towards: research based teaching, Group teaching and improved feedback to students.

48.2 Dr Matthews asked the committee what they would like to see developed over the next three years and the following issues were raised:

- The growing administrative responsibilities of Teaching Directors;
- Communication across the University & a lack of understanding between the Schools and the central administration of the pressures each faces;
- Lack of recognition for teaching excellence
- Collaborative learning; involving students in the process.

49. Revised Course Proposal Process

Considered

The role of the Faculty/school administration in supporting the revised course proposal process.

49.1 The Chair up-dated members on the new process and explained that assignment of risk now comes to him as Associate Dean (Learning and Teaching) for HUM.

49.2 The members were asked by the Chair to consider whether it was appropriate for ARM to have the veto for any new course proposals. Members expressed concern about ARM having this power so Ms Pavey clarified that due to the high number of course closures in recent years ARM need to be consulted during the first stage of the progress to ensure there is a market for new courses. The Chair asked if this could be clarified in the guidance documentation because it was currently not clear.

Resolved

Ms Pavey to ask for the flow chart in support of the new course proposal process to be up-dated to reflect when ARM need to be consulted.

50. I ♥ Arts and Humanities

Considered

The Faculty guidance document on the I ♥ Arts and Humanities action plan for 2017-8.

50.1 The Chair advised members that as a result of feedback from Schools Transition week in September 2017 will only be for 1st years and PGT students. Transition events for 2nd and 3rd year students will therefore need to be arranged at appropriate times later in the academic year.

50.2 Members were also advised to consider what peer-to-peer initiatives they could run in their Schools.

51. **Week 13 Teaching**

Dr Inthorn wanted to note the difficulty of week 13 teaching with regards to setting deadlines for coursework which still allow academics to meet the LTS deadline for marks to be returned in time for June exam boards.

52. **Blackboard access**

It was noted that LTS currently don't have access to all module Blackboard sites so cannot access module outlines to collect assessment submissions data.

Resolved

The Chair will contact Alicia McConnell, Head of Learning Technology, to ask for LTS staff to have access to all module Blackboard sites for HUM.