

LTC17D010

Title: *Faculty Undergraduate Annual Course Monitoring School Summary Reports (QAR3) 2016/17: Matters for University Level Consideration*

Author: Michele Pavey

Circulation: LTC – 18 October 2017

Agenda: LTC17A001

Version: Final

Status: Open

Issue

As part of the University's current Internal Quality Assurance process Schools report to Faculty LTQCs on the outcome of the annual review of courses. Within this Schools are invited to highlight issues for University wide consideration.

This year, the Secretary to LTC has scrutinised the QAR3s and identified University wide issues raised for consideration that are within the remit of LTC and proposed the most appropriate forum for these matters to be considered.

Recommendation

Recipients are invited to consider issues arising from 2016/17 annual course review for Schools in HUM and SSF and the proposed actions for addressing matters raised.

Resource Implications

N/A

Risk Implications

N/A

Equality and Diversity

No specific issues.

Further Information

Michele Pavey (M.Pavey@uea.ac.uk) x 2097

Attachments

Key issues arising from the annual course monitoring process for University wide consideration from HUM and SSF.

**Undergraduate Annual Course Monitoring 2016/17: Matters for University Level Consideration
HUM and SSF Schools**

School	Issue identified	Proposed action
AMA	Field trips and placements in the School need to be supported by dedicated administrative roles and there should be a clear role description and workload attached	Refer to HUM Exec
LDC	<p>Module enrolment process is cumbersome and time consuming for academic staff, particularly allocating students onto different modules when their choices are over- subscribed modules</p> <p>The School are still unhappy with LTS's policy of holding back all student work on large team-taught modules until every marker has returned their work. If even a single marker is late, for whatever reason, all the work is returned late, students are unhappy, NSS scores go down, and recruitment suffers. This really isn't an issue the university can afford to ignore.</p>	<p>LTS lead on Module Enrolment to discuss with Head of the Student Admin Systems</p> <p>Refer to the Coursework Working group</p>
Various HUM Schools	Consistently low response rates for student module evaluations	Refer to the Internal Quality Audit group (IQA). HUM Schools are encouraged to use in-class mid semester evaluation.
HUM Associate Dean (L&T) on behalf of LTQC	The Internal QA system needs reviewing and streamlining or replacing	Refer to IQA group
ECO	<p>Various issues around the reassessment process including tight timescales for marking and students taking reassessment overseas</p> <p>Issues concerning recent restrictions to module design aiming to evidence compliance with CMA regulations - The School embraced the recent change in regulations concerning module design and capillary monitoring is already in place.</p>	<p>Refer to the LTS Assessment and Quality Manager and LTS Managers</p> <p>Refer to Head of LTS (Quality)</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - However, in a period of rapid change and increased competition in the HE sector, the School is concerned that compliance with this restrictive regulations will impinge on its ability to conduct agile change, and adapt to the needs and the requests of the student body, with domino effect on KIS indicators. - The School wishes to emphasize that these regulations will hinder its ability to implement changes planned in its Employability Action Plan in a swift manner. The formulation of an ambitious TEF Preparedness Action Plan will also be hindered by restriction to change that it is seen as essential to enhance the student experience as well as teaching effectiveness. - The School suggests that these rules should be re-examined to find a solution that satisfies CMA compliance, but enables swifter change. One suggestion could be making use of student representation in SSLCs and Teaching Committees to facilitate and speed up the process of revision of teaching and assessment practices in the direction suggested and agreed with the students. 	
LAW	<p>Remaking requests for summative assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the procedure fails to take into account that the first marker and moderator are the subject specialists and that the School may not have a third member of faculty who is able to competently comment on the assessment - external examiners are not notified that results which they have agreed are being altered following a remark, even when the student paper in question may have been included in the sample sent to the external examiner (a third specialist in the area – in which case, why allow the student to ask for a 4th person to mark the paper when the mark has been agreed by three separate, competent people?) 	Refer to the Academic Director of Taught Programmes (ADTP)

	<p>Unconscious bias in Student evaluations/surveys</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The university continues to use student module evaluations and other student surveys but is not addressing the unconscious gender and ethnic bias which studies have shown are reflected in student evaluations of teaching staff 	<p>Refer to the ADTP and Head of Equality and Diversity for further consideration</p>
General	<p>Some Schools have expressed concerns working/interactions with the Hubs.</p> <p>Some Schools have expressed concerns about timetabling and rooms</p>	<p>Refer to LTS Managers</p> <p>These concerns are regularly reviewed by the Learning Spaces Group and the Teaching and Learning Spaces Working Group</p>