

LTC17D183

Title: *HUM LTQC*
Author: Lorraine Newark
Date: 17 May 2018
Circulation: LTC – 20 June 2018
Agenda: LTC17D006
Version: Final
Status: Open

Issue

Faculty of Arts and Humanities minutes of LTQC meetings from 14 February 2018

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

Lorraine Newark, Coordinator & HUM LTQC Secretary, Arts Hub. Tel: 01603 592157, email: l.newark@uea.ac.uk

Background

Please find attached the confirmed minutes of the HUM LTQC meeting held on the 14th February 2018.

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 Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee held on 14th February 2018

Present: Professor N. Selby (Chair), Dr M. Gough (PPL), Dr J Sharkey (HIS), Dr T. Karshan (LDC), Ms M. Colledge (Postgraduate Education Officer uea|su), Jo Caulfield (uea|su representative)

Secretary: Miss L. Newark

In attendance: Ms L Cosham (HUM School Manager Representative), Ms M. Pavey (LTS, Arts Hub Manager), Mr J. Tully (HUM, Senior Faculty Manager), Amanda Harries (HUM Project Officer)

Apologies for absence: Dr F. Costa (HUM), Thomas Howard (HUM Faculty Convenor)

59. MINUTES

To confirm: Minutes of the meeting held on 10 January 2018. Copy held on the HUM LTQC Blackboard site.

59.1 External Examiner reports

Discussed

Committee responsibilities for scrutiny of reports

RESOLVED: To pick up during informal meetings with the Chair, Nick Selby (NS) and Teaching Directors

60. MATTERS ARISING NOT COVERED ON THE AGENDA

60.1 Implications of strike action

TK raised this in relation to module briefings for continuing students. He advised that LDC would normally give the briefing in week 8 and carry out one-to-ones in week 9. Under the current proposals week 8 just has Friday which is not a strike day and week 9 has none

TK asked about moving the briefings and the online module enrolment process.

MP responded that she would ask Andrea Blanchflower as there are contingency plans and that to move dates could be problematic in terms of being able to schedule and timetable students in a timely way.

JS advised HIS have booked theirs for the Friday of week 8 and will record it as it will clash with teaching. JS also explained that the school compiles a guide of how to enroll which goes alongside the session that goes on Blackboard too.

RESOLVED: MP to talk with Dr Blanchflower, Director of LTS, and NS will keep in contact.

60.2 E-marking

NS confirmed that at LTC the principle of having a comprehensive approach to e-marking was agreed. There will be a consultation with academics and then an implementation plan will go to Associate Deans for review and scrutiny.

SECTION A: ITEMS FOR REPORT

61. Statements from the Chair

Received:

61.1 New format of meeting papers

The agenda is now an online version on Blackboard, along with the meeting papers. In response to the Student Union's request we aim to have more information about each item together with supporting papers, available in advance of the meeting,

The Chair (NS) and Secretary will monitor how this method works going forward.

61.2 Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) pilot

NS advised that the pilot is moving along and that the draft of the faculty subject submission appears later in the agenda. NS stated he would like to express thanks to Matthias Neumann and the Teaching Directors who have been involved in writing the statements.

61.3 Teaching Excellence plans (TEP)

These have now been made available with pre populated data to Heads of School. Drafts due to be submitted by end Feb).

Next steps:

The TEP's then become part of a process which will be reviewed in LTQC.

- Having the TEP's discussed in this way provides a formal record so Schools can refer to it in TEF statements.
- The Associate Deans, in consultation with students are to help with planning.

MC asked how the Faculty is approaching getting students involved in the process. NS explained there has been consultation part of which is to discuss in LTQC and that he believed Matthias Neumann had spoken with Staff Student Liaison Committees (SSLC's) within the Schools too.

NS advised that TEPs will involve students in the discussions around teaching plans and what works best.

61.4 Module outlines

TD's to be reminded of those outstanding.

RESOLVED: Secretary to circulate

61.5 QARs outstanding

2016/17 QARS still to be submitted have been escalated to the TD's and Heads of School.

61.6 Postgraduate low recruiting courses

NS advised that PGT courses recruiting fewer than 11 students are coming back under focus.

RESOLVED: NS will start discussion about these with schools.

SECTION B: ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND ACTION

63. National Student Survey

Received

A reminder that the NSS is now open, to use the slides and ask colleagues to encourage students to complete the survey.

NS also included Sarah Barrow email reminding of 5 key points from Neil Ward

64. Exemplars

Received: Oral Presentation from Jeremy Schildt regarding work the service has been doing with schools on exemplars

Jeremy introduced the approach that has been developed and some findings from using that.

The approach has two main features – first, a blended approach. Making use of exemplars in class facilitated to formulate discussion followed by online tutorials teaching how to deconstruct a text. Main points discussed:

- Found it was helpful to take small paragraphs / excerpts and using two or three examples. To show choices and possibilities rather than mandating this is how it should be done. It should be process of showing rather than telling.
- Putting student in role of marker or reader.
- To explore how such exemplars might be used in one's own approach.

Also, in class, invited students to respond using clickers to statements at beginning or workshop and end to get idea of impact. This was found to be the most surprising and useful element of the project.

The work has found that there seems to be benefit of providing short videos, after working in class, to go through what was discussed. Particularly so when catering for large cohorts. Feedback was that those that found it difficult in sessions enjoyed being able to go back in their own time over the session. Also noticed it enabled the students to revise and refresh when it came to work on their own assignments.

3 questions were asked before the approach was used and after:

1. Marking criteria seems clear
2. I understand what lecturers expecting from assignment
3. I feel confident in this assignment

This process saw increases in confidence as they could see how the cohort voted, and it opened up a dialogue amongst the group.

JS stated that they found asking the questions so useful would even suggest using on their own in order to open up the conversation.

He offered opportunity to chat further with schools that were interested in getting involved.

NS commented that he was struck that at the heart of this is engaging and getting a conversation going and how academics can feed into those conversations. He mentioned that there was a positive impact on workload. JS: responded that PSY advises that they found there was a difference in the qualitative queries and quantity of them after this process. The queries received were more thought through.

NS remarked that schools need to be talking with Jeremy about this. JS advised he has been working with schools in different ways and that his involvement can be anything from troubleshooting to co-delivery. There are a number of workshops already in the timetable designed to address assessment which could include this. Ultimately thinking about it at programme level but initially identifying a module where it might be best would be the best starting point.

RESOLVED: TD's start identifying areas within courses where would be beneficial and get in touch with Jeremy.

65. HUM Workload Model review

Received:

Notes provided by Amanda Harries:

Theme suggested/ emerged	Details on themes noted in conversations.
Green Book	<p>Review of Green Book keeps being delayed. How secure is the Workload model review, as it reflects current Green Book? There is a risk that the model may need to be modified in the future – the standard employment terms and conditions are also being referenced to help mitigate this risk.</p> <p><i>[Review will document Green Book issue and flag with Linda Cole and Sarah Barrow to see if any detail/nuance needs to be added.]</i></p>
Student perspective	<p>Two different issues raised with regards to Masters Supervision:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PGT – support over Summer 2. Purported access to academic staff not matching reality (data

Theme suggested/ emerged	Details on themes noted in conversations.
	<p>to be shared by MC). PhD students supervising in some cases. <i>[JT has asked Nick Garforth to check PGT supervision allocations as part of the review actions.]</i></p> <p>It was noted that the model has to find ways to capture increased workload in Summer.</p>
Wider HE Context	<p>The variety of work that academics are expected to do is increasing and this is increasing workloads and workload pressures. Any effect on students is symptomatic of these wider pressures.</p>
Framework principles/ approach	<p>Avoid too much granularity. The workload framework is a model and should not be a one-to-one map of reality.</p>
Operational teaching planning/ over- administration	<p>It's not clear how teaching hours relates to staff time.</p> <p>Software doesn't speak to timetable. Until very recently, Teaching Directors did not have access to the software but need to populate teaching timetable. Can the datasets be linked? Can timetable information be pre-populated?</p> <p>The Seminar Group numbers don't relate in WLM to anything on timetable – meaningless information.</p> <p>Now that Teaching Directors have access to the software, training is required.</p>
PGT Supervision	<p>PGT supervision varies between Schools – the model sets a minimum but this is not being used consistently. How many hours are allocated?</p>
Teaching intensity variation	<p>How hours in classroom translate into support hours needs careful consideration. Do more variables need included? For example, more weighted for Early Career Researchers or new modules?</p> <p>Module Organisers get no credit for this but it's a considerable proportion of workload. Need clarity on how many hours a week they're working.</p>

66. Teaching Excellence Framework

Received: TEF Draft Model B
NS asked if there were any comments or suggestions.

MC stated that she thought it is fair, in a positive way, and that the report is very reflective. Statements are supported by data. The committee was in agreement.

RESOLVED: NS will follow up with Thomas Howard for feedback in his role as the HUM faculty convener.

SECTION C: ONGOING ITEMS FOR REGULAR REPORT

- 67. Course Approvals, Course Title Changes and Course Closures in HUM, 2017/8.
Held in folder C1 within meeting papers for this meeting on Blackboard**
None for this meeting
- 68. Items for report/discussion from Faculty Appeals and Complaints Panel meetings**
None for this meeting
- 69. Items for report/discussion from Teaching Committees**
None for this meeting
- 70. Items for report/discussion from Learning and Teaching Service**
None for this meeting
- 71. SSLC Minutes: Matters arising from SSLCs**
None for this meeting, copies of minutes held on the HUM LTQC Blackboard site.
- 72. Employability**
None for this meeting
- 73. Undergraduate and Postgraduate External Examiner Reports and School Responses**
To note:
Undergraduate and Postgraduate External Examiner reports and School responses (these are on the HUM LTQC Blackboard site in the External Examiners tab)
- 74. I ♥ Arts and Humanities**
None for this meeting
- 75. Date of next meeting**
16 May 2018

