

**LTC11D062**

**Title:** Faculty Associate Deans (Learning, Teaching and Quality)  
**Author:** Faculty of Science Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee  
**Circulation:** Learning and Teaching Committee – 8 February 2012  
**Agenda:** LTC11A004  
**Version:** Final  
**Status:** Open

---

**Issue**

To receive the minutes of the Faculty of Science Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee meeting held on 8 February 2012.

**Recommendation**

None.

**Resource Implications**

Not applicable.

**Equality and Diversity**

Not applicable.

**Timing of decisions**

Not applicable.

**Further Information**

Contact details: Julia Jones, Project Co-ordinator New Academic Model, telephone: 01603 593528, email: [Julia.jones@uea.ac.uk](mailto:Julia.jones@uea.ac.uk) enquiries about the content of the paper.

**Background**

Not applicable.

**Discussion**

Not applicable.

**LEARNING, TEACHING AND QUALITY COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 8 February 2012 at 2 pm**

---

Present: Dr Ben Milner (Chair), Inga Birzakova (UUEAS Science Faculty Convenor), Dr Ros Boar (ENV), Dr Alan Bond (ENV), Dr Nigel Clayden (CHE), Prof David Evans (MTH), Dr Helen James (BIO), Dr Geoff McKeown (CMP), Dr Adam Longcroft (Academic Director of Taught Programmes), Dr Jenni Turner (ENV) with Julia Jones (Acting Secretary).

Apologies: Dr Martin Loftus, Professor David Wright

---

Welcome and introductions

A1. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING

Considered

the minutes of the previous meeting held on 14 December 2011 (copy filed in the minute book). The minutes were confirmed as an accurate record except that Dr Harriet Jones (not Dr Harriet James) had attended.

*Action points:*

- A2.5 Invitation to Garrick Fincham to attend a future LTQC (to provide guidance and explanation re the Guardian's League tables as per Minute A7, 13 July 2011) would be postponed as upcoming LTQC agendas were very full.
- A4. Chair had written to thank Hub front desk teams.
- A5. The expectation is that NAM module codes will be assigned by LTS.
- A8. The Chair still needed feedback from members on the revised Senate Scale for Science.

A2. STATEMENTS FROM THE CHAIR

Received

statements from the Chair:

- A2.1 CSED was arranging Higher Education Academy critical thinking workshops for staff on 21 March and 18 April 2012.
- A2.2 The Academic Director of Taught Programmes had drafted a new Code of Practice for Placement Learning. The Chair had sent this to Science Faculty Year in Industry Co-ordinators in advance of a SCI Year in Industry meeting to be held on 16 February.

**(Action: Chair to send draft CoP to School DLTs)**

### A3. STATEMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF UNIVERSITY GROUPS

#### Received

Oral reports from members of University groups on matters of interest to the Committee as follows:

- Employability (Nigel Clayden) - nothing new to report
- ISD Education Board (Geoff McKeown) – meeting of 18 January:
  - Virtual Learning Environment, including the possibility of offering guidance on conventions for naming and structuring Blackboard site
  - demo of a tool for uploading reading lists, which had appeared to be very powerful and useful
  - business case for increased mobile access
  - lecture capture
  - decision to set up an IT strategy workshop
- TPPG (Ros Boar) – meeting of 19 January:
  - marking Scale
  - review of Academic Appeals and Complaints
  - Code of Practice on Assessments
  - Code of Practice on Placement Learning
  - allowable costs
  - policy on word counts (is being revised but the new policy will be in place by the end of June)
  - New Academic Model (revised regulations and defined choice)
  - Peer Assisted Learning
  - pedagogy-focused CPD
  - exam feedback
  - use of electronic dictionaries in exams
- Appeals and Complaints Working Group (Nigel Clayden) - The group will meet again after the sub-group on extenuating circumstances has completed its series of meetings.
- New Academic Model (NAM) PGT Working Group – The group had met on 9 January and the ADTP reported that the planned application of NAM principles to PGT programmes was proving to be extremely controversial. There were 2 main areas of contention, and the ADTP asked SCI LTQC members for their views:
  - Requirement to pass all modules – the consensus was that PGT requirements should be the same as UG (although some members did not agree with the principle of passing all modules in the first place).
  - Earning the right to reassessment by means of achieving a module mark of at least 20% (members willing to tolerate this) and at least 80% attendance of monitored sessions (members not supportive).

#### A4. STATEMENTS FROM STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES

Received

an oral report from the Student Union Science Faculty Convenor, Inga Birzakova:

- The Student Union was currently conducting a survey on extra costs to students (including printing costs).

**(Action: IB to bring results of survey to next SCI LTQC)**

- The Student Union (at the request of the School) was currently conducting a survey on feedback in the School of Mathematics, and would be willing to do the same for other Schools. ENV was conducting its own survey and BIO had published research on feedback and student responses to it (details available from Dr Harriet Jones in BIO). Students perceive that the NSS feedback question on feedback only relates to summative assessments, and need to be made aware that it also relates to formative assessments. The consensus of the meeting was that UEA provides good feedback, but it is not always timely for use in feeding forward, and also students are not always aware of what constitutes feedback. The ADTP suggested that Course Directors might consider producing feedback charts detailing when in the year feedback is received, who gives it and what is its purpose. This would enable students to understand what constitutes feedback and how it works on their programme.

**(Action: Secretary to circulate IB's email address to DLTs)**

**(Action: IB to bring results of MTH survey to next SCI LTQC)**

- IB reported that student reps were not liaising sufficiently with their Faculty Convenors and with the SU Sabbatical Officers. The Chair suggested that IB could set up meetings with the Science School level reps.

#### A5. EMPLOYABILITY

Received

an oral report from the Chair on the Employability Executive:

- committee is chaired by Tom Ward and David Richardson, who have ambitious plans to ensure that UEA is in the top 20 universities for Employability by 2017
- initial investment in a new Careers Centre (will be part of REN)
- £2 million per annum investment in Employability until 2015
- buy-out (or possibly buy-in, to recruit the right person) for School Employability Directors, who will be part of the School Executive
- more internships and work experience opportunities for students
- the Chair felt that some of the money might be better spent on outreach and embedded Employability support within the hubs
- IB noted that students reported gaps in the Employability provision, an example being a lack of support for students aiming for careers in scientific research
- The Chair asked each School to consider who would be the best person to appoint as Director of Employability.

an oral report from the Jenni Turner on the ENV Employability module, including:

- teaching of Employability skills
- raising awareness of the skills students have and the skills employers want
- careers fairs
- help with applications, CVs and interviews
- ENV wants to raise the percentage of ENV students going into graduate level jobs from 66% to 75% by 2017
- ENV Employability week (Semester 2 reading week) where students come dressed for work and learn about Employability – this could be adopted University wide
- JT is preparing a matrix with skills taught in modules and how these might relate to job advertisements, person specifications etc
- ENV is piloting the use of Facebook, Twitter, Blackboard etc to advertise jobs and careers events.

***(Action: Chair to find out when the new funding will start)***

#### A6. UG EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORTS

Received

feedback from Directors of Learning and Teaching on their Quality Assurance checking of External Examiner reports and School responses (document B)

- BIO - Chair of Examiners currently collating School responses.
- CHE (reviewed by AB and DE) – School responses good but it would have been helpful if the ‘Action Completed’ column had been completed.
- CMP (reviewed by NC) – there were a number of blanks on the forms and it is recommended that the School writes responses to all comments, including commendations.
- ENV (reviewed by HJ and GMcK) – the External Examiners had been extremely thorough. The School needs to respond to Dr Alan Gadian’s comment on the annotation of examination scripts. It is recommended that the School responds to every point, even where at first sight no response is required. Professor Sandy Steacy mentioned her ‘recommendations for the University’ but there were no recommendations for the University listed on the form.
- MTH – LTS has not yet sent School response pro-formas to the Chair of Examiners.
- NatSci (reviewed by AB and DE) – School responses are fine though the ‘Action Completed’ column was not filled in.
- PHA (reviewed by NC and ML) – the response to Professor Carmel Hughes implies that the School will deny reassessment to any student who fails to submit a project – this is against University regulations. The School had responded to points from Professor Laurence Patterson, for example on vivas and rounding, but had not noted any follow up action to be taken.

***(Action: Chair to discuss the PHA project/reassessment issue with the PHA DLT; Secretary to consult the Head of Learning and Teaching Service (West))***

- There was concern about the procedures for collating and responding to external examiners’ reports:

- reviewers did not receive the original reports, and therefore could not check that all relevant points had been included in the response form
- it was noted that the SSF LTQC received the original reports, the response forms and draft thank you/response letters to the external examiners
- there were blanks on the response forms where a response and a follow up action would be necessary or appropriate
- the process for feeding issues up to University level was unclear

***(Action: Chair to investigate procedure for responding to EEs' reports)***

#### A7. NEW ACADEMIC MODEL (NAM) PROGRESS

##### Received

oral reports from Directors of Learning and Teaching on progress

- BIO – progress on course revision is slow because resolving issues re arrangements for 2012 currently has priority. In years 2 and 3 BIO has modules of at least 20 credits and has already introduced formative assessment and cut down on summative. However, year 1 needs work as there are currently a number of 10-credit level 1 modules.
- CHE – F101 MChem is done and will be used as a model for the other Chemistry courses. Most will be straightforward but Biological and Medicinal Chemistry are more problematic as students take some BIO modules. CHE modules are all 'NAM compliant' in terms of credit value, formative vs summative assessment and learning outcomes
- CMP – still work to be done. All modules are already at least 20 credits, but module organisers are currently thinking about formative assessments, and the programme specifications are awaiting the module outcomes. Actuarial Sciences may be delayed as only one person is working on it. The Chair noted that joint courses (eg the CMP/NBS Business courses) will need special attention. The ADTP agreed, reminding the group that running of UEA's joint courses had been criticised in the 2009 QAA audit (eg lack of liaison).
- ENV – work is going well though ENV has a large number of courses and modules. Year 1 has been redesigned and approved by the School Teaching Executive. All the module outcomes have been collated and incorporated into the main F900 Environmental Sciences specification, which can now be used as a template. Once the information is complete the resulting overview will enable the School to plan and implement further reforms. The School is considering one 'Year Abroad' variant for each programme, rather than separate North America, Australasia and Europe variants.
- MTH – only 5 programmes and 3 of them are very similar. Forms have been submitted though some detail is still to be added. MTH is implementing a redesigned year 1 in 2012, so will need their new year 2 ready for 2013. Years 3 and 4 will not require much modification. Further liaison is needed with NBS with regard to the Mathematics With Business course.
- PHA – the PHA Director of Learning and Teaching was not present.
- Natural Sciences – the NatSci Course Director / Director of Learning and Teaching was not present, but see below.

##### Discussed

issues for NatSci, including timetabling

- The Chair reported that the NatSci programme specification could not be done until the other Schools had completed their work.
- The NatSci degree and the General Science (with a Foundation Year) Course Directors need to know the timetable slots of modules in other Schools, and there is no place to record timetable slot on the pro-forma. ENV and BIO reported that their timetable slots were unlikely to change, though the amalgamation of modules may cause difficulties.

Received

an oral report from the Chair on timescales and process for approval

- Quality Assurance work must be completed in time to present the programme specifications to LTC on 16 May
- LTC Secretary will need them by 27 April (end of week 12)
- Science Faculty to meet to approve w/c 16 April (Easter week 3)
- School Teaching Executives to approve by 30 March (end of week 11)
- The Chair asked that each School provide a short commentary on their philosophy re course design and assessment strategy

#### A8. EMPLOYABILITY AND ENRICHMENT MODULES

Received

an oral report from the Chair

Discussed

plans for SCI employability and enrichment modules

- EEC modules will run from 18h00 – 21h00 on Tuesdays and Thursdays
- 20 credits (or 30 credits for HUM)
- available to year 2 and 3 students
- faculty member to be module organiser, but PGR students or Research Associates could teach
- each School is encouraged to offer one
- SCI LTQC members were not enthusiastic

#### A9. QUALITY OF TEACHING FACILITIES

To receive

oral reports from the Directors of Learning and Teaching

***This item was not discussed due to lack of time – Chair to consult members via email***

#### A10. COURSE RATIONALISATION

To receive

an oral report from the Chair

***This item was not discussed due to lack of time – Chair to consult members via email***

A11. ONLINE MODULE ENROLMENT

Received  
timeline for enrolment for 2012/13 (document C)

***Members received the document for information – no discussion***

A12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS – to close

Received  
Any other business

- The ADTP distributed UEA Summer School leaflets

***(Action: DLTs to inform the Chair if their School wishes to offer a module or an additional module)***

---

**SECTION B: ITEMS FOR REPORT**

No items for report