

LTC11D102

**UNIVERSITY OF EAST ANGLIA  
Faculty of Social Sciences**

**Minutes of the meeting of the SSF LTQC held on Wednesday 7  
March 2012**

**Present:** Mrs Helena Gillespie (Chair & Associate Dean LTQ), Ms Laurence Wild (Secretary), Dr Edward Anderson (DEV), Dr Peter Dawson (ECO), Dr Jonathan Dickens (SWP), Miss Meg Evans (Academic Officer, Union of UEA Students), Dr John Gordon (EDU), Mr David Mead (LAW), Professor Naresh Pandit (NBS),

**With:** Mrs Rachel Paley (LTS) (item B2)

**Apologies:** Mr Richard Havell (Student Representative), Mr Matthew Wright (SSF Faculty Convenor)

---

**1 MINUTES Document 11M005**

**Approved:** Minutes of the meeting of 25 January 2012

**2 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

No matters arose from these minutes

**SECTION A: ITEMS FOR REPORT**

**A1 PTES 2010 OUTCOMES Document 11D022**

Received:

an overview of the PTES 2010 outcomes for SSF, with an accompanying list of annual academic experience related surveys of the UEA student population.

Noted:

That a large number of the PTES respondents were PGCE students for whom the survey tool was not especially appropriate

That the list of surveys was both long and incomplete

That the purpose of this exercise was to find out what surveys students were being asked to take part in, to see what data is being collected and what it can be used for, and for Directors of Teaching and Learning to be aware and to pass any relevant information regarding these surveys onto their schools

Agreed:

To revisit this issue once the Associate Dean LTQ had completed her investigations into all these surveys with the above in mind.

To ask for clarification from colleagues in the BIU regarding the target response rate for PTES

## **A2 EXTERNAL EXAMINERS' STATUS REPORT**

Received:

an oral report on the progress of the External Examiners' reports process for 2010/11

Noted:

That the process was very much behind schedule due to multiple factors of which one was Integration

That a large number of school responses had been circulated to FLTQC members for scrutiny in the last few days

That some External Examiner reports had still not been received

Agreed:

that new deadlines would be drawn up for this process

## **A3 MODULE AND COURSE MONITORING UPDATE**

Received:

an oral report on the module and course monitoring process

Noted:

That the committee had received only 3 UG and one PGT MCM2 form

That the process was being held up in part due to Course Update forms not being completed

Agreed:

that the committee would consider MCM2s once the whole set had been received

## **A4 KEY INFORMATION SETS (KIS) UPDATE**

**Document 11D028  
(tabled)**

Received:

a document outlining the University's plans for the production and publication of KIS from 2012, and a current data set for the SSF schools.

## **A5 SSF PGR ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT**

**Document 11D027  
(tabled)**

Received:

An executive report on the annual progress monitoring of SSF's postgraduate research

Noted:

That a meeting will be arranged between SSF Associate Deans LTQ and PGR to discuss ways to improve the number of PGR students making “good” progress, and to address the issues raised in the document.

## **SECTION B: ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND ACTION**

### **B1 STATEMENTS FROM THE CHAIR**

#### **(i) LTC memo 05/02/2012**

**Document 11D023**

Received:

A memo from the PVC (Academic) regarding the National Student Survey, progress on the NAM course review process (discussed under item B3) and the Learning Enhancement Team report from 2009-2011 (discussed under item B4)

Reported:

That the survey is open and will remain open till the end of April

Noted:

That it was important to get a good response rate for this survey in order to make the data more meaningful and useful

That UUEAS Academic Officer Meg Evans had made a few presentations to 3rd year students in their lectures to encourage them to complete the survey (3 in NBS, 3 in CHE and 1 in MTH). She is happy to give more talks – they only take 5 minutes

#### **(ii) Enrichment**

Reported:

That schools had been consulted on whether the 2 weeks gained from the shortening of the assessment period should be used a) before the exams (eg for revision workshops etc) or b) after the exams (eg for employability activities)

That this question doesn't relate to FMH, and that the other two faculties had decided one in favour of “before” and one in favour of “after”

That SSF schools had voted 50-50 “before” and “after”

Noted:

That students prefer the “before” option to allow time for revision workshops etc, and because they believe it would be difficult to encourage students to come back to campus after their exams, especially if their exams finished early in the assessment period

That employability activities such as work placements etc are resource intensive and if sufficient resources are not available the time for this kind of

activity might not be well used

That LTC will make the decision at their next meeting in 2 weeks' time, based on the results of these consultations; and that whatever the outcome 50% of schools would be disappointed with the result

## **B2 STUDENT ATTENDANCE MONITORING**

**Document 11D024  
(tabled)**

### Received:

A table outlining the criteria each SSF school has chosen for reporting on undergraduate student attendance monitoring, the results of one monitoring event, and some qualitative comments on the process

### Reported:

That data previously collected across the University shows uneven absence across schools, but that it isn't clear if this is actually a difference in absence or a problem with recording absence

That the AD LTQ (SSF) has considerable concerns about this process, in particular because of its intended future link to the right to reassessment, which a student will lose if they have less than 80% attendance record (this 20% rule is written into the NAM regulations but has not yet been passed by LTC; there was uncertainty as to whether the 20% rule applies across all modules, or is to be applied module by module)

That if this data is going to be used for such draconian punishments, it is imperative that the data is accurately recorded, and that therefore the AD LTQ (SSF) had asked for the data contained in the tabled document to be collated and presented to the committee for discussion; and Rachel Paley (LTS Manager, EFB & ECB) had been invited to attend the meeting to participate in this item

That LTS were planning to put scanners into lecture theatres which could be used for taking electronic registers

### Noted:

That SITS doesn't permit a straightforward extraction of the data needed to monitor attendance against set triggers

That the student attendance data currently held, and the reporting carried out to date, represents LTS's first shot at attendance monitoring and reporting, and that this is a work in progress

That a new Discoverer reporting tool has been developed to allow attendance data to be extracted from SITS and viewed by cohort (and therefore by student) rather than just by module as is presently the case; that attendance at all modules, regardless of the host school of the module, will be drawn into the report on a particular student's attendance; that this will allow for more meaningful and less time-consuming attendance reporting; that this tool is expected to go live next week (w/c 12/3/12)

That this new tool, and the data collated for this meeting, represent significant progress towards making this process work properly

That the different criteria used for both recording and monitoring attendance and for trigger points makes cross-school comparisons difficult

That the data could very easily be misunderstood and could also be used for purposes for which it was not intended, particularly given that the data doesn't readily permit cross-school comparisons

That the data **does** tell us the extent to which registers are being completed by academics

That currently some schools monitor attendance at seminars only, and that it is unclear whether it will become a requirement to monitor attendance at all teaching events

That schools should decide which are their key teaching events and monitor these accurately; they should not attempt to monitor those teaching events where it would be difficult to do so accurately

That attendance monitoring in CMP has worked well, leading to better outcomes for students, but that this doesn't necessarily mean it will work in other schools, as one reason for the success in CMP may be that the teaching sessions are lab sessions and there is perhaps more to be lost by missing one of these than some other types of teaching event; that there will be variation between schools on the likely impact on student outcomes of non-attendance

That the electronic register system is open to abuse (eg people bringing non-attending students' cards in and scanning them)

That if the monitoring system isn't watertight it will be hard to uphold punitive measures resulting from non-attendance in the face of student appeals

That if the 20% rule applies across all modules this breaks the link between success and attendance – for example a student may pass a module without having attended any teaching event, but fail one where (s)he had attended every teaching event, and would be denied reassessment despite 100% engagement with respect to that particular module.

That there will be some discretion at exam board regarding the right to reassessment, but that this will only be exercise in the context of formal circumstances affecting study; that the issue of circumstances affecting study is being looked at by a working group

That students can now see their own attendance record on e:vision and that, while this openness is beneficial on the whole and gives students the opportunity to check that their attendance has been accurately recorded, some students are misinterpreting what they see, taking "not recorded" to mean "recorded as absent", that this is causing concern amongst some students and could potentially cause difficulties in student/lecturer relationships

That students feel that as they are paying for their studies they should have the right to choose whether or not to attend; the current proposal treats students like school kids

That if a student has poor attendance but passes the module, the right to reassessment issue isn't even relevant; if a student has poor attendance and fails, the cost to the University of reassessment is greater than the £100

students have to pay, and there is an important question around whether the University should bear this cost if the student hasn't attended/engaged

That non-attendance is not necessarily a sign of non-engagement, and non-engagement cannot be addressed simply through attendance monitoring: maybe the teaching event itself if not engaging; maybe a student feels they will derive more benefit from an extra hour in the library than from attending a particular lecture/seminar

That it would be ideal (particularly from the LTS perspective, but also some academics agree) to have a standard model for attendance monitoring which individual schools could tweak to suit their specific requirements; that it may be necessary to have two models, one for standard courses and one for professional courses

Agreed:

To check whether the 20% rule applies across all modules, or is to be applied module by module

To circulate the attendance monitoring data within schools – to School Executive Teams etc, and particularly to Heads of School and Senior Advisors – for schools to ask themselves if attendance is being monitored robustly enough in their school; and if not, what can be done to improve attendance monitoring

That LTS will write to students explaining the meaning of the various columns in the attendance record

That LTS is responsible for making post-hoc alterations to the register on the basis of letters/emails/calls from students explaining their absence; that students should be encouraged to contact the hubs regarding absence, for both pre- and post-absence notification; that LTS will ensure that this practice is being implemented across all hubs/schools

LTS will draft a code of practice on attendance monitoring to present at a future meeting

That LTS will produce some case studies of where attendance monitoring is working and having the desired effect on student outcomes, and that these might help to encourage a certain consistency of approach across schools

[Secretary's note – following the meeting, the AD asked for all SSF schools' attendance monitoring reports to be copied to her. This request has already been circulated to the relevant LTS coordinators.]

### **B3 NEW ACADEMIC MODEL**

#### **(i) PGT Regulations update**

**Document 11D025a**  
**Document 11D025b**  
**(tabled)**

Received:

The Academic Director for Taught Programmes' paper outlining a number of outstanding questions with respect to the drafting of the NAM PGT regulations

A collation of feedback from SSF schools on the questions raised in the above paper (each faculty is preparing a response in this way)

Reported:

That the Dean of SSF had commented and his input was included in the feedback document

That both documents would be taken to next week's SSF Executive meeting for discussion

Noted:

That SSF's voice needs to be heard on this issue as the faculty has a very high number of PGT students: SSF is important to PGT and vice versa; that if the regulations are not well designed there may be serious consequences for SSF schools

That the idea of different "flavours" of degrees proposed by SSF is not a popular idea further up the University, but the AD will continue to press for it

**Date of NAM PGT implementation:** that there is a lot of work involved in reviewing/redesigning all the PGT courses, and there is nothing to be gained from rushing into implementing the changes. ECO, however, are ready for a 2013/14 start and are willing to do so as a pilot, which would offer an excellent learning opportunity, as would the implementation of the NAM UG regulations in 2013/14

**Pass all modules:** that that one size won't fit all; that currently some schools have high rates of condoned failure (eg NBS, ECO – this is in line with national trends for these subjects/departments), whilst others have none (EDU, SWP – related to the fact that they are professional courses and the professional bodies don't allow it); that some of the other NAM features may have the effect of improving pass rates, leading to less condoned failure anyway; if condoned failure is ruled out, this may lead to more appeals by students whose marks are close to the pass rate; that this is a difficult issue to resolve and will likely be debated the longest.

**20 credit minimum module size:** that NBS will be exempted due to accreditation body (AMBA) requiring them to offer 10 credit modules; that the PGCE uses a single credit as a tag for placements to allow them to be viewed on SITS, but SWP has found a way to view placements without needing to allocate credits to them

**Right to reassessment:** the 20% rule can't be applied to PGT as this would be too complicated, eg some PGT courses have pass/fail only marking; some professional bodies insist on right to reassessment

**Defined choice:** this also is too complicated for PGT and therefore there will be no regulations on this

**All courses to have programme-level outcomes, and clear ways of assessing these:** if this is going to be implemented then an additional year will be required; that a few PGT courses run over two years and therefore there are progression issues to be considered

**SITS configured for pass/fail or 0-100% marking:** that SSF would prefer

both to be available, so that marks can be input in either way dependent on the course

***M-level award outcomes (pass/merit/distinction)***: that 60% is a lower mark for a merit than DEV currently uses; that this is not a problem as this will lead to better results for students and for the school; that professional courses will have to be exempted if the professional bodies only allow for pass/fail

***APEL/APCL arrangements***: that sometimes for professional reasons students might pick up their credits in a piecemeal fashion and that UEA's regulations shouldn't mitigate against this; that this applies in particular to professional courses, eg SWP post-qualification courses

Agreed:

All the SSF feedback in Document 11D025b with one minor amendment: whilst on balance the faculty prefers a postponement to the implementation of NAM PGT to 2014/15, ECO are ready to go and would like to act as a pilot in 2013/14. If this is going to happen they would need to know soon due to imminent prospectus deadlines

That the Director of Teaching for SWP will investigate what the current rules are for their post-qualification courses with respect to APEL/APCL

**(ii) NAM Programme Review update**

**Document 11D025c  
(tabled)**

Received:

The minutes of the last SSF New Academic Model Working Group meeting (27/2/12) and the SSF AD LTQ notes on the same meeting

Reported:

That the NAM working group meetings were very productive, with good discussions and a sense of making a difference, and providing an unusual opportunity to examine the workings of other schools in some detail

That ECO were the only school in the University to meet the deadline for submission of NAM UG Programme Specifications

That 6 ECO courses, 1 EDU course, 1 LAW course, and 1 Psychology course had been considered by the working group to date; that all had been approved though ECO needed to make some minor amendments which didn't then need to go back before the Working Group, and EDU had to fill in some uncompleted areas of the form

That the Psychology document was an excellent example of how to review/present a course within the terms of the NAM, and was therefore easy to approve

That the remaining EDU and LAW courses would be considered at the next meeting (12/3/12), along with any NBS courses that might be ready for consideration; that DEV courses would be considered at the last scheduled meeting, in late March; that if the NBS courses weren't ready for consideration at the next meeting an additional meeting might have to be set up in April as there wouldn't be time to consider them all alongside the DEV

ones in late March

That all NAM UG Programme Specifications need to be approved and ready to present to LTC at their meeting in mid-May (to Julia Jones by end April)

That the AD's notes focused on pedagogical issues arising from the working group meeting, and suggested changes to the form and the process

Noted:

That point C6 of the AD's notes was unclear

Agreed:

That the AD will amend point C6 to make it clearer

**B4 LEARNING ENHANCEMENT TEAM, DOS,  
REPORT 2009-2011**

**Document 11D026**

Received:

The above report

Reported:

That the document is very helpful and useful, showing the service to be increasingly used; and well summarised in the final 5 bullet points

Agreed:

That schools should be encouraged to read this document

That students should be encouraged to use this service

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Wednesday 9 May 2012, from 2.30pm to 4.30pm, in ARTS I, room 1.83 (the DEV Meeting Room)