

SSF LTQC 12M002

Minutes of a meeting of the SSF LTQC held on Wednesday 3 October 2012, from 1430 to 1630, in A1.83 (DEV Meeting Room)

Academic Members Present:

Helena Gillespie (Chair)
Lee Beaumont (EDU UG)
Neil Cooper (PSY)
John Gordon (EDU PGT)
Martin Gill (SWK)
Ed Anderson (DEV)
Naresh Pandit (NBS)
Bibhas Saha (ECO)
Andreas Stephan (LAW)

Student Member present:

Cal Corkery (SSF Faculty Convener)

With:

Heather Reynolds (Secretary)
Tina Jeffrey (Administrative Assistant)

Apologies:

Josh Bowker (SU Academic Officer)
Richard Havell (Student Representative)

1. MINUTES

Confirmed: Minutes of the meeting of 19 September 2012.

Document 12M001

2. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

2.1 Employability & Enrichment

- PSY TD reported that 2 evenings per week would not work for them.
- Chair responded that only evening slots would enable any student to attend. SCI labs are booked out at other times so using alternative slots would mean that SCI students would not be able to take part. This scheme will provide extra revenue to schools so it would be good to include SCI students. Equal opportunities issue – students would be disadvantaged at PGCE interview if they didn't have an opportunity to attend these classes.
- PSY TD thought that it should be left to each school to decide on contact hours and what the discipline could offer.

Resolved:

Chair will resist standardisation and will take forward those modules offered.

2.2 Peer Assisted Learning

- Two volunteers from each Faculty were sought for new PAL initiatives by the ADLT (measures used are for UG teaching).
- EDU cannot take this forward.

Resolved:

NBS TD will take this up with James Cornford.

SECTION A: ITEMS FOR REPORT

Documents for these items are available to view on the SSF LTQC Blackboard site in the relevant meeting folder.

A.1 STATEMENTS FROM THE CHAIR

- (i) Introductions and welcome from the Chair.
-

SECTION B: ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND ACTION

B.1 WRITTEN ASSIGNMENT FEEDBACK GRID

Following discussion at the meeting on 19 September, TDs were encouraged to submit any draft feedback grids devised so far to the Chair.

Received:

Feedback grids from EDU and LAW.

Noted:

- EDU TD preferred a simple sheet for comments. They have separate marking criteria. Would not return Senate Scales to students with feedback.
- Chair suggested highlighting relevant parts of Senate Scales and returning these to students with the feedback sheet.
- LAW TD suggested that both the Senate Scales and the LAW marking criteria should be provided to students in handbooks and the spirit applied to the subject, improving feedback and good honours. Blank text boxes permit inconsistency between markers. It would be difficult to use feedback of this type based on one module to improve another. Using boxes focuses feedback. At the end of form it is possible to explain what students could do to get a better mark.
- NBS TD - it is not clear what weight is given to various areas of feedback. NBS feedback sheet gives a weighting and alleviates the need to explain what students could do to get a better mark. It is important for students to understand the weighting.
- PSY TD – writing comments on the work explains much better.
- Chair – unhelpful comments could be crushing to a student's confidence.
- LAW TD – difficult to be consistent whilst writing comments on coursework which is moderated.

- Chair wondered how far the remaining schools had got with developing their feedback grids.
- ECO TD – using all existing feedback forms through to December. Trying to create a new coursework form but could not get agreement on using weighting. Commenting on each count but only giving one single mark. Considering an eighth box for comments relating to further improvement. Postponing presentation feedback forms until Spring.
- PSY TD – form has tick boxes for basic first year problems but may need different boxes according to year group, indicating an expectation of improvement during studies.
- SWK TD – no changes for the new Senate Scales.
- Chair – Is standardisation a useful aspiration?
- Cal Corkery – Students are passionate about getting better feedback. Not sure that students would ask for one standard form and would probably think lecturers are best placed to decide on this.
- Chair thought that a standard form would be unlikely to improve quality of feedback and wondered whether students felt consistency across programmes is important.
- LAW TD – students have a perception that the goalposts keep being moved and marks achieved depend on the lecturer concerned. Perhaps too much discretion is available at the moment.
- ECO TD – in some cases markers need to write on scripts, to explain maths errors for example.
- NBS TD – need guiding principles. Feedback relating to specific criteria. Weightings for feedback with box to explain why a particular mark was given.
- LAW TD will be rolling out their feedback form and will have a focus group of second and third year students who will have experienced both types of feedback forms.
- Chair – Important to take a long run at this and consolidate for NAM. Will subscribe to a set of guiding principles for feedback, if forms are not standardised, with some case studies. SSF assessment policy might be the way forward, explaining non-standardisation and purpose.
- ECO TD felt that changing the goalposts was unfair to students. Important to retain consistency and transparency using weighting and comments in a clear way on different feedback areas.
- Chair – Non-negotiables will be in principle and not in practice.
- EDU TD wondered whether students need to be aware, via feedback, whether double-marking had taken place.
- Chair advised that this is not the case as double-marking is part of quality control so this doesn't involve the students.
- Chair – Nigel Norris is seeking to financially support ADs with improving quality of feedback to students with a view to improving NSS results. Under NAM, formative assessment will be compulsory. Some formative assessment arrangements can be timeconsuming for academic staff so we need to get better and quicker at this. Needs to be targetted and technology needs to be used to support formative assessment.

- LAW TD – Melbourne tried electronic resources and managed expectations – highlighting all instances during the year when feedback was given and offering additional opportunities to students. They found that students took this into account whilst completing NSS and responded favourably.
- NBS TD – mobile phone technology might be possible.
- EDU TD – more analysis of assessment practice/conditions of working, interactions around feedback, verbal element of feedback.

Resolved:

- Cal Corkery will ascertain whether students feel that using a standard form across programmes is important and the Student Union view on whether writing comments on scripts is beneficial.
- Chair noted that members didn't want a standardised SSF feedback form and will feed this back.
- TDs will discuss feedback forms at SSLCs.
- Return to this item at the January meeting.
- LAW TD will report back to LTQC following focus group meetings.
- Chair will take three proposals to Nigel Norris (a) learning technologist needed in SSF for this purpose (b) managing expectation will also be considered but not sure how finance might help (c) closer look at data to see if there are characteristics of good or poor performance.
- All TDs to email Helena with any ideas – it was agreed that any additional finance will be focused.

B.2 THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE SURVEY

Document 12D004

Presentation by Dr Sree Ghosh and Dr Garrick Fincham (Business Intelligence Unit) on the NSS results and plans for the Student Experience Survey.

Sree – necessary to have at least 23 students responding otherwise data is not released. Trying to achieve 60% response. SSF trend is good. Students like copies of handouts given to them. Full data and timetable on management info blackboard site. Possibly slightly more slimlined internal SES which will shadow the NSS. Response and completion rates acceptable and there is no indication that length of the survey is too long. Not expecting any better rate this year. SES picked up all major patterns of NSS and offers confidence going forward.

Garrick – 7% loss (significant) on a theme translates crudely into 1% loss for school. UEA as a whole lost 3% on feedback. Performance in assessment and feedback was relatively weaker. Corporate Plan - aspiring to be top 20. Students have nothing to compare their UEA experience with unless they have spent time elsewhere.

PSY TD – need to disaggregate PSY and SWK data. Data will be clearer next year as the schools will be separate.

Chair – teaching scores – keeping company we wish to keep. Assessment and feedback scores – keeping company we would not wish to keep. Students exercised by timetable issues and room changes. Not sure that giving copies of handouts to students would have a pedagogical impact but this may depend on how the handouts are used. Important to compare externally as well as internally. Many subject areas cannot be benchmarked against each other.

NBS TD – quantitative and qualitative data will be made available at School Board.
LAW TD – need to ensure no selection bias.

B.3 ROLES OF COURSE DIRECTORS AND TEACHING DIRECTORS

Document 12D005

Additional document relating to the role and responsibilities of Teaching Directors will be available during this academic year.

Resolved:

That Teaching Directors will put together a list of the duties they are asked to perform under the headings below using a wiki on the Blackboard on-line agenda and may add additional headings. This item will be added to the November meeting agenda.

- Meetings attended/chaired
- University processes
- Pedagogical leadership and development

SECTION C: ONGOING ITEMS FOR REGULAR REPORT

Documents for these items are available to view on the SSF LTQC Blackboard site in the relevant meeting folder.

C.1 COURSE CLOSURES

None.

C.2 CHANGES TO EXISTING PROGRAMMES

LLM International Competition Law & Policy – name change to LLM International Commercial and Competition Law with minimal module change.

Approval Date: 26/9/12

C.3 NEW COURSES

None to report.

SECTION D: EXTERNAL EXAMINERS REPORTS

D.1 COMPLETED EXTERNAL EXAMINERS' REPORTS 2009/10

None to report.

D.2 OUTSTANDING EXTERNAL EXAMINERS' REPORTS 2009/10

CCE – Carolyn Richardson (UG)

EDU – Winston Brookes (PGT)

NBS – T C Melewar (PGT)

D.3 COMPLETED EXTERNAL EXAMINERS REPORTS 2010/11

None to report.

D.4 OUTSTANDING EXTERNAL EXAMINERS REPORTS 2010/11

CCE –;Ford, Richardson, Seddon, Carswell (FdA Social Pedagogy) – all UG with Task Gp member

DEV – Lind UG – report not submitted

EDU – Smith, Woodhouse, Chambers Childs – with Task Gp member,
Alexander, Ayres, Beaton, Brookes, Clarke, Croft, Levy – with School

NBS – Almond (PGT) – report not submitted, Doherty (PGT), Jack (UG), McCullum-Oldroyd (UG), Prince (PGT) – with School, Marriott (PGT), Meleware (PGT), Rogers (PGT) – with Task Gp member
SWP – Baron, Blissett, Cocker, Doel, Hart, Johns, Langan (all PGT) – with School, Pinkerton (PGT) – report not submitted.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING AND FUTURE ITEMS

Wednesday 14 November 2012, 1430 – 1630, in A1.83 (DEV Meeting Room)

1. HEAR REPORT (1630)
Presentation by Lynne Simpkin (Students Union)
Meeting: NOVEMBER 2012
2. PEER ASSISTED LEARNING
Discussion of Faculty plans for PAL in AY 12/13 and 13/14
Meeting: NOVEMBER 2012
3. WORD COUNT POLICY
For discussion once the new policy has been in force for a semester.
Meeting: JANUARY 2013
4. MA HEP (1500)
Presentation by Claudina Richards
Meeting: JANUARY 2013
5. FORMATIVE COURSEWORK
Meeting: JANUARY 2013
6. EXAM TIMETABLING
Discussion relating to the scheduling of examinations and to establishing the purpose of academic colleagues attending examinations immediately prior to commencement.
Meeting: MARCH 2013
7. FEEDBACK TO STUDENTS ON WRITTEN ASSIGNMENTS – SENATE SCALES
To return to the guiding principles for feedback at a future meeting.
Meeting: JUNE 2013
8. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF COURSE DIRECTORS AND TEACHING DIRECTORS (ITEM B1)
To follow up on the discussion held at the October meeting and resulting wiki collection of duties currently performed.
Meeting: NOVEMBER 2012
9. WRITTEN ASSIGNMENT FEEDBACK GRIDS (ITEM B1)
To follow up on the discussion held at the October meeting.
Meeting: JANUARY 2013