University of East Anglia

**LTC12D108**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Title:** | **Faculty Associate Deans (Learning, Teaching and Quality)** |
| Author: | Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee |
| Circulation: | Learning and Teaching Committee – 20 March 2013 |
| Agenda: | LTC12A004 |
| Version: | Final |
| Status: | Open |

### Issue

To receive the minutes of the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee meeting held on 28 November 2012.

### Recommendation

None.

### Resource Implications

Not applicable.

### Equality and Diversity

Not applicable.

### Timing of decisions

Not applicable.

### Further Information

Contact details: Mr Robert Gray, Learning and Teaching Co-ordinator, telephone: 01603 593262, email: r.gray@uea.ac.uk for enquiries about the content of the paper.

### Background

Not applicable.

### Discussion

Not applicable.

### Attachments

Minutes of 28 November 2012

**Minutes of the meeting of FMH LTQC held on 28 November 2012**

Present:     Rosie Doy (Chair), Simon Horton (AHP), Laura Henson (AHP), Mary Jane
            Platt (MED), Debbie Harrison (AHP), Ian Harvey (FMH), Zoe Butterfint (AHP),
            Cath Harrison-Williams (NSC), Sam Clark (STU)

Apologies:   Sandra Gibson (MED), Julia Hubbard (NSC),

With:        Robert Gray (Secretary).


1.    **MINUTES**

     Amendment
            that internship post has not been approved or applied for. 16 (3) (ii).
            MED have not held a faculty workshop, though initial discussions have been
            held.
     Confirmed
            the minutes of the meeting held on 28 November 2012 were confirmed.


2.    **MATTERS ARISING**
     **(1)     SHA EQuAD/PQAF 2012-13**
     Reported
            that Claire Budgen had not yet responded to concerns raised over the SHA's
            Fitness to Practise guidance.
     **(2)     Blackboard mobile pilot**
     Reported
            that the pilot modules for Blackboard mobile have been forwarded to ITCS.
     **(3)     Timetabling**
     Reported
            that the timetabling task force has met and discussed whether the timetabling
            elements in SITS will suit the needs of the university.
     **(4) Safeguarding Policy**
     Reported
            that the Faculty Executive have signed up for the adult safeguarding policy and
            a task and finish group is being setup with SSF (EDU and SWK).


3.    **STATEMENTS FROM THE CHAIR**

        (i)     Welcome to new members
     Stated
            by the Chair that the committee welcomed to new members, Zoe Butterfint
            (AHP) and Cath Harrison-Williams (NSC)

        (ii)     Teaching excellence website nominations
            Reported
            that Tony Jermy(NSC) and Swati Kale (AHP) had been nominated for the
            above.
        (iii)     CSED supervision workshops.
            Reported

that Zoe Butterfint, Cath Harrison-Williams and Jonathan Mason had volunteered to attend from the faculty.

(iv)    Timetable Action Group.
  Reported
  that some work has been undertaken by the group looking at potential clashes and issues such as communication of timetable information, mandatory training etc. The group are also examining whether the updated system from Tribal will be fit for purpose.

(v)    The new student experience.
  Reported
  that the Chair and Andy Hutchinson are currently putting together a survey to be run early in the new year mirroring the NSS & SES and concerning the new students experience. Some small workshops are also planned with new students to review their experiences and to assist in the transition to higher education in future years.

Reported in discussion
that MED survey all students in April and it may cause confusion if this survey coincides.

The Chair stated that the survey is very focused on the new student experience and will involve the student reps and the Student Union.

(vi)    PAL Pilots.
Reported
that a PAL pilot in NSC will run to coincide with the January intake and MED will undertake one in September. A university PAL coordinator (Anne Guyon) has been appointed.

Reported
that interviews were being held for an LTS administrator to assist with PAL across the university.

(vii)    Tools pilot around formative assessment.
Reported
that a policy has been approved and the Chair will be working with Annie Grant to look at this across the university.

(viii)    New group to review attendance monitoring
Reported
that this group will be meeting on 4th December and will include representatives from FMH including Richard Holland (MED), Julia Hubbard (NSC), Karen Bates (NSC), Lynne Ward (LTS), Clare Walker (LTS) and Sarah Wright (LTS). The group will be led by Christina Chan (LTS). The initial meeting will examine what information is currently available, what is collected and what is presented.

The group will also look at automation of the attendance monitoring system with built in triggers where attendance levels are not met.

(ix)    Review of confidentiality policy
Reported
that a policy had been agreed that was very much in line with the plagiarism policy with implication and intent being key drivers. Both Rosie Mason and Emma Sutton

are working on the policy and harmonising the implementation across the faculty.

(x)    Feedback regarding Senate marking scales
Reported
that the faculty need to use the full range of marking with work.

## 4.    CONFIRMATION OF CHAIR'S ACTION
There was no Chair's action to report.

## 5.    EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY
With Helen Murdoch

Received
Athena SWAN bronze award application document
Athena SWAN update documents
New pregnancy and maternity rights for students – Equality 2010 document.

Reported
- The equality office has been involved in the REF, particularly focused on equality training and impact assessment on the mock submission. This will be repeated for the main submission.

   o  Legislation defines nine protected characteristics. However the university currently only monitors gender, age, disability and ethnicity. HM is currently meeting with Heads of schools to see what advice the equality office can offer them and ensure that they are aware of equality issues.

   o  The university has achieved the Athena SWAN bronze award for STEM subjects which recognises efforts made to promote equality. A silver award is also possible, though requires further evidence in the form of case studies be submitted.

   o  The bronze award looks at key areas of provision such as attrition and levels of awards. It requires input from the Head of School and a robust action plan.

   o  NIHR funding will, in future be dependent on the achievement of Athena SWAN award. Each school is able to apply for their own award, with MED (already bronze) applying for silver next year. NSC is applying for bronze in the spring and AHP silver next spring.  Overall the university will be undertaking five submissions in spring 2013.

   o  Equality and Diversity office is working with LAW to roll out the programme across the university (not just STEM) and also work on other protected characteristics.

Reported in discussion
HM reported that the Athena SWAN award mostly focuses on business critical members of staff, rather than students. However there was no reason why students could not be involved with the school self-assessment groups.

MJP stated that a low proportion of UG students will have long term career goals within HE as the vast majority will be going into health care related careers.

DH reported that within the Allied Health Professions it is female dominated. Also, age is an issue as a significant proportion of students have caring responsibilities, which raises particular challenges. Niamh Kennedy is taking the lead on these issues within the school.

HM replied that the Equality and Diversity office is keen to look at the issue of students with caring responsibilities and associated issues. Jessica Corby has been appointed as Equality and Diversity project officer within the office to co-ordinate Athena SWAN applications.

MJP reported initiatives within other institutions where funding is ring fenced to support women returning from career breaks to enable them to refresh their knowledge within the field.

HM has been working with Human Resources in order to examine initiatives such as this.

MJP replied that it was important to recognise that these initiatives should not only be concerned with retaining but also promoting talent.

Reported
- o By HM that in order to comply with the Equality Act 2010 the Equality and Diversity office has issued clarification on the pregnancy and maternity rights for students. Schools need to ensure that students can maintain their studies and should accommodate where possible. This may include rearranging placements. There shouldn't be an assumption of intercalation. A breast feeding support room with appropriate facilities is being built in the Elizabeth Fry Building and guidance for usage is currently being written.

Reported in discussion
by SC that the student union had breast feeding support facilities available in the Hive.

MJP reported that within certain teaching areas there is a health risk to pregnant women. Within the anatomy labs, fumes are a problem. Schools will need guidance on how to manage any adjustments.

HM responded that the Equality & Diversity office are currently developing guidance over this. However, what needed to be borne in mind was could the learning outcomes be achieved in an alternative way.

LW asked for clarification over how the Assessments office approach to managing pregnant students. The office takes the view that if the student is fit and well they will undertake the assessment as normal. Good cause would be approved where the students had an illness related to the pregnancy.
HM responded that this seemed to be a reasonable view.

6. **GOOD HONOURS AND BIU DATA – HOW IT CAN WORK FOR SCHOOL PLANS.**
   Reported
   By GF

   - That the management information Blackboard site should be visible to all members of FLTQC. This pulls together key metric data such as tariff, drop out, and employability.

- BIU has recently agreed a data set to be provided for Course Review reports which uses the data from the Blackboard site.

- The site started as an information depository of data but has evolved and now much wider and complex. The website is currently thematic, with data held under themes such as 'League Tables', 'Corporate Plan', 'NSS Data' and 'Admissions Metrics'. HESA data is also held here and the site will always contain the most up to date data held by BIU.

- A longer term plan is to pull the data metrics together. At the moment it is not possible to place multiple indicators for each route into a single place, though this is the long term goal.\z

- Once this is in place it will then be possible to experiment with the data and test how different factors impact on league tables. For example, if 2% is added to good honours, what is the effect on the subject in league tables. Though it may be difficult to drill down to programme level as much of the data is obtained from JACS codes.

Reported in discussion

The Chair asked whether it was possible to drill down to module level with the Tableau software.

GF reported that the Tableau software enables BIU to compare two different sets of data such as employability and good honours. This data can then be presented in a more readable form, though as a Pdf. The Tableau Reader software allows the Tableau files to be opened on the individuals PC, though this software requires an installation.

In terms of module analysis, good honours data will enable the targeting of certain modules causing issues. BIU is examining how to get low level data which influences larger issues. The next stage is to pull together programme level 'dashboard' data which will be able to show course and module level data.

The Chair stated that 'good honours' was particularly concerning for Post-Reg NSC.

IH commented that the level of good honours awarded within FMH went down this year. With the classification range within the Faculty following a normal distribution. This is something which we need to think about.

GF stated that amongst our competitors are giving out almost 100% good honours across a range of subjects. The relationship between entry tariff, good honours and employability is not fully understood and needs more work. There is some data which suggests that poor performance in year one of a course is difficult to catch up and is reflected in course outcomes.

Within FMH there seems to be a lot of partial data and BIU is looking at understanding this better. It seems to be due to the way the courses are structured which leads to holes in the data. There are different timings for boards etc with results coming late. GF feels that the issue is more to do with timing rather than the data.

IH stated that the message needed to be sent that we do not need to mark to the normal distribution and we need to feel confident about giving marks over 80.

The Chair felt that the new Senate marking scales will help with this.

MJP suggested that training may be required in terms of assessment and the criteria reinforced.

The Chair responded that AHP and NSC are doing work on this and CSED are also planning to provide some training. It should really be dealt with within school CPD programmes.

GF stated that as an institution relatively small changes could have a large effect in overall league table position.

**ACTION: TD's LOOK AT THE DATA AVAILABLE ON THE MANAGEMENT INFORMATION BLACKBOARD SITE.**

7.    **LECTURE CAPTURE PROJECT**
Reported
By KD

- that KD had been part of a working group looking at procuring a lecture capture solution for the university.

- The solution needed to work within a wide variety of settings and four solutions where identified as being potentially suitable. The working group went for a software based solution as opposed to a hardware based one. It was felt that this offered the most flexible option as it could be deployed in almost any of the teaching spaces on campus.

- A further consideration was how well the solution could cope with disabilities or those whose first language was not English. There would be some additional costs in terms of close captioning video. However, this cost would need to be considered with any publicly available output.

- There are a substantial number of legal issues around lecture capture relating to copyright, performance, data protection and a legal sub group has been set up to look at these. The sub group has produced 3 separate permission forms (for lecturer, student and 3rd party speakers). This is so that the creative works can be used by the university.

- Rough costings have been obtained and show a set up cost of approximately 40k, with running costs in the 40-50k per annum range. There are issues over data storage for the captured sessions and also legal clearance on the waiver documents.

    Reported in discussion
    The Chair asked about training to use the system and raising awareness of its availability once operational?

    KD responded that the group felt this was something which should be led by CSED. Some departments/units have already purchased solutions or employ

ad hoc systems and there is a risk if this continues to happen. Therefore the new system will need to have a high profile and be straightforward to use. There is a reputational risk to the university if inappropriate systems are used. The group was aware that it was not generally representative of faculty in terms of attitude to technology.

The Chair commented that ISD have indicated any solution will not be everywhere but in a large proportion of teaching rooms.

MJP asked whether the legal position can be clarified for those schools/individuals employing ad hoc solutions to lecture capture, before the proposed solution is in place.

KD stated that the current regulations cover most of these issues. With the purpose of the permission forms being to make this explicit. However, the copyright of the material is still and issue and needs clarification. Further to this, many of our competitors already have solutions in place and use lecture capture to promote their institutions.

The Chair suggested that whilst we are waiting for a permanent solution a document on things to avoid could be issued for those with ad hoc systems.

KD responded that there is a flow chart checklist which Jo Bruce (CSED) has developed.

The Chair asked if KD could work on how to implement this and provided guidance on best principles etc and perhaps develop some training for the faculty.

8. **SHA EQUAD/PQAF 2012-13**
   Received
   QAF EQuAD 2012_13 Academic Self-Assessment link(**DOCUMENT 12D0020)**

   Reported
   - by the Chair that phase one (self-assessment has been completed) and been reviewed by Practice Educators. KPI 4 placement feedback loops is declared as amber. KPI 7 for ClinPsyD is now amber (last year this was red). This is over the issue of a standardised induction programmes. KPI 9, C2 is amber across all programmes and involves the issue of how to get feedback from placement providers. Practice partners will be holding individual meeting to examine and review the RAG ratings.

   - We should hear next week whether any extra evidence will be required and have been reassured that only evidence that is absolutely critical will be requested.

   - The annual review meeting is planned for 15th February (09:00-13:00) and will be in the Council Chamber. It is hoped that an internal rehearsal meeting can be held the week before. It is hoped that the event will be bigger this year and attendance from Practice Partners better than last year. At the event RD will make a presentation, also Andy Hutchinson is planning a statistical presentation. Both of these will be aimed at showing what has been achieved within the action plan.

9. **SHA EQuAD/PQAF 2011-12**

Received

 SHA QAF action plan progress.

> 2011/12 PQAF Action Plan Quarter 2 ( **DOCUMENT 12D0021)**
> 2011/12 Complete Survey report EQuAD **(DOCUMENT 12D0022)**

Reported

- By the Chair that the action plan for quarter 2 to be carried forward to quarter 3.

## 10. NET 2013 CONFERENCE
Received

 Net 2013 flyer

> NET 2013 – Call for Abstracts (**DOCUMENT 12D0023)**

Reported
- By the Chair that the faculty may wish to support a couple of individuals to attend this conference which taking place in September 2013.

Reported in discussion

 By ZB that abstracts need to be submitted by January.

**ACTION: CAN MEMBERS OF LTQC COMMEND THIS TO COLLEAGUES**

## 11. PROPOSAL FOR LTQC TO DEVELOP A PROJECT BASED APPROACH
Received

> LTQC Agenda Schedule 2012-13(**12D0024**)
> LTQC Critical Read Schedule(**12D0025**)

Reported
- that the Chair proposed that standard reports be moved to the 'Items to report' section of the committee paperwork. In addition to this, the Chair also proposed that small projects be set up involving 2 or 3 members examining a project, consulting and reporting back. Projects such as lecture capture might be suitable for this. The concept behind the proposal is to encourage more speakers at LTQC meetings and too prevent too much reporting of items.

- The Chair proposed that the International Officers be tasked with presenting the annual report at the next FLTQC meeting.

- The committee agreed to enact the new way of working.

**ACTION: COMMITTEE MEMBERS TO THINK OF PROJECTS AND BRING IDEAS TO THE NEXT MEETING.**
**ACTION: RG TO DESIGN ACTION LOG WITH RAG RATINGS.**

## 12. NEW UNIVERSITY PROCESSES
Received

> Academic Appeals and Complaints Procedure (**12D0026**)
> LTS Bulleting (**12D0027**)

Reported
- by LW that the policies for appeals and complaints has been reviewed and new regulations drafted. These are designed to promote consistent decision making and reduce the number of stage 2 appeals received. The main points of the new

system are;

- at stage one there will be a limit of seven areas which can be appealed against (degree result, confirmed marks, failure to transfer to a PhD from an MPhil, required withdrawal from a course, verdict of plagiarism/collusion, penalty applied in respect of plagiarism/collusion, refusal to permit the submission). If the issue falls out of these areas it is considered to be a complaint.

- At stage two an appeal can only be made if there was a procedural irregularity or if the remedy has not addressed all of the issues raised at stage one.

- At stage two the substance of the appeal cannot be reconsidered unless there are good grounds for this. This decision can only be made by the ADLT.

- The new process is in place for modules beginning in the 2012/13 academic year. Modules starting prior to this are under the old system.

- Guidance on the new procedure can be found on the LTS website.

- Consideration of appeals has now moved to a panel based approach. There will be one panel per faculty for taught programmes and one for PgR. Panels will meet monthly and fortnightly at busy periods. Panels will consist of 3 academic colleagues, a Chair and an academic colleague from one of the other faculty panels.

- The FMH panel will consist of Nicola Spalding (Chair), Sarah Wright (Secretary), Ian Barr (BIO), Kenda Crozier (NSC), Richard Holland (MED), Jane Cross (AHP), Maggie Quinn (MED). One more member is needed from each school for the reserve list.

- The organisation of the panels is managed through the DUS office.

Reported in discussion
the Chair stated that a large proportion of are the result of late evidence of extenuating circumstances being submitted. Had this been considered?

LW replied that late circumstances are considered by the ADLT who approves whether or not they can be considered as part of the appeal. However, a working group is currently examining the processes around this and is due to report in the Spring, with implementation for next academic year.
LW stated that the Head of School still has a role to play within a stage one appeal. Detail of the appeal goes to the HOS and if there appears to be an immediate remedy, that is within their remit to use, then the appeal can be resolved. Though there is no need for the HOS to investigate the substance of the appeal.

MJP enquired as to the new word count policy. The advice seems confusing, for example over the whether endnotes are included within the word count. If so, this would seem to discourage good use of references.

LW responded that she would seek clarification from Claudia Gray.

DW added that it was confusing for students to have a mid-year change of policy.

LW asked the committee if they had seen the timescales for Course Review document.

The committee had and responded positively to this.

13. **FEEDBACK ON QAA – OUTCOMES OF INSTITUTIONAL AUDIT**
Received

Feedback on QAA – Outcomes of Institutional Audit (**12D0028**)

The Chair asked the committee to read this document.

14. **SERVICE USER STRATEGY: REPORT ON PROGRESS & DISCUSSION OF PLANS**
Reported
by Simon Horton that;
- the HCPC consultation on Service User involvement finishes on 7/12 and he is yet to hear back from all of the Course Directors (can TD's prompt them).

- A survey has been sent out to Faculty on the issue of Service User involvement (deadline 7/12), with a sporadic response. This is for PQAF programmes.

- SH is currently pulling together a list of suitable attendees at the ARM in February.

- A knowledge exchange event will be held on 12/12. A video conference with QEH is planned.

- A Teaching Fellowship application has been made for Service user impact across the faculty. We will find out in January whether we are successful or not.

Reported in discussion

by DH that the slow response to the HCPC consultation could be a reflection of agreement with the proposal.

SH reported that he would submit a review of the Service User strategy at the 19 June FLTQC meeting.

RD suggested that Service User involvement might be worthy of an event in its own right.

SH stated that if the application for a fellowship was not successful that it might be worth creating an event.

15. **WORKSHOP WITH PHIL RACE: AGREEING FACULTY PRIORITIES**
Received

Workshop with Phil Race – FMH priorities (**12D0029**)

Reported in discussion
by DH that TD's were examining the list and looking at taking it forward.

RD stated she had received feedback indicating that faculty would prefer long advanced notice of the workshop.

12. **REPORTS FROM MEMBERS**

   **(1) SEC (Student Experience Committee)**
   Reported
   by LH that she now had been in contact with MED SSLC reps, but no with AHP. Can TD's provide a list of student reps so that they can be invited to the strategy day?

**ACTION: TD'S TO PROVIDE SSLC STUDENT REP LISTS TO LH**

   **(2) PLANNING FOR GOOD PRACTICE EVENT**
   Received
   Good practice event draft agenda

   Reported in discussion
   by ZB that the half day agenda forced the planning team to constrict the agenda, with a focus on sharing good practice. Though it was important to also build in some discussion time. The event will be held in Congregation Hall 0.13 as this was the only room that had capacity and was available. The draft flyer is nearly complete and will be sent out soon.

   RD stated that assessment feedback and marking were important issues and the MED use of Speedwell was particularly interesting. Finally, the event needs to reflect all of the schools in the faculty.

   **(3) TPPG**
   Received
   TPPG briefing document from July meeting (D**ocument 12D0016)**

13. **GENERAL DISCUSSION ITEMS**