

**LTC14D211**

**Title:** *HUM LTQC Minutes 18 February 2015*  
**Author:** Lorraine Newark  
**Date:** 27/03/15  
**Circulation:** LTC – 13 May 2015  
**Agenda:** LTC14A005  
**Version:** Final  
**Status:** Open

---

**Issue**

Faculty of Arts and Humanities minutes of LTQC meeting 18 February 2015

**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 18<sup>th</sup> February 2015.

**Discussion**

None

**Attachments**

Minutes

**UNIVERSITY OF EAST ANGLIA  
FACULTY OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES**

**LEARNING, TEACHING AND QUALITY COMMITTEE**

Minutes of the meeting held on 18 February 2015

Present: Dr C Matthews (Chair), Mr S Bennett, Dr G Pagani, Dr J Poppleton, Dr R Fraser, Mr R Deswarte (representing Dr Neumann), Mr T Barker (UUEAS HUM Faculty Convenor), Mr J Clare (UUEAS Head of Student Engagement)

In attendance: Ms M Pavey (Learning and Teaching Service, Arts Hub Manager), Miss L Newark (Secretary to the Committee), Mr O Carlisle and Mrs Wilkinson (representing Mr Garforth)

Apologies: Dr M Neumann, Dr R Tillett, Mr C Rand (UUEAS UG Education Officer)

**31. MINUTES**

Confirmed: Minutes of the meeting held on 14 January 2015. Copy held on the FLTQC Blackboard site.

**32. MATTERS ARISING NOT COVERED ON THE AGENDA**

None

**33. Agenda item A1. Statements from the Chair**

Received

**33.1 Support for students during reassessment**

<https://portal.uea.ac.uk/documents/6207125/8104573/ltc14d103dividerh.pdf/9f457b86-81d0-45c7-a2c0-201aa35cb89f>

The Chair advised that following recommendation from LTC, Schools are now required to offer assistance to students referred to reassessment by way of some kind of remedial support. This can be provided on a one to one basis or group revision sessions for example.

To establish how this can be monitored within the Faculty, Dr Matthews suggested:

- Module Organisers to be informed automatically by receiving a copy of each reassessment email sent to students on their modules following the exam boards.
  
- The Module Organiser/Convenor should then send a message to the student/s about what support is on offer and copy in the Hub. This then provides the quality audit trail.

Dr Matthews advised that written feedback on the failing piece of work is **not** sufficient. For Postgraduates students who may have travelled home additional support for dissertation reassessment could be offered via Skype. Dr Poppleton asked whether Advisors could also be informed so that they could provide support to their advisees. Miss Newark confirmed that this was

possible but might take a little longer to arrange on the system. Ms Pavey advised that the discussions in LTC referred to the Module Organiser being responsible for the offering of support.

**ACTION:** Miss Newark to arrange with the Planning Office for the reassessment emails to be copied to Module Organisers and Advisers.

### **33.2 Return of Examination scripts**

The Chair advised that he is working to change the University's view on exam scripts. The current situation is that the scripts belong to the institution, which is why they are not returned to students.

Dr Matthews suggested that it makes sense to return the scripts with feedback in order to be meaningful for the students. He advised that there is general agreement about this fact however, consideration is needed of how to deliver this.

Dr Matthews commented that this is a matter which may require a change in marking culture, allowing that scripts will go back to the students.

Dr Pagani explained the issue for PPL where before the restructure PSI provided individual feedback on examinations, but the practice within LCS was different. These differences became obvious in discussions at SSLC meetings. The PSI offering now provides a problem with rolling out delivery as the new combined School Support office no longer has the resources to aid the process. The past arrangements have always been on the request of the student rather than simply provided to all.

Logistical problems which need to be addressed with returning exam scripts:

- A. Scripts will be going back at a time when the student is not at university (i.e. in the summer) so returning all would mean the scripts waiting in a public area for a long time.

Problem: how do we best get scripts back to students?

- B. There is just one handwritten copy, so if a student wishes to challenge the mark after collection we have no way of checking whether has been tampered with.

Problem: how do we ensure security of the content of each scripts?

Mr Barker suggested that we could scan the script before returning to the student, with the university keeping the original.

Ms Pavey advised that LTS does not currently have resources to photocopy / scan the exam scripts or facilitate the return of all scripts. If suitable resources were made available the Hub would be able to consider this.

Ms Pavey reminded the meeting that we need to be careful about offering feedback before results are out as this can cause students unnecessary distress.

### **33.3 Examinations for autumn modules**

Dr Matthews explained that there is pressure from the University to remove exams for autumn modules. The steer for next year is that these no longer be allowed. This direction has the support of the Pro Vice Chancellor (PVC), Academic Director of Taught Programmes (ADTP) and the Dean of Faculty. He reported that within the Faculty, History, Art and Philosophy are areas which use these. Dr Matthew's position is that if a good pedagogical reason is provided then cases for continuing will be considered.

Dr Pagani asked whether this instruction will be delivered from the Executive Team. Dr Matthews confirmed that he has also raised this question and that it would, at the relevant time.

Dr Matthews also advised the meeting that the University will be able to move to a five week exam period next year, with the aim of moving to four weeks the following year. The purpose of this is to free up more time to spend constructively with students.

#### **33.4 Release of marks to students**

Dr Matthews reminded the meeting of the intention behind LTS holding marks back a week after the marked work is returned to students. The reason was to encourage students to collect their feedback in order to help them understand their mark.

Dr Matthews advised that his understanding was that approval had been given to no longer do this as it did not have the desired result last year.

**ACTION:** Ms Pavey to follow up with Caroline Sauverin for clarification. **UPDATE:** The marks are no longer being held back.

#### **33.5 Coursework return**

Dr Matthews reported that the Faculty is doing very well on the whole in returning work to students within the 20 day target. He noted however, there are still some cases where work has been delayed.

From the comments on the report Dr Matthews had identified errors which appeared a number of times. These were where the work is handed back to the Hub without a moderation form or mark sheet completed properly. He suggested these were areas where the Faculty could easily tidy up and reduce turnaround times more.

**ACTION:** Miss Newark to circulate the e-marking turnaround times

Dr Poppleton raised the problems of not being able to return coursework in small batches. The policy currently states that the whole cohorts work is to be returned to the Hub before it will be released to students. Dr Poppleton felt that this could delay work for the majority if just one seminar leader fell behind on their marking.

There was a discussion about the role of the Module Organiser, whether it was their responsibility for ensuring all work was marked in time fell to them and whether there should be an allowance in the workload allocation for this. Dr Poppleton explained that for large cohorts, LDC often uses Associate Tutors who are not contracted in the same way so it is harder to control.

Dr Pagani advised that due to similar problems in the past for PPL Schools, that PPL have now ensured responsibilities for assessment are included in the Associate Tutors contract.

**ACTION:** Dr Matthews to discuss the return of work in small batches with Dr Blanchflower, Director of the Learning and Teaching Service.

Mr Barker raised his concern that if this was permitted, the pressure on the remaining marker is then relieved and the marking of that one group could drift and be even more disadvantaged. He commented that this is in effect a failing of someone to do the work.

#### **33.6 External Examiner comments in reports**

Dr Matthews confirmed that the sub group has looked at all undergraduate external examiner reports received up to the beginning of February. A common theme within the reports was praise for colleagues in teaching, assessment and administration.

**ACTION:** Miss Newark to provide information to Board of Examiner Chairs to disseminate

#### **34. Agenda item A2. Report from the Union of UEA Students (UEAS)** Received:

An oral report from Mr Clare on behalf of the UUEAS Education Officer

- 34.1 Mr Clare reminded the meeting that it is now election season in the Students Union. He requested that if anyone knew of students who would be good in the roles to point them to the Students Union before the end of the week.
- 34.2 Mr Clare also advised that the Teaching Awards were going well, with someone from each school nominated.
- 34.3 Items from the Advice Service  
Concern had been expressed about summative group marks being given to groups as large as sixteen, all those within the group receiving the same mark. Mr Clare asked if this was usual. Mr Barker confirmed this matter was also discussed at the AMA SSLC and that students across the board were not happy with this situation. Ms Pavey confirmed that there was one seminar group which had been assessed for summative work as a group, this was a production module in Media. Mr Barker explained that this had raised a question over fairness.

**ACTION:** Dr Matthews to be sent a copy of the SSLC minutes.

**35. Agenda item B1. Annual review and Assessment report**  
Received - Document A

Dr Matthews informed the meeting that the document had been submitted to LTC. He advised that he had only received reports from two schools out of eight – HIS and LCS, though he was aware that AMS had rolled up some issues in other meetings.

Dr Matthews explained that he understood from colleagues in School Support that the problem was getting people in same place at same time in order to hold the meetings. He suggested that the School Managers should look to put dates in the diary now.

**ACTION:** Mr Carlisle / Mrs Wilkinson to advise all School Managers in the Faculty and implement.

Dr Matthews has argued it is difficult to conduct reviews because of the range of courses on offer in the Faculty with a liberal set of profiles. He suggested that the way forward is to look at what modules the students are likely to take, historical information can be made available. The Course Directors can then ask for just those Module Organisers to be involved.

Dr Matthews explained the reasoning behind the review is to look at the balance of assessment over the level of the course and to ask whether it is appropriate. The overall aim is to be able to deliver a better experience for the students.

Dr Matthews also suggested the review should look at submission dates to see if they can be evened out although he acknowledged that this can be very difficult for humanities degrees. He asked Teaching Directors to seriously consider how to operate the reviews and to report back. He reminded those present that there is a document which lists what needs to be fulfilled:  
<https://www.uea.ac.uk/learningandteaching/documents/assessment/School+Annual+Review+of+Assessment+and+Moderation+Vs5+140530>

Dr Pagani suggested using the review to focus on pattern of formative and summative assessment and how it has worked best.

**ACTION:** Teaching Directors

**36. Agenda item B2. Triggers for moderation**

Discussed:

Dr Matthews stated that most summative work in the Faculty has to be moderated. He proposed it would be better to move to a risk based system, similar to the module review process.

The ADTP's view was that it is reasonable for HUM to ask to do this with the understanding that other faculties may not be so keen.

Dr Matthews remarked that this may help speed up return of marked coursework. Dr Pagani commented that individual markers are likely to still be moderated each year even with a move to a risk based approach.

Dr Matthews asked Mr Barker and Mr Clare whether such a change would worry them in terms of lowering of standards.

Mr Barker replied that it is more of a worry for students that not all markers work to the same guidelines and that there is not a single standard within any school. This is a separate issue and would not be affected by scaling down the moderation.

**ACTION:** Dr Matthews to take forward to TPPG

**37. Agenda item B3. Senate report**

Received - Document B:

For discussion and report.

Comments collated by the Secretary for the Taught Programmes Policy Group (TPPG):

Dr Matthews summarised:

- (1) There is a lack of distinction in the document between the general principles which underlie the University's Assessment & Feedback and the mechanical details by which they are realised. The latter often do not need to be included in the document: for example, the detailed description of the moderation process on page 16 is not relevant here both in principle but also because its details may change. In other words, a hot link to the moderation policy would be a better way of handling this.
- (2) It is far from clear who the readership of this document is meant to be – staff/students?
- (3) The document is far too long and, hence, is unlikely to be read or referred to. It may be useful to refer to the Northumbria University document since it is much more succinct and, to my mind, fit for purpose:  
<https://www.northumbria.ac.uk/static/5007/arpdf/aq/afpolicy.pdf>
- (4) It may be worth considering using the University of Edinburgh webpages on feedback (<http://www.enhancingfeedback.ed.ac.uk/index.htm>). Cardiff appear to have a mirror copy, so presumably Edinburgh are willing to share.
- (5) Needs editing for more consistent style across the document.

**38. Agenda item B4. Reading weeks moved to march agenda**  
Dr Matthews

**39. Agenda item B5. Induction**

Received:

Oral report from Mr Carlisle and Mrs Wilkinson, representing Mr Garforth, following School Manager meetings with Teaching Directors to discuss Induction.

The aim was to discuss induction and what it might look like in 2016 and also to get things moving for this year.

Suggestions from the meeting included:

- A week long task – to be set on the Monday and then discussed on the Friday of week one with their adviser.
- In the middle of week one, hold a session about lectures / seminars and how to get the most out of them.
- Hold whole school talks about the disciplines for all students, therefore not running the risk of excluding anyone.
- Keep the Head of School's welcome on the first day but move the housekeeping to another time.
- Revisit the value of buddy schemes. It was suggested these should be formulated more to a mentoring role to link to engagement and employability. However, it was recognised that this may be a large task and perhaps not achievable for this year.
- There was a suggestion that these ideas go onto SSLC agendas to find out what students think, however, Mr Barker pointed out that most schools have already held their spring semester meeting.
- For new students to have group meetings with advisers rather than one to one as their first meeting so that the meetings are more productive and less intimidating.
- The idea of setting a blackboard challenge to get students to engage with Blackboard and encourage their use of the system.

Mr Barker suggested that the School Managers should be careful not to lose some of the good practice in its aim to encourage informality. He mentioned that ART has very specific ideas on how their induction should work. Mr Barker again stressed the need to ask the students opinion through Chairs of SSLC.

Mr Bennett suggested asking first year students who have progressed from the Foundation year as buddies as they have invaluable experience.

**ACTION:** Induction to be standing item on future agendas – Miss Newark to add

**40. Agenda item C1. Course Approvals, Course Title Changes and Course Closures in HUM 2014/15, 2015/16**

BA (hons) Film and American Studies U1TW76402, U1TW76401 (pre-2013), U1TW76302 (3 year), U1TW76301 (3 year pre-2013). Final admission of students 2015/16/

Document C

BA (hons) Film Studies and Art History U1WV63302 & U1WV6301 (pre-2013)

Document D

BA (hons) Film and American Studies U1TW76402 / U1TW76401 (pre-2013)  
/ U1TW76302 / U1W76301 (pre-2013)

Course closure – consultation with students needs to be completed before submission to LTC. **ACTION:** Dr Tillett

41. **Agenda item C2. QAR3 approvals by the Chair**  
Completed forms stored on the LTS Quality Blackboard site  
ART UG 2013/4
42. **Agenda item C3. Items for report/discussion from Faculty Appeals and Complaints Panel meetings**  
Nothing to report
43. **Agenda item C4. Items for report/discussion from Teaching Committees**  
Referred to March meeting
44. **Agenda item C5. Items for report/discussion from Learning and Teaching Service**  
Nothing to report
45. **Agenda item C6. Employability**  
Mr Barker reported that the highest level achievable for students taking part in the pilot in Bronze. He felt that there was no mention of the fact that Silver and Gold is not available in the pilot this year and believes the students should be informed.

It was agreed that the message should come from the Careers Centre.  
**ACTION:** Dr Matthews to send an advisory not to the Employability Officers in the School to make them aware. **UPDATE:** Miss Newark contacted the Careers Centre for their input on this matter. Dr Matthews will discuss with them directly before sending out his message.

46. **Agenda item C7. Undergraduate and Postgraduate External Examiner Reports 2013/14 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)

School responses approved:

**Undergraduate**  
HIS

Packer Ian  
Ryan Magnus  
Swain Geoffrey

LCS

Maiorani Arianna  
Skrandies Peter

Guo Zhiyan  
Melcion Lourdes  
Wilson Christine

LDC

Draycott Jane  
Gardner John  
Power Henry

PHI

Callanan John

PSI

Burnham Peter  
Callanan John  
Chadwick Andrew