

LTC14D212

Title: *SSF LTQC Minutes*
Author: Heather Reynolds
Date: 29.4.15
Circulation: LTC – 13 May 2015
Agenda: LTC14A005
Version: Final Version
Status: Open

Issue

To receive the Minutes of the SSF LTQC meeting held on 25.2.15

Recommendation

None.

Resource Implications

None.

Risk Implications

None.

Equality and Diversity

N/A

Timing of decisions

N/A

Further Information

Contact details: Heather Reynolds, Learning and Teaching Coordinator, telephone 01603 592517, email: h.reynolds@uea.ac.uk, for any queries/further information relating to this document.

Background

N/A

Discussion

N/A

Attachments

SSF LTQC 14M005

Minutes of a meeting of the SSF LTQC held on Wednesday 25 February 2015, commencing at 1400, in TPSC 2.24.

Academic Members present:

Ratula Chakraborty (Chair)
Rob Grant (DEV)
Sue Long (ECO)
Lee Beaumont (EDU)
Claudina Richards (LAW)
Graham Manville (NBS)
Neil Cooper (PSY)
Jane Dodsworth (SWK)

Student Members present:

Connor Rand (SU Academic Officer – Undergraduate Representative)
Amilcar Johnson (SSF Faculty Convener)
Tony Moore (UUEAS)

With:

Heather Reynolds (Secretary)
Becky Fitt (LTS Manager)

Apologies:

Liam McCafferty (SU Academic Officer - Postgraduate Representative)

1. MINUTES

Confirmed: the Minutes of the meeting of 14 January 2015.
Document 14M004 available online

2. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

- QAR 3 PGT - SWK will be completed next week. LTS Manager checking EDU position. PSY will be available imminently.
- Secretary to ascertain deadline for submission of SSF report on Engagement through partnerships to LTC.
- Learning & Teaching Strategy Meeting – SSF had nothing to add to the agenda.
- Student Experience Report completed by Chair.

SECTION A: ITEMS FOR REPORT

Documents for these items are available to view on the SSF LTQC Blackboard site in the relevant meeting folder with discussion taking place via the discussion board online.

A.1 STATEMENTS FROM THE CHAIR

1. Usefulness of Discussion Board relating to items in Section A.

- This has not been used for some time so a decision was taken to remove it from future online agendas.

2. Supporting students entered for reassessment - there will be an opportunity for the referral to reassessment emails, which are sent by LTS to students, to be copied to Module Organisers and Advisers. This would make Module Organisers and Advisers aware of which students, taking reassessment in their module, they need to support. Is this something SSF colleagues would be interested in? You will find an example of the reassessment email sent to BIM students 2013/14 online and this will be updated, where necessary, for 2014/15. There is a similar email template for CCS students.

- Members preferred an emailed list of relevant students to Advisers, Module Organisers and Course Directors rather than copying emails to them. Secretary to investigate whether this is possible.

A.2 LTC UPDATE

LTC update following meeting on 28 January 2015 (document available online).

A.3 TPPG

Nothing further to report.

A.4 FACULTY APPEALS & COMPLAINTS COMMITTEE

January 2015 report available online.

A.5 PERIODIC COURSE REVIEW 2014/15

Course Review documentation 2014/15 can be found in the Course Review folder online.

A.6 ANNUAL MODULE REVIEW, ANNUAL COURSE MONITORING AND COURSE REVIEW

ANNUAL REVIEW OF ASSESSMENT AND MODERATION

Opportunities will be identified for the wider sharing of best practice and progress in completing action points will be monitored on an annual basis.

Documentation and information relating to 2014/15 Undergraduate and Postgraduate Annual Course Monitoring can be found in the 2014/15 Module Review and Annual Course Monitoring and Update Folder online.

A.7 MID MODULE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

TDs have been asked to complete the questionnaire distributed by the ADTP and return it to Rob Gray (TPPG Secretary) by 23 February for consideration at TPPG on 4 March.

Message from the ADTP:

As you know the SU Academic Officers are keen to see Mid Module evaluation taken forward, and there is strong support for it in recent QAA/HEA publications. Many HEIs do this already routinely and I am convinced that this should be a direction of travel for

us at UEA. Prior to any further discussions at TPPG or LTC, I'm keen to hear from Schools about their preferred approach.

Would you be kind enough to liaise with your TDs with respect to the current usage (or absence) of Mid-Module Evaluation in your Schools? I'd like to get a feel for whether this never happens, happens rarely, frequently, or all the time. I suspect it will be a very mixed picture. I'd also be very interested to know, in Schools where Mid-Module evaluation is being employed, whether it is being used on 1 semester modules or on Year-long modules, and also how it works – i.e. what method is used – hard copies, online via BB, other?

Discussion:

- ECO TD – relevant to year-long 40cr modules. Semester long modules are evaluated at the end of the relevant semester.
- SU Academic Officer – effectively informal evaluation takes place – students like to see change and dialogue whilst studying on the module.
- LAW TD – each module has a student rep reporting any issues on behalf of students and feeding back to them whilst modules are ongoing.
- SU Academic Officer – examples of informal good practice should be brought to the attention of academic colleagues and this does not necessarily need a formal process involving additional administration. Students generally ask for more/better use of the module Blackboard site, handbook clarification, lecturer to speak more clearly, finding feedback difficult to read etc.
- SSF Faculty Convener – student feedback has resulted in syllabus being changed to incorporate such things as how to write essay questions.
- NBS TD – colleagues need feedback on informal techniques.
- DEV TD – would prefer not to have any formal mid-module evaluation system

A8 COURSEWORK SUBMISSION AND RETURN DATA

Updated data provided by LTS.

SECTION B: ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND ACTION

B.1 NEW COURSES

ECO

BSc (Hons) Economics with YA (Scrutineer – Claudina Richards – report online).

- Scrutineer's comment: Need to establish the year abroad academic requirement in order to achieve a pass.
- ECO TD response: Awaiting decision as to who their year abroad partners will be and then this will be decided. Students will be studying in English.
- Scrutineer's comment: it might be helpful to clarify in the marketing material that students will be studying in English and therefore there is no language ability requirement to study on the year abroad and the School needs to set out the academic requirement in order to achieve a year abroad pass once partnerships have been agreed.

•
RESOLVED: This new course proposal was approved.

Proposal documents available in New Course Proposals and Course Closures folder online.

B.2 CHANGES TO EXISTING PROGRAMMES

LAW

LLB Law with American Law (Scrutineer – Sue Long)

- Proposal being resubmitted and was not received in time for this meeting. Following scrutiny it is hoped that Chair's Action will be possible.

Proposal documents available in New Course Proposals and Course Closures folder online.

B.3 FOUR POINT ACTION PLAN

Improving assessment and feedback for the NSS – discussion relating to the effectiveness of this plan.

Document 14D018 available online

Discussion:

- PSY TD – NSS is complex, changing year on year, dependent upon a whole range of factors – action points marginal.
- SU Academic Officer – Range of issues key to student experience – some of these, particularly CW turnaround times, would have an impact.
- Chair - short timeframe for responding to the four points. Arbitrary actions. CW turnaround - important, where CW turnaround times not met, for schools to explain to students the reason why this is taking longer than expected and when this might be completed. Students also need to understand fairness of feedback and marking
- NBS TD – marking with multiple markers – MO can see any discrepancies during meeting held with markers at the end of the marking task. Task is well resourced in NBS and they can still meet 20 day turnaround.
- SU Academic Officer – real difference between students in final year this year having just an odd piece returned late and last year when half of the work was returned late. Competitors returning work within 15 days.
- LAW TD – School has a number of students with extensions, some very lengthy. Feedback cannot be released until all of the work is submitted so 20 days is the longest extension that can be granted to a student without setting a new task.

B.4 REVIEW OF FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT

Chair submitted Faculty-wide report – document available online.

B.5 EXAM PAPER COLLECTION

Discussion relating to the process within Schools.

Discussion:

- Some statistics noted as being incorrect.
- Likely to be responsibility of TDs to keep within timeframe.
- Schools have different practices.
- TDs being chased to complete a task prior to the deadline is not helpful as schools are likely to have the task in hand.

B.6 PEER OBSERVATION

Document 14D019 available online

Discussion:

- Chair - need to achieve 100% compliance. ATs with a teaching workload of at least 20% need to be observed.
- NBS TD - NBS 96% compliant.
- DEV TD – DEV 70% compliant.
- LAW TD to submit document and circulate to members.

B.7 NSS AND PTES

Discussion around plans to boost take-up. Verbal reports from TDs.

Document 14D020 available online

Discussion:

- PSY TD – NSS 60% response rate. Already attended third year lectures to remind students to complete survey.
- LAW TD - Incentives can be risky.
- Likely to find more disengaged students completing the survey as the deadline approaches.
- NBS TD – promoting in school– CDs promoting in core modules, header slides onto main lectures, run a project management module and one of the projects help to facilitate take-up. Response rate not so good as last year at the moment but a concerted effort is in place now to promote take-up.
- DEV – 20% NSS and 8% on PTES – down on last year;’s figures currently. Currently promoting by announcement in bulletin, student reps asked to discuss within their courses, SSLC discussion, will use header slides.
- SU Academic Officer – higher turnout probably benefits the University.
- LAW TD – 20% NSS, about 5% down on this time last year. Colleagues putting slides and posters up. HoS spoken with Student Law Society, considered incentive of donating towards student ball if students respond to the survey. Considering other incentives for take-up.
- SWK – using postcards, welcome back meetings, research day with lunch, providing two labs to make it easier for students to complete the survey.
- EDU – regularly get 85% plus students completing surveys – TD goes to classes and tells students to complete the survey and they do. End of Jan/early Feb reminder, follow up with further reminders. Being too pushy may result in negative comments.
- ECO – response rate could be better –Teaching Enhancement Officer has been to third year lectures, follow up on Facebook and then another push in lectures to promote NSS survey.
- Incentive for students to study in a top performing university.
- PSY TD - if students are having real problems they need to consider whether resolutions are best achieved by directing these to the University or publishing through the survey.
- UUEAS representative – this is an opportunity for students to have their say.
- Survey data circulation – the process needs to be complete before circulation where naming/shaming takes place otherwise this has too negative an outcome.

B.8 E-ASSESSMENT (1500)

Alicia McConnell (presentation to be made available online)

- Emarking – seems to be going fine. Students feel that there hasn't been any enhancement to the feedback though.
- Group submissions – possible to see contribution of each student – quality of each student's contribution not necessarily clear though.
- Interactive rubrics available for any BB assessment – can be attached to each assessment – opportunity to feedforward on skills (usually give feedback on content). Available now for formative feedback. Should use Senate scales and can personalise feedback text. Technology needed to be able to download to iPad to enable markers to mark offline.
- Opportunity for different forms of assessment.
- Training needed.
- DEV good take up of emarking.
- Moving to BB will be a good advancement.
- Alicia's team will help anyone wishing to include interactive content into their formative assessment.
- Early adopters need confidence in the system. Introducing this is ideal when developing a new module. Incentivise early adopters in schools. NBS TD working on this in NBS.
- STU Academic Officer– students on some modules have very good experience in the use of technology but others not.
- University understands that resource is needed to develop technology.

B.9 MODULE AND STAGE REPORTING (1530)

Adam Green BIU

Document 14D021

- How can data best be utilised?
- Data being provided on an annual basis rather than on a five yearly basis for course review.
- ECO TD - data often incorrect and it may be appropriate to include a warning to indicate this is the case.
- PSY TD – stats analysis/text published may include incorrect assumptions which is problematic. Preference for stats without any text/analysis. Strong statements are not always helpful.
- General concern amongst TDs surrounding distribution/publication of data which might be incorrect or misleading. Analysis/qualitative comments need to be removed as there is a lot of information that is not collated into the analysis. Need to improve provision of data reports.
- NBS TD - entry tariff very important and this doesn't appear to have been considered – quality of students entering will have an impact.

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

LLM International Competition Law & Policy – Closure approved by Chair 17.2.15
Economics & Economic Psychology – Closure approved by Chair 19.2.15

Closure documents available in the Course Closure folder online.

SECTION D: EXTERNAL EXAMINERS REPORTS

External Examiner Reports/Responses 2012/13 – LTQC report to Assessments Office prepared by Chair – to be available online.

19 September 2014 – Assessments Office will remind those UG External Examiners who have not submitted reports by this deadline

24 October 2014 - Assessments Office will send a second reminder to UG External Examiners.

28 November 2014 - Assessments Office will send a third and final reminder to UG External Examiners.

16 January 2015 - Assessments Office will remind those PGT External Examiners who have not submitted reports by this deadline.

13 February 2015 - Assessments Office will send a second reminder to PGT External Examiners.

20 March 2015 - Assessments Office will send a third and final reminder to PGT External Examiners.

D.2 EXTERNAL EXAMINERS' REPORTS 2012/13 COMPLETED

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

EDU – Beaton, Carmichael (PGT)

PSY – Millings (PGT)

SWK – Doel (PGT)

EXTERNAL EXAMINERS' REPORTS 2012/13 OUTSTANDING

EDU – Burstow, Clarke, Croft, Ford, Stone (PGT) – with School

D.3 EXTERNAL EXAMINERS' REPORTS 2013/14 COMPLETED

Documents for these items are available to view on the SSF LTQC Blackboard site in the External Examiners' folder.

ECO – Reilly (PGT)

EDU – Stone, (PGT)

DEV – Corpus Ong, Garforth, Hurt, McKay, Sanchez-Ancochea, Singal, Wilson (PGT)

LAW – Rogers (UG)

NBS-LON – Barrett, Christodoulou, Johnson (UG)

NBS - Asimakou (NBS-LON), Rogers, Tan, Weetman (PGT)

PSY – Millings (PGT)

SWK - Higgs and Lymbery (UG)

SWK – Bailey (PGT)

Reilly (ECO PGT 2013/14): ISSUES FOR THE ATTENTION OF SSF LTQC:

THE SCHOOL RESPONDED APPROPRIATELY TO ALL THE POINTS RAISED BY THE EXTERNAL EXAMINER.

ONE PARTICULAR ISSUE IS THAT OF MARKS BEING RELEASED TO STUDENTS PRIOR TO THE FINAL ASSESSMENT BOARD WHICH BOTH THE EXTERNAL EXAMINER AND THE SCHOOL ARE UNHAPPY ABOUT BUT THUS FAR UNABLE TO DETERMINE WHY, OR PRESUMABLY BY WHOM, THIS DECISION WAS MADE. AS CONSISTENCY OF APPROACH IS KEY ACROSS THE UNIVERSITY THIS MAY BE AN ISSUE FOR LTQC TO CONSIDER FURTHER.

- Provisional exam marks released to students whilst they were still doing exams. Approved by TPPG without objection. This will be reviewed and picked up.

HIGGS (SWK UG 2013/14): ISSUES FOR THE ATTENTION OF SSF LTQC:

THE EE STATES: "There were some examples of marks being awarded on the borderline of marking boundaries which suggested the need for a clearer decision by markers and which led in some cases to marks being adjusted at the Board, when such decisions were probably more appropriately made via the marking/moderation process." SSF internal examiners would benefit from a steer on this matter.

- Taken into consideration by school

LYMBERY (SWK UG 2013/14): ISSUES FOR THE ATTENTION OF SSF LTQC:

(1) THE EE STATES: "I believe that it is important to allocate modules to individual External Examiners rather than splitting them; I believe that this will enable a fuller accommodation with the requirements of Degree Regulation 7.3.4." SWK agrees. Should other SSF Schools be directed accordingly?

(2) THE EE STATES: "I did have cause to mention that marks of 70 should be avoided – where possible, an essay/script should be marked positively as being located in a given category, rather than on the borderline." SSF internal examiners would benefit from a steer on this matter.

- School has this in hand.

EXTERNAL EXAMINERS' REPORTS 2013/14 OUTSTANDING

CCE– Mannering (UG) – with Task Group Member

CCE – Seddon (UG) – Report Not Received

DEV – Lind (UG) – Report Not Received

EDU – Smith (UG) – Report Not Received

EDU – Ford (PGT) – with Task Group Member

EDU – Alexander, Bailey, Beaton, Carmichael, Croft (PGT) – with School

LAW – Andreangeli, Ashiagbor, Harrison, Soyer, Syrett (PGT) – with School

LAW - Paterson (PGT) – with Team Leader

LAW – Bagshaw (UG) – Report Not Received

NBS – Nikolopoulos (PGT) – with Task Group Member

NBS – Tempest, Veloutsou (PGT) – with School

NBS - Barrett, Johnson (PGT) – Establishing whether reports have been received

NBS – Ioannidis (PGT) – Report Not Received

PSY– Cook and Vitkovitch (UG) – with School

SWK – Doel (PGT) – with School
SWK – Baron, Broadhurst, Murphy, Nelson (PGT) – with Team Leader
SWK – McGregor (Skehill) (PGT) – Report Not Received

DATE OF NEXT MEETING AND FUTURE ITEMS

Date of Next Meeting: Wednesday 22 April 2015 1400 - 1600 in TPSC 2.24

Future Items:

APRIL 2015 Meeting:

1. Senate Scales - revisit to assess the impact of the new UG senate scales.
2. Schools to report back on Peer Review (completed March 2015) to enable the Chair to report to the June LTC.
3. Annual Monitoring - closing the loop.
4. Support for students between initial assessment and reassessment-Review for 2014/15 students. Students need to be aware of what opportunities are available to them. Discuss at April 2015 meeting.
5. Neil Ward (1400 - 15 mins) - Module and Stage Data.
6. Lynne Ward (1530 - 20 mins) - External Examiners, QAE Guide, HER Update