



ACADEMIC BOARD

LEARNING, TEACHING AND STUDENT EXPERIENCE COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 23rd November 2016 at 2pm in the Dartington Suite, Wallscourt Farmhouse, Frenchay campus.

Present: Jane Harrington (chair), Jo Midgley, Lisa Harrison, Gerry Rice, Fiona Tolmie, Wendy Woodland, Mandy Lee, Jenny Dye, Sarah Mackie, Rachel Cowie, Alastair Osborn, Elizabeth Cleaver, Jackie Chelin, Maggie Westgarth, Jan Richardson, Jenny Ames, Jamie Jordon, Olivia Evans, Irajeh Ahmed, Ronnie Mutulili, Joshua Vaughan, Gail Wilson (officer)

Apologies: Jackie Rogers, Teresa Wood, Jim Longhurst, John Lanham, John Clarke, Rosie Scott-Ward, Neil Willey, Elyshia Neal, Timothy Kichwen

In attendance: Jayne Storey (for item LTSEC16.11.5), Edward Burrell, Jenny Wills (for item LTSEC16.11.11 and LTSEC16.11.12), Lisa Connors (for item LTSEC16.11.19), Helen Clark (for item LTSEC16.11.20)

LTSEC16.11.1	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE
LTSEC16.11.1.1	Apologies for the meeting were recorded.
LTSEC16.11.2	MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING
LTSEC16.11.2.1	The minutes of the last meeting, which was held on the 5 th July 2016, were confirmed as an accurate record of the meeting.
LTSEC16.11.3	MATTERS ARISING NOT OTHERWISE INCLUDED ON THE AGENDA
LTSEC16.11.3.1	Blended learning update LTSEC16.07.4.4.1 - the Officer gave an update that a meeting between the Associate Deans, the Student Finance Manager and the Immigration Team Manager had taken place and decided that the term was no longer fit for purpose and would be phased out.
LTSEC16.11.4	LIST OF BUSINESS 2016-17
LTSEC16.11.4.1	The Chair introduced paper <i>LTSEC16.11.02</i> which gave an indication of the business for the committee for the year. A decision was made that the enhancement meeting in May would focus on learning gain.

	<i>The meeting then moved to item 21.</i>
LTSEC16.11.5	Annual Report on Student Behaviour 2015-16
LTSEC16.11.5.1	The Head of Strategy and Executive Services introduced paper <i>LTSEC16.11.17</i> and highlighted the different levels from 1-3 for categorising issues, with 3 being the most serious. Case numbers are broadly comparable to 2014-15, with a slight increase in student cases under the Fitness to Study policy, which is thought to be caused by the policy becoming more embedded. There are large numbers of low level complaints focused on noise and anti-social behaviour caused by alcohol and drug-use. 37% of students in University accommodation were disciplined and there is a concern that a culture is developing on campus which normalises these behaviours, and with student accommodation spaces on campus increasing there is an urgent need to address the situation. The Head of Strategy and Executive Services showed the committee a sample of CCTV footage as an illustrative example of the kinds of behaviour causing concern.
LTSEC16.11.5.2	Due to the increasing number of complaints the Vice Chancellor has received from neighbours a taskforce has been set up. The question posed to the committee was how the University can affect change based on support and culture change, rather than using discipline and sanctions. There was support for establishing a set of shared values, linked to employability and professionalism, that are communicated to students as being key to their future employment prospects. This approach has worked well in health programmes, where professional suitability is embedded, and in Architecture, where students become part of a professional community from day 1. Health and Education have worked to share good practice around professional suitability which colleagues have found very useful.
LTSEC16.11.5.3	There was a lot of discussion around Fresher's and induction week and how this sets the tone for the rest of the year. Fresher's events are often very focused around alcohol, and some programmes have a very light schedule in induction week, leaving students with lots of free time. The Director of Academic Services has asked the Start of the Year Group to explore making induction week more intensive to help settle students in academic life as soon as possible. The Students' Union also reported that they had been running more daytime events during Fresher's Week, and were happy to explore running more events along these lines and support key messages around behaviour. There is also a key link with the enhanced year project and exploring options for more curricula or co-curricula based events. Academic Personal Tutors also have a key role in supporting students and communicating what is expected.
LTSEC16.11.5.4	There was a concern that the University had built lots of accommodation on campus without considering the facilities and environment on offer to students beyond the traditional activities on offer from the Students' Union. More needs to be done to create an inclusive campus that fosters different kinds of engagement. Incidents are often dealt with by low grade security staff in the early hours of the morning and more needs to be done to support these staff. A Senior Lecturer in FBL has been

	pioneering the use of bystander training and there was support for exploring this approach. Action: Officer to invite the Senior Lecturer to LTSEC to speak about bystander training.
LTSEC16.11.5.5	Complaints about students are not routinely shared with the faculty (apart from Professional Suitability issues) and often students are most concerned about their tutors finding out about their behaviour. More needs to be done to share information between faculties and professional services so that staff have an awareness of what is going on and to help communicate messages. Action: The Head of Strategy and Executive Services to provide data broken down by faculty
	The Students' Union have introduced Teaching Individuals Gender Equality and Respect (TIGER) into training for sports and societies committee members and are also keen to reintroduce the Halls Reps system, which would be a key group to train in bystander training.
LTSEC16.11.6	LEARNING 2020
LTSEC16.11.6.1	Enhanced Year Project
LTSEC16.11.6.1.1	The Associate Dean Learning, Teaching and the Student Experience for FBL introduced paper <i>LTSEC16.11.03</i> which provided an update on the enhanced year project. The VP Education provided some feedback on the proposals, which had been discussed at the Student Representative Committee. In terms of providing "value for money" students like the current length of the year and would prefer to see more resources and contact time within the existing calendar. In response, the Associate Dean highlighted that the proposals would not extend the term any further into the summer, but was more about the weeks currently scheduled and there were plenty of opportunities within the existing calendar to add activities. Action: VP Education to share the student feedback from SRC.
LTSEC16.11.6.1.2	There was a concern about how developing and delivering activities would be resourced, and how staff would be supported. The paper is asking if there is an appetite to put resource into developing the concept further; some ideas are easy to do and some need resource to develop further. There is general support for the concept but more work is still required around how it would work in practice to answer many of the operational questions. The committee endorsed the paper to Academic Board.
LTSEC16.11.7	STUDENT VOICE AND ENGAGEMENT
LTSEC16.11.7.1	National Student Survey: outcomes and planning
LTSEC16.11.7.1.1	The Head of Learning and Teaching Enhancement provided an update

	<p>on behalf of the NSS taskforce. Common themes from the taskforce meetings highlighted that staff on high performing programmes work as a team and foster a culture of openness, honesty and ownership with their students. Issues will always occur in such a large and complex organisation but students value staff communicating with them about the issues and what is being done, rather than a blame culture developing. Although sometimes programme structure can influence student satisfaction, it was found that generally staff have the most impact. Programme leaders need particular skills, such as attention to detail and the ability to communicate with students, in order to be successful.</p>
LTSEC16.11.7.1.2	<p>A set of focus groups were held with students to help improve understanding of how students would interpret and answer the new NSS questions. A number of useful points were highlighted;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individually students were clear in what they thought the questions meant, but there was no collective understanding • Timely feedback was not related to the 20-day turn around policy but rather local expectations set by programme teams • Demand for IT is moving away from hardware to specialist software, and being able to access this off campus • The student rep system is not always associated with the SU.
LTSEC16.11.7.1.3	<p>Preparations are now beginning for the 2017 NSS. UWE will be launching the survey officially from the 30th January, but as for last year programme teams can promote the survey earlier, from the 9th January, if this suits their programme structure better. Communications out to staff will begin shortly and briefings for staff will be held during December and January in preparation for the survey launch, but programme teams need to be talking to students now about issues and changes that have been made in response in feedback so students understand how their feedback has been acted upon. The Chair reiterated the importance of NSS and encouraged faculties to ensure staff are engaging with their students and attending briefings.</p>
LTSEC16.11.7.1.4	<p>The "You Said, UWE Did" campaign is evolving to have a greater programmatic focus. At University level more will be done to help emphasise positive messages all year round to help develop pride and confidence in students and help facilitate engagement at a local level, discussions are currently taking place with Marketing, Student Communications and Internal Communications. There were lots of suggestions to how communicate messages to students including the use of lamppost banners and coffee cup cuffs.</p>
LTSEC16.11.8	<p>Update on the Academic Quality and Regulatory Review</p>
LTSEC16.11.8.1	<p>The Chair gave a verbal update on the review which will deliver a radical overhaul of quality and the regulations. The review is clearly linked to L2020 and will pull together a number of initiatives that impact on programme design into a framework that is manageable in practice. The new quality framework will also be more focused around metrics in line</p>

	with the changing external environment.
LTSEC16.11.9	Changes to the Quality Management and Enhancement Framework
	The changes proposed in paper LTSEC16.11.05 were approved.
LTSEC16.11.10	International Student Experience Group
LTSEC16.11.10.1	<p>The membership and terms of reference (<i>LTSEC16.11.06</i>) were tabled at the meeting for approval. There was a query about whether the group would just be considering taught students and if it should be extended to cover research students as well. It was also thought that a representative from Students Communications might be useful, although possibly only for relevant meetings considering the size of the group. Finally, the committee requested that the group review the remit at the end of the year and if it needs to continue. Action: Officer to feedback points to chair of the group.</p> <p>The committee approved the membership and terms of reference.</p>
LTSEC16.11.11	Guidelines on Supervision for Dissertations and Projects by Taught Students
LTSEC16.11.11.1	The Head of Complaints and Appeals introduced paper <i>LTSEC16.11.07</i> . The guidelines had been developed in response to an OIA recommendation to give staff more comprehensive guidelines on what they should be delivering around supervision. The guidelines had been informed by a workshop with supervisors which had helped clarify a number of issues, mainly to not set minimum and maximum amounts of supervisory meetings as one size does not fit all, but to allow this to be agreed at a local level, with the student being clear on what to expect.
LTSEC16.11.11.2	There was discussion around whether 4 weeks was too long for a supervisor to be away before alternative arrangements were put in place. There was some support that 2 weeks might be more suitable but it may depend on the time of the year and there was a clear difference between foreseen absence, and unforeseen absence, especially if it was prolonged. Staff also have a responsibility to put clear out of office messages on so students are aware the member of staff is away and who they can contact.
LTSEC16.11.11.3	There was a concern about wording from a CMA perspective, and it was felt it would be useful to review the guidelines with this in mind. Action: The Head of Complaints and Appeals to speak to the Deputy Head of Learning and Teaching Enhancement about the guidelines and CMA.

LTSEC16.11.11.4	<p>There were some specific comments around the wording including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The language jumps from 1st to 3rd person • Some of the language is colloquial and may be confusing for international students • Replace he/she with they <p>Most of the difficulty with the guidance is clarification around phrases such as “respond promptly” which are open to interpretation. It also needs to be clearer that first page is the agreement and the rest is guidance which can be edited. The committee requested that the guidance be revised and brought back for approval.</p>
LTSEC16.11.12	Complaints and Appeals Annual Report 2015-16
LTSEC16.11.12.1	<p>The Head of Complaints and Appeals introduced <i>LTSEC16.11.16</i>, the annual report on complaints and appeals. This year has seen a reduction in case load for the team, which is due to the changes to extenuating circumstances, greater empowerment of staff at a local level to deal with stage 1 complaints and the University learning from past cases and reports. For example, there has been a significant reduction in complaints around fees, due to the hard work of the student fees team to make the fees policy clearer and provide better information to students. The total number of cases is still low in context with the number of students at the University. The team will produce detailed faculty reports to be considered at future ASQC meetings. The team is currently working closely with HAS in preparation for the changes to funding and the expectations of students and with the Equality and Diversity unit to produce guidance for staff around dealing with allegations of bullying and harassment.</p>
LTSEC16.11.13	Teaching Excellence Framework
LTSEC16.11.13.1	<p>The Chair discussed the data in <i>LTSEC16.11.08</i>, highlighting the negative flag for retention for part-time students, which is due to the way these students are registered. The 15-page submission is due the 26th January and the University is confident of achieving a silver rating. The next step is to work towards a gold rating, which as a teaching-focused institution, should be a key goal. Although there are many political tensions around the TEF and how it may be used, ultimately the focus has to be on improving the student experience.</p>
LTSEC16.11.14	UWE Graduate Destination and Employment Performance Report 2016
LTSEC16.11.14.1	<p>The Head of Employability and Enterprise presented <i>LTSEC16.11.09</i> and highlighted some of the key points from the paper. The University has made significant improvements over the last 6 years, outperforming the market average and in terms of graduate employment is ahead of many Russell Group universities. However, under the headline figures there is</p>

	<p>huge amounts of variation at a subject level, with some areas performing very well and some very poorly. One contributing factor is that rates of further study are very low across the University and in many subject areas where you would expect to see 25% of students go on to further study, very few of them do. The University's very large cohort of health students helps to keep employment figures high but this cohort may decrease in size due to changes in funding. The second largest cohort, business, also performs well, but could do even better due to the strength of the region the University sits in. There was a particular mention for Education, who have improved their outcomes significantly, with one JACS area now performing 17.3% above the market.</p>
LTSEC16.11.14.2	<p>The paper highlights a number of barriers to improving DLHE outcomes. The introduction of two metrics from DLHE in the TEF puts even greater emphasis on the University's results, and this has already increased focus and engagement from staff. A number of recommendations were outlined in the paper, many of which are already in motion. In particular, there is now agreement for an employability taskforce, mirrored on the NSS taskforce, to tackle areas of low performance and share good practice from high performing programmes. Programmes also need to work across subjects to improve outcomes, for example encouraging students into look into further study in subject areas such as business, which dramatically improves their graduate prospects.</p>
LTSEC16.11.15	Widening Participation Committee: Update November
LTSEC16.11.15.1	<p>The Pro Vice Chancellor Student Experience gave an overview of paper <i>LTSEC16.11.10</i>, which provided an update on the work of the Widening Participation Committee. The University successful bid for funding from the HEFCE National Collaborative Outreach Programme to develop a scheme called Future Quest, to work in partnership with schools and colleges to target areas where the participation rate is lower than expected based on attainment at GCSE. There has also been a recent internal audit of the way the University monitors progress against the access agreement, which has highlighted a number of areas for improvement. Finally, the Race Equality Taskforce has kicked off with an initial meeting to discuss the scope and start planning.</p>
LTSEC16.11.16	Early Resits
LTSEC16.11.16.1	<p>The Director of Academic Services introduced paper <i>LTSEC16.11.11</i> which provided a review of the change to the academic calendar two years ago, particularly focusing on the move of resits to earlier in the summer term. The paper presents a number of advantages and disadvantages to the change, plus data from two years of results. The data shows that the pass rate at resits increased by 4%, whilst attendance dropped slightly by 1%. The recommendation from the paper was to continue with the academic calendar, as the experience at the start of the year is much improved, and the University can be much</p>

	more proactive in supporting students. The committee endorsed this recommendation and proposals in the paper for further improvements.
LTSEC16.11.17	Use of SafeAssign
LTSEC16.11.17.1	The Head of Learning and Teaching Enhancement presented paper <i>LTSEC16.11.12</i> which summarises the University's journey with the plagiarism detection software SafeAssign. A sub-group of LTSEC had been convened last year to explore the possibility of automatically running all work submitted online through SafeAssign. This work was picked up by QAA during the Higher Education Review in October 2015 and the roll-out of SafeAssign was included in the final report as an affirmation. To explore the potential impact of this, a pilot was carried out, which highlighted that many staff believed that SafeAssign was not supporting the effective detection of plagiarism in student work. Following on from this, there have been discussions at the Academic Technologies Group around exploring Turnitin, which is widely understood to be the market leader in plagiarism software detection.
LTSEC16.11.17.2	There was concern from some on the committee that there was a perhaps a misunderstanding from staff about what plagiarism software can do, and no software would catch everything. However, it was clear that Blackboard, who own SafeAssign, have no plans to develop the product and is missing access to several large journal publishing houses, which Turnitin does. It is also difficult to predict what Safeassign will or will not pick up, which makes it difficult in turn to produce helpful guidance for staff. It has been challenging throughout the whole project to get a consistent view of the best approach, therefore the Chair requested that a small sub-group meet to agree the way forward. Action: Interested members to contact the officer.
LTSEC16.11.18	Annual Report of the Learning, Teaching and Student Experience Committee 2015-16
LTSEC16.11.18.1	Paper <i>LTSEC16.11.13</i> was approved by the committee as an accurate report of the activity of the committee.
LTSEC16.11.19	Annual Thematic Review of Periodic Curriculum Review and Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body Activity 2015-16
LTSEC16.11.19.1	The curriculum Review and Accreditation Manager presented <i>LTSEC16.11.14</i> which gave an overview of PCR and PSRB activity in 2015-16. Positive themes identified included engagement with Strategy 2020 and the strong links with industry, the positive impact of engaged teaching staff on the student experience and the value of placements, although there is an ongoing challenge in providing enough suitable placements for students. There were less issues raised around assessment than in previous years, which demonstrates the progress

	being made in this area. In terms of areas of enhancement, more needs to be done around student's awareness of accreditation and the value of these. One of the areas, around articulating appropriate learning outcomes for level 7, is already being addressed within the Learning and Teaching Enhancement Team in order to best support academic colleagues. The pilot of the new PCR process, which is more based on evidence and metrics, will continue to be rolled out during 2016-17.
LTSEC16.11.20	External Examiner Annual Reports
LTSEC16.11.20.1	The Senior External Examiners Officer introduced LTSEC16.11.15, which in response to feedback on last year's report has changed in format and moved away from a thematic report, which replicated work undertaken within faculties, to an assurance based report for Academic Board. The report shows there is still a difference between confidence in standards and quality between UWE provision and collaborative partners. Action: Collaborative Provision Committee to report back to LTSEC on the difference and the impact of last year's actions.
LTSEC16.11.21	Delays to Periodic Curriculum Review
LTSEC16.11.21.1	The Director of Academic Services highlighted that the Academic Quality and Regulatory Review would cause disruption to the PCR schedule and asked LTSEC to give permission to approve changes outside of the committee. LTSEC agreed to this approach.
	Dates of future meetings: 25 th January 2017 29 th March 2017 10 th May 2017 21 st June 2017 19 th July 2017