



LEARNING, TEACHING AND STUDENT EXPERIENCE COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting of the Learning, Teaching and Student Experience Committee held on Wednesday 6 April 2022.

Present: Amanda Coffey (Chair), David Barrett, Tim Brailsford, Suzanne Carrie, Jacqueline Chelin, Rachel Cowie, Jennifer Dye, Antony Hill, Samuel Ikpe, Helen King, Vanique Kruger, Hannah Mathias, Cathy Minett-Smith, Heather Moyes, Dami Okeyoyin, Gerry Rice, Jeanette Sakel, Selen Kars, Helen King, Richard Strange, Ian Stratton (Secretary), Jenni Wilkinson, Neil Willey, Thomas Wild.

In attendance: Dan Bougourd (item 5.1), David Evans (item 4.6) Amy Morgan (Officer), Iain Mossman (item 4.3 and 4.4), Laura O'Brien (item 4.1), Judith Ritchie, Bec Rengel (item 4.2) and Lucy Scott (item 5.2).

Apologies: Jacqueline Butler, Sasha Chibumbu, Caterina Costa, Peter Clegg, Nadine Fry, Laura Harrison, Jo Midgley, Jackie Rogers, Simon Scarle.

LTSEC22.04.1	WELCOME AND APOLOGIES
LTSEC22.04.1.1	The Chair welcomed members to the meeting and noted apologies received.
LTSEC22.04.1.2	The Chair noted there were no declarations of interest.
LTSEC22.04.2	MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING
LTSEC22.04.2.1	Previous Minutes
	<i>Paper LTSEC22.04.01 was received</i>
LTSEC22.04.2.1.1	The minutes were approved as a true and accurate record of discussions
LTSEC22.04.2.2	*Action Sheet and Matters Arising
	<i>Paper LTSEC22.04.02 was received</i>
LTSEC22.04.2.2.1	Members noted the updated action sheet, and the Chair confirmed there was only one remaining action (policy register) that had been moved into business as usual.
LTSEC22.04.2.3	*Chair's Actions
LTSEC22.04.2.3.1	The Chair confirmed there had been no Chair's Action since the last meeting on 2 February.
LTSEC22.04.3	STANDING AGENDA ITEMS
LTSEC22.04.3.1	*Chair's Report
	<i>Paper LTSEC22.04.03 was received</i>
LTSEC22.04.3.1.1	Members noted the Chair's report for information.

LTSEC22.04.3.2	Students' Union Report
LTSEC22.04.3.2.1	<p><i>Paper LTSEC22.04.04 was received</i></p> <p>The VP societies and comms presented the paper and members noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) That the presidents are starting to transition and handover as there is two months left of the current SU presidents. ii) That the new officers have been appointed for the next academic year and Rania Regaieg will be the new SU president. iii) That there have been various activities on the key focuses; sustainability, celebrating culture campaign, student voice and mental health – all noted in the paper. iv) That the SU have recently engaged with open day, introducing students all the SU offers and there was positive feedback from prospective students and parents following this. v) That the SU are working on promoting the SU's achievements and the preparation is in progress for the award ceremonies throughout the summer. vi) That the SU Team are planning mental health first aid training for sport clubs, societies, and academic staff around Easter.
LTSEC22.04.3.2.2	<p>The Chair thanked all SU colleagues on behalf of LTSEC for all the hard work and commitment of the SU officers throughout 21/22.</p>
LTSEC22.04.4	QUALITY, STANDARDS AND THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE
LTSEC22.04.4.1	Access and Participation Plan Update
LTSEC22.04.4.1.1	<p><i>Paper LTSEC22.04.05 was received</i></p> <p>The Reporting and Communications Manager presented the paper. Members heard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) That the paper provides an update on progress against the APP plan and the OfS have recently reviewed their approach to APP monitoring asking HEIs to provide a variation to their plans 23/24. ii) That the most immediate change is that monitoring return will not be required and these with only be required from providers where there are concerns. iii) That a working group has been set up to progress the variation with the aim to secure sign off in May and submission of the variation over the summer.
LTSEC22.04.4.1.2	<p>In further update, members heard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) That UWE is currently on target or ahead of many objectives however there are still improvements needed in certain areas.

<p>LTSEC22.04.4.1.2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii) That the community of practice is highly active and currently has 294 members. iii) That the equity module is supporting current students with 111 registered for the module and 35 students have been matched with mentors from local businesses. iv) That the total UWE Cares cohort is now 400 undergraduate students who are supported in a wide range of different ways. <p>In group discussion, members noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) That the award gap continues to present the biggest challenge and area of risk for the University and reducing the awarding gap is a key strategic priority. The progress is positive but remains an ongoing challenge and colleagues must not become complacent. ii) That EDI colleagues are attending an online conference to learn in more detail about the variation and plans are developing week by week.
<p>LTSEC22.04.4.1.3</p>	<p>The Head of EDI noted the three main risks were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Funding is being reduced to partnerships (future quest), expecting partners to do more with less money. ii) There is increased focus on raising attainment in schools and this is challenging as there are already well-established mechanisms in plan to address raising attainment. It will be important to capture everything that happening already to show evidence and impact on raising attainment. iii) The mechanism to addressing access to outcome, looking at subject level and where there is widening access and diverse student body – are those students achieving good outcomes?
<p>LTSEC22.04.4.1.4</p>	<p>In group discussion, members noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) That it is important the university is making sure the rationale for work we do is clear and show evidence for that. ii) That ensuring other spaces align with the EDI plan is critical for example the apprenticeship provision. iii) That LTSEC and the university need to push harder on these objectives and actions. For example, the graduate school, access measured through PGR level. iv) That the university need to ensure EDI is not being compartmentalising but rather the EDI thread should run through all business. v) That there should be work done on how to strength the EDI message, ensuring colleagues work is carried out through an EDI lens.

LTSEC22.04.4.1.5	The Head of EDI confirmed there would be further updates with possible Chair's actions needed before the June meeting however members would be keep informed.
LTSEC22.04.4.2	2021 Inclusive Curriculum Survey Results
	<i>Paper LTSEC22.04.06 was received</i>
LTSEC22.04.4.2.1	The Data and Evaluation Officer presented the findings.
LTSEC22.04.4.2.2	Members heard the main purpose of the survey was to better understand the perspectives of learning and teaching staff on inclusivity in curriculum design, teaching practice, and general awareness.
LTSEC22.04.4.2.3	Members heard that the survey was also used to temperature check the Inclusive Practice Toolkit (IPT) ensuring it was fit for purpose.
LTSEC22.04.4.2.4	Members heard that the successes included: awareness was increasing of underrepresented groups and awarding gaps, L&T staff were engaging in inclusive practices and the majority of respondents were using the IPT.
LTSEC22.04.4.2.5	Members heard that the areas for improvement included: making policies and procedures more well known, more content needed in the toolkit on inclusive language and learning styles, changes in staff attitudes and there was scope to think more innovatively about curriculum and assessment design.
LTSEC22.04.4.2.6	Members noted there were 17 recommendations however future work focus on the following themes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Workload allocation and incentivisation ii) Clarity and comms iii) Teamwork and collaboration iv) Student voice
LTSEC22.04.4.2.7	In group discussion, members noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) That the APD work with programme teams about curriculum design principles of which include inclusivity and the UVP panels scrutinise curriculum. ii) That inclusive practice should be embedded into business as usual and part of general professional development. iii) That it is the responsibility of leadership teams who have the agency to change and develop working practices. iv) That the time it takes to design modules and doing this well to provide a rich experience should be acknowledged. v) That the Subject Readiness Review project with support the inclusive practice work. vi) That the getting the workload model correct will allow for an academic portfolio to be sustainable and of value. The workload model needs to be used creatively and effectively. The Chair thanked EDI colleagues for all the work involved in the survey and the ongoing IPT.

LTSEC22.04.4.2.8	
<p>LTSEC22.04.4.3</p>	<p>Review of UWE Degree Awarding Algorithm against UK Standing Committee for Quality Assessment (UKSCQA) principles for effective degree algorithm design <i>Paper LTSEC22.04.07 was received</i></p>
<p>LTSEC22.04.4.3.1</p>	<p>Head of Student and Academic Policy Enhancement presented the paper and members heard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) That following a review by an external consultant it was noted that there was divergence between UWE’s degree algorithm and practice across the sector. ii) That the paper demonstrates features of the UWE degree algorithm against UKSCQA’s six principles. iii) That the use of ‘best 100 credits’ is becomingly increasing out of date and many universities have reduced influence of this in degree classification. iv) That the recommendation is to remove the best 100 credit calculation from our Level 6 algorithm from 2022/23 academic year for new first year undergraduate students. v) That the proposed changes address about 90% of the areas of concern.
<p>LTSEC22.04.4.3.2</p>	<p>In group discussion, members noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) That the university needs to be mindful of working within the framework of the sector, within regulatory guidance and principles. ii) That the data needs to be reviewed and understand what this might mean for the awarding gap, UUK research shows that changes to degree algorithm can impact gaps (more or less). iii) That an equity analysis needs to be during as part of the consultation. iv) That there needs to be clear comms to staff and students if/when implemented and decided. v) That the year one will continue to not count with some discounting in year two and final will be more significant. vi) That the discounting just at level 5 will have the biggest impact on graduate outcomes and the recommendation could be changed to discounting at level 5&6. vii) That year one is about building students confidence as they enter HE and allowing students to be creative and experimental and this is common in UK HE.
<p>LTSEC22.04.4.3.3</p>	<p>The Chair summarised discussions and noted that there is work to be done on the impact of changing the algorithm, understanding what it means for outcomes and being mindful that it does not address all concerns outlined in the report.</p>

<p>LTSEC22.04.4.3.4</p>	<p>It was agreed a sub-group would take this work forward and any learnings from other institutions who have gone through this would be sought.</p>
<p>LTSEC22.04.4.3.5</p>	<p>Action: Head of Student and Academic Policy Enhancement LTSEC members endorsed the general approach to the review and the recommendations to changing the degree algorithm.</p>
<p>LTSEC22.04.4.3.5</p>	<p>The Chair confirmed the post graduate taught algorithm would be brought back to LTSEC for review and approval.</p>
<p>LTSEC22.04.4.4</p>	<p>Options for implementation of the new Academic Regulations</p>
<p>LTSEC22.04.4.4.1</p>	<p><i>Paper LTSEC22.04.08 was received</i> Head of Student and Academic Policy Enhancement presented the paper and members heard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) That the paper sets out the options for implementation of the new draft academic regulations, following the delay of the Student Information and Records Management system. ii) That the ongoing project is looking at what can be delivered and how through the existing UWE systems with changes to systems and processes. iii) That a working draft of the regulations is due to be presented at Academic Board in May through scrutiny of UQSSC. iv) That the recommended proposal is to bring in all possible changes for September 2022, using wording from newly drafted regulations. v) That LTSEC are being asked if members are comfortable with the timeframe, that the proposal is sensible and if there is any high risk.
<p>LTSEC22.04.4.4.2</p>	<p>In group discussion, members noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) That the biggest challenges are the changes of the fundamental building blocks of current SIRM system. ii) That the regs work is being integrated into the assessment conversation. iii) That the timeframe will be published as soon as possible to colleagues including academic practice staff. iv) That the impact on students starting in September 2022 needs to be considered and that there needs to be a tight handle on communications and version control. v) That partners need to be considered as part of this work and the implication on variant regulations.
<p>LTSEC22.04.4.4.3</p>	<p>LTSEC members delegated detailed scrutiny to the University Quality and Standards sub-committee.</p>
<p>LTSEC22.04.4.5</p>	<p>Collaborative Provision Review <i>Paper LTSEC22.04.09 was received</i></p>

LTSEC22.04.4.5.1	<p>The Head of Student and Academic Policy Enhancement presented the paper and members heard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) That the new OfS B conditions have been confirmed and will come into force on the 1 May. These are explicit that the conditions apply to both the awarding body and the delivery partner. ii) That the paper sets out how UWE processes for monitoring CP are meeting the conditions and draft recommendations. iii) That currently there are risks that UWE will not meet the conditions (regarding CP) unless action is taken. iv) That there are not consistent annual monitoring processes across the University and that there are pockets of inconsistency with student engagement across the University. v) That the recommendation is to set up a task and finish group that reports into LTSEC and UQSSC to progress the recommendations from the review.
LTSEC22.04.4.5.2	<p>In group discussion, members noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) That the use of the continuous improvement tool will be a positive contribution towards the collaborative provision review. ii) That the University is not currently at risk however members need assurance there is a consistent approach. iii) That a tight task and finish group needs to quickly see through the recommendations and report back to LTSEC in due course.
LTSEC22.04.4.6	<p>Ofsted SAR and QIP (Apprenticeships)</p>
	<p><i>Paper LTSEC22.04.10 was received</i></p>
LTSEC22.04.4.6.1	<p>The Deputy Director SAS (Policy Development and Student Experience) presented the paper and members heard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) That the paper is a substantially revised version of the first draft that came to LTSEC in November 2021 and that these are the key documents in readiness for Ofsted inspection of apprentice provision. ii) That the paper is a more concise and succinct version and will remain as a working document to build on. iii) That an Ofsted inspection will take place in the next 13 months and the SAR and QIP are based on the education inspection framework and assessing against this, identifying areas of strengths and improvements. iv) That LTSEC are asked to comment and endorse the report with a view to take to the May Academic Board and to publish and send through to Ofsted.
LTSEC22.04.4.6.2	<p>The Deputy Director SAS thanked all colleagues involved on the hard work and collaboration to bring the improved SAR and QIP</p>

<p>LTSEC22.04.4.6.3</p>	<p>together and asked LTSEC members to send through any detailed feedback and comments directly to them.</p> <p>In group discussion, members noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) That the SAR & QIP reflect the maturity of UWE as an apprenticeship provider and that there will be more examples over time to add to the SAR to provide richer data. ii) That the 'British' values currently doesn't align to the UWE values and there was a suggestion to not amend to 'all' values. iii) That as the provision matures, there will be less focus on on examples and more assurance from underlying data. iv) That there will soon be data on feedback from employers due to the surveying at the moment, these will be included in the SAR. v) That the risk is to ensure the SAR is as good as possible and the focus will now shift to socialising this into the institution. vi) That there has been a recent Ofsted inspection on the ITT provision, and therefore colleagues are learning as much as possible about the inspections, mindful the apprenticeship provision is very different.
<p>LTSEC22.04.4.6.4</p>	<p>Members confirmed they would send any further feedback, comments, questions and areas to strengthen to the relevant colleagues.</p>
<p>LTSEC22.04.4.7</p>	<p>Ethical Review of Student Research</p>
	<p><i>Paper LTSEC22.04.11 was received</i></p>
<p>LTSEC22.04.4.7.1</p>	<p>The Chair of RESC presented the paper and members heard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) That the paper updates LTSEC members on action taken on the ethical review of student research from June 2021. ii) That a supporting a student and prevention will continue to be the priority for the institution before deadline with an assessment offence. iii) That following a PwC internal audit in 2021, a checklist and SharePoint site have been developed to enable the University to audit supervisory risk assessment and approvals. iv) That the proposal is for the online checklist to go live for the 22/23 academic year. v) That LTSEC members are asked to approve the recommendations detailed in paper LTSEC22.04.11.
<p>LTSEC22.04.4.7.2</p>	<p>In group discussion, members noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) That it is a good idea to capture this information in an online environment as there is currently no paper trail.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii) That there needs to be assurance that all staff members are trained on ethics and a suggestion to make ethics training mandatory for all. iii) That the term 'checklist' could be amended to 'review' or 'reflection' to ensure this is integrated into the process. iv) That an audit should be carried out to show how this is measured. v) That the checklist is a much-improved model of the previous process used in FET.
LTSEC22.04.4.8	Policy Review Update
	<i>Paper LTSEC22.04.12 was received</i>
LTSEC22.04.4.8.1	The Head of Student and Academic Policy Enhancement presented the paper.
LTSEC22.04.4.8.2	Members noted an update on Tranche 1: all policies now have an identified author, all policies are now in the process of being reviewed, it is anticipated that the first reviews will be completed by the end of April.
LTSEC22.04.4.8.3	Members noted an update on Tranche 2: (Due) policy authors are being identified and review work has started on a number of policies.
LTSEC22.04.4.8.4	Members noted that a number of revised policies would be coming to the June LTSEC meeting for members approval.
LTSEC22.04.5	TRANSFORMING FUTURES LEARNING STRATEGY 2030
LTSEC22.04.5.1	Non-continuation Overview
	<i>Paper LTSEC22.04.12 was received</i>
LTSEC22.04.5.1.1	Members noted the non-continuation PowerPoint update that was presented to Board of Governors on 24 March.
LTSEC22.04.5.2	Non-continuation data and summary report
	<i>Paper LTSEC22.04.13 was received</i>
LTSEC22.04.5.2.1	Business Intelligence presented the NC summary from 18/19 – 20-21, broken down into faculty and demographics.
LTSEC22.04.5.2.2	The latest internal NC was presented from the last five years and members noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) That 10.7% of new September-entry starters in 20/21 did not continue into 21/22 and that this was an increase of just over 1 percentage point from 19/20, bringing the rate back to almost the same as it was in 18/19. ii) That UWE's NC rates have hovered between 9.6% and 10.7% over the last five years, with no trend to decrease. iii) That over the last three years, NC amongst year 0 students has decreased, though rates for this cohort remain much higher than those for year 1 students.

<p>LTSEC22.04.5.2.3</p>	<p>Performance across UWE faculties was discussed and members noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) That internal data shows NC have been highest in FET and ACE over the last three years. Rates in FBL have been closer to the university average and rates in HAS have been consistently lower than other faculties. ii) That there are gaps between the NC rates amongst Year 0 students and Year 1 students in every faculty.
<p>LTSEC22.04.5.2.4</p>	<p>Performance across demographic groups was discussed and members noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii) That NC rates are consistently higher amongst male students than it is amongst female students, with male students making up 48% of the cohort of students commencing study in any given year, but 52% of the students not continuing into the next academic year. iv) That there has been improvement in the rates for Asian students and the rate for black students is down in 20/21, after an increase in 19/20. In 20/21, both of these ethnicity groups have lower rates of NC than white students. v) That by disability, rates of non-continuation have been highest amongst students with mental health conditions and on average, NC rates amongst students with disabilities are lower than the rates amongst non-disabled students.
<p>LTSEC22.04.5.2.5</p>	<p>In discussion, members noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) That UWE's NC rate target in S2030 is challenging, however the university is currently ahead of the sector. ii) That is important to take any good practice/learning from HAS where there is evidence NC rates are low. iii) That the university needs to be better at support supports via for non-traditional entry routes iv) The university needs to work on better capturing internal transfers, support students to achieve good outcomes. v) That interconnectivity in a student's experience makes a difference, this is reflected in the HAS results – better at connecting everything together. vi) That programme teams are critical in supporting students and the importance of these roles should not be underestimated. vii) That FET have asked programme leads to reflect on NC rates in the continuous improvement tool and immediate actions are being put in place. viii) That ACE are looking into where there are specific areas where NC is an issue and targeting these. <p>Members noted papers LTSEC22.04.14a/b/c/d for information</p>

LTSEC22.04.5.2.6	
LTSEC22.04.5.3	CCC Pilot (TOM) mid-point review <i>Paper LTSEC22.04.15 was received</i>
LTSEC22.04.5.3.1	The Head of Business Change presented the paper and members heard: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) That the CCC Pilot was part of the 'NSS Bounceback' instigated following fall in NSS results last year - coordinators, coaches and comms officers were seconded to selected departments to support programme teams and students. ii) That the mid-point review gave an opportunity for feedback and to reflect on success and areas for improvement. The meeting was filmed and can be accessed for LTSEC members information. iii) That the review indicated that 3 out of the 5 departments results were very good and 2 have been not so effective. iv) That there will continue to be a monthly review meeting to feedback on the CCC Pilot as part of the target operating model. v) That work is being done with student and academic services about how this might work in the schools and college structure. vi) That it has been confirmed the CCC pilot will be extended to July 2023 and the work is ongoing to roll some of the positives out quicker to more support across more programmes.
LTSEC22.04.5.3.2	In group discussion, it was noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) That the university should look into programme coordinators and aiding the apprenticeship provision. ii) That the extra resource should be placed where there is most value added and be flexible in filling spaces and gaps. iii) That faculties are keen to understand if the support will remain in the programme leads as part of the new academic year.
LTSEC22.04.5.3.4	The Chair requested an update on the CCC pilot and the status of the coordinators, coaches and comms officers to come back to the June LTSEC meeting. Action: Head of Business Change
LTSEC22.04.6	ANY OTHER BUSINESS
LTSEC22.04.6.1	There was no other business identified.
LTSEC22.04.7	DATES OF 2021/22 MEETINGS

LTSEC22.04.7.1	Next meeting dates for Academic Year 21/22 <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="548 157 760 189">• 8 June 2022
----------------	--