UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK

<u>Minutes of a meeting of the Student Learning Experience and Engagement Committee held on Monday 22 January 2018</u>

Present: L Jackson (Co-Chair, Students' Union Education Officer), Professor G van der Velden (Co-Chair, Academic Director of Warwick International Higher Education Academy (WIHEA)), A Brewerton (Head of Academic Services, Library), Professor A Clark (Academic Director (Undergraduate), WIHEA Fellow), Professor G Cooke (WIHEA Fellow, School of Engineering), E Dunford (Students' Union Postgraduate Officer), Professor L Gracia (Dean of Students), Dr C Hampton (Academic Representative of the Faculty of Arts), Dr J Heron (Academic Representative of the Institute for Advanced Teaching and Learning (IATL), Dr C MacLean (Academic Representative of the Faculty of Social Sciences), Dr H Nolan (Academic Representative of the Faculty of Medicine), H Pennack (Director of University Marketing), Professor C Sparrow (Academic Director, Graduate School), A Thomas (Service Owner, Academic Technology, IT Services), Dr D Wood (Academic Representative of the Faculty of Science).

Apologies: S Bennett (Director of Student Careers and Skills), A Delameilleure (student representative, the Chair of the Students' Union Education Executive), Dr R Freeman (WIHEA Fellow, Head of Student Engagement and Recruitment, Life Sciences), Professor C Hughes (Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education)).

In Attendance: C Henrywood (Secretary), N Howell-Manning (Student Communications Officer).

* An asterisk in front of the title of the minute denotes a RESTRICTED item that should not be shared beyond the membership of the Committee

16/17-18   <u>Conflicts of Interest</u>

REPORTED:

(a)   That, should any members or attendees of the Committee have any conflicts of interest relating to agenda items for the meeting, they should be declared in accordance with the Committee of University Chairs (CUC) Higher Education Code of Governance (2014), available online from http://www.universitychairs.ac.uk/publications/;

RESOLVED:

(b)   That no conflicts of interest were raised.

17/17-18   <u>Minutes</u>

CONSIDERED:

The minutes of the meeting of the Student Learning Experience and Engagement Committee held on Thursday 26 October 2017.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Student Learning Experience and Engagement Committee held on Thursday 26 October 2017 be <u>approved</u>.

18/17-18   Welcome Week 2018

REPORTED: (by the Co-Chair, L Jackson)

(a)   That progress had been made on the design and development of Welcome Week 2018 with plans coming together for the academic induction, community building, independence and finding your way activities.

(b)   That all academic and professional service departments had been actively engaged in workshops and one-to-one meetings and the Welcome Team are currently pulling feedback into an events list and Academic Induction Framework, noting that the outputs would be taken to the Welcome Steering Group at the end of January and published across campus at the beginning of February.

(c)   That the scheduling form to request times and spaces during Welcome Week will open from 1 March to 31 March 2018 with details of the form and guidance notes being published in February, noting that requests for times/spaces outside of March 2018 will not be considered.

RESOLVED:

(d)   That if members did not feel that they had been sufficiently engaged or had ideas/challenges to discuss, they be urged to contact Chris Luck before 25 January 2018.

19/17-18   Student Academic Representation Transformation Project

REPORTED: (by the Co-Chair, L Jackson)

(a)   That the project was well on its way to completion, with a couple of changes made following some internal workshops.

(b)   That a paper would be submitted to SLEEC for consideration at the meeting on 16 February 2018.

20/17-18   Faculty Student Engagement Coordinators

REPORTED: (by the Co-Chair, Professor G Van der Velden)

(a)   That the review and consultation of the academic SSLC Coordinator role had been considered by the University's Education Committee and the adverts for the Faculty Student Engagement Coordinator roles for Arts and Social Sciences will be posted shortly, noting that Dr I Tuersley will be the Student Engagement Coordinator for the Faculty of Science.

(b)   That members of SLEEC be encouraged to consider the roles if interested and/or to bring the revised role to the attention of others who may be interested.

21/17-18   Module Evaluation

REPORTED: (by the Co-Chair, Professor G Van der Velden)

(a) That three working groups had been established:

  (i) A group to consider the supporting technology and systems – led by Amber Thomas;

  (ii) A group to consider the underpinning policy and links to the existing quality 'eco-system' – led by Katharine Gray;

  (iii) A group to consider the academic case – led by Professor Gwen van der Velden.

(b) That the group looking at technology and system was making good progress but that it was too early to provide a detailed plan.

(c) That the group looking at the academic case was concentrating on developing the core questions and there were 5 or 6 questions that had been circulate for wider consultation and through the use of the Learning Circle:

  (i) Wednesday 5th February, 3.00pm - 5.00pm;

  (ii) Wednesday 28th February, 2.30pm – 4.30pm;

  (iii) Interested colleagues can register via the WIHEA website at https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/cross_fac/academy/activities/learningcircles.

(d) That the academic case group were also considering how the information gathered would be used and looking at available research in this area, including the impact of unconscious bias.

(e) That it was acknowledged that there would never be full consensus within the University on what should be included in the module evaluation form but that it was important that there was some commonality and that forms were not developed in isolation.

(f) That there would be substantive items at the next two meetings, the first to outline progress made so far and the second to present proposals for consideration.

22/17-18   Student Communications

REPORTED: (by H Pennack)

(a) That swift progress was being made and that following on from working with the Education Executive on developing the narrative themes that will support the education strategic themes, the Marketing team were devising how these will shape the messaging used.

(b) That the first time that the narratives will be used will be in the National Student Survey (NSS) campaign that is due to be launched in February.

23/17-18   Promotion Criteria

REPORTED: (by the Co-Chair, Professor G Van der Velden)

(a) That a set of new criteria for academic promotion under the leadership of Professor Chris Ennew, Provost, had been made available to all academic staff to comment on.

(b) That the consultation process is in its early stages and it is noted that whilst it is a complex approach, it should be acknowledged that it is a complex methodology that we are trying to work with.

(c) That members of SLEEC be strongly encouraged to comment on the new criteria, particularly to ensure that the student learning experience is reflected in the criteria.

24/17-18   Review of Personal Tutoring

CONSIDERED:

A paper and an oral report from Professor Louise Gracia, Dean of Students (paper SLEEC.08/17-18) that reported on the work of the Personal Tutoring Review Group and proposed a number of recommendations to enhance the provision.

REPORTED: (by Professor L Gracia)

(a) That a previous iteration had been to the University Education Committee (UEC) where the broad direction of travel was supported and members of SLEEC were invited to consider the paper to refine the detail before a final version goes to UEC and then Senate.

(b) That the report presented 18 recommendations and operational plans needed to be developed for each recommendation, noting that not all recommendations required resource to be implemented.

(c) That the resourcing concerns from colleagues in the Faculty of Arts regarding the proposal that Teaching Fellows would be located in open plan offices in the new Arts building, making it difficult to meet with Personal Tutees, was a University-wide concern for Teaching Fellows that needed to be given careful consideration outside of the Review of Personal Tutoring.

(d) That, if approved, information and links regarding the proposed Personal Tutoring system will be available via the Dean of Students' website.

(e) That it is planned that all new staff will receive information on Personal Tutoring Warwick, not just those on probationary contracts, and that if approved by Easter this year, a 3 yearly rolling programme of refresher training regarding Personal Tutoring will be introduced from 2018/19 for all staff.

(by Professor G Cooke)

(f) That a thorough review had been undertaken and that the recommendations were sensible however some of the recommendations may need to be sold to colleagues and there needed to be visible support and commitment from Senior Management to the institutional value of personal tutoring in order to secure the support of all colleagues.

(by Dr I Tuersley)

(g) That the Personal Tutors ability to meet on a one-to-one basis with Personal Tutees was an important one and if such spaces are not available, it may reduce the value of the Personal Tutoring system and Tutees with sensitive issues may not be comfortable approaching their Personal Tutor in an open-plan office environment.

(by Dr C MacLean)

(h) That a lack of private meeting space might have an impact on the number of academics who would be willing to be Personal Tutors.

(by Dr D Wood)

(i) That the limit of 25 Tutees per Tutor may be problematic in Mathematics as some Teaching Fellows have been appointed to be Personal Tutors with a light teaching load and have more Personal Tutees than the suggested 25.

RESOLVED:

(j) That the Committee endorsed the direction of travel proposed for personal tutoring.

25/17-18   *University Education Strategy

CONSIDERED:

The revised draft University Education Strategy (paper SLEEC.09/17-18), together with an oral update from Professor Gwen van der Velden.

REPORTED: (by the Co-Chair, Professor G van der Velden)

This is a restricted item.

RESOLVED:

This is a restricted item.

26/17-18   Survey Action Plans – Professional Services Departments

CONSIDERED:

The Student Survey Action Plans from Professional Services Departments (paper SLEEC.10/17-18), be read and reported on by groups of Close Readers.

REPORTED:

(a) That the four groups of Close Readers had been asked to comment through one nominated person at the meeting on the following:

(i) How the Department is working with students and academics to deliver the action plan;

(ii) Whether the action plan contains clear targets with an obvious link back to metrics;

(iii) Whether the action plan is inclusive of all student groups;

(iv) Whether the action plan draws on a wider range of feedback (not just NSS).

(b) That the four groups of Close Readers were organised as follows:

(i)   Group A – **The Library and ITS:**
Professor A Clark, Dr I Tuersley and Dr H Nolan.

(ii)   Group B – **Examinations Office and Student Careers and Skills:**
Professor G Van der Velden, Dr J Heron, Dr D Wood and A Brewerton.

(iii)   Group C - **LDC and Space Management and Timetabling:**
Professor C Sparrow, Professor L Gracia, L Jackson, Dr C Hampton and H Pennack.

(iv)   Group D – **International Student Office and Wellbeing:**
Professor G Cooke, E Dunford, Dr C MacLean, A Thomas and N Howell-Manning.

(c)   That the generic feedback regarding all survey actions plans was as follows:

(by the Co-Chair, Professor G Van der Velden)

(i)   That this was the first time that departments had been asked to produce action plans in response to surveys so the process next year will benefit from feedback received this year.

(ii)   That each report was individual and it was evident that the action plans for those departments that worked more directly with students benefited from closer links with the student community.

(iii)   That this first iteration may change in form and process as required

(iv)   That action plans from academic departments were being considered by Faculty Education Committees next week and would be considered by SLEEC at its meeting on 16 February 2018.

(by Professor A Clark)

(v)   That it was evident that the authors of the action plans were not given the same briefing regarding what was to go in the plans as the briefing that SLEEC members received with regard to what to comment on in the action plans.

(by Dr I Tuersley)

(vi)   That there may be some correlation between two of the briefest action plans being submitted by the two Departments that were the most understaffed of the eight Departments (Examinations Office and Wellbeing Services).

(d)   That the specific feedback from the four groups of Close Readers was as follows:

(e)   Library

(by Dr I Tuersley, Professor A Clark, Dr H Nolan)

(i)   That the report was comprehensive and demonstrated that the department was working with students and academics to deliver the action plan.

(ii)   That the action plan was ongoing and was open-ended, however it was noted that there were actions that could be metricised, particularly regarding how the Library would cascade back to students what actions it had taken.

(iii) That the action plan was inclusive of all student groups and that there was evidence that the action plan incorporated a wider range of feedback than NSS (included feedback from SSLCs/PTES/PRES).

(f) IT Services

(by Dr I Tuersley, Professor A Clark, Dr H Nolan)

(i) That the report demonstrated that the Department was working with academics though it was noted that IT Services work through academic departments to reach students so it was harder for IT Services to demonstrate that they were working with students to deliver the action plan and this therefore also made it difficult for IT Services to answer the inclusivity question.

(ii) That two actions had been assigned completion dates but it was unclear how these would meet the metrics.

(iii) That the NSS, PTES and DLHE feedback had been addressed by the action plan.

(by A Thomas)

(iv) That IT Services had been advised to demonstrate how they had been accountable for the services that they provided, rather than to address the four points that the Close Reading groups from SLEEC had been asked to review.

(by Dr C MacLean)

(v) That there was a strong demand for lecture capture recordings from students but that for academics, lecture capture included some legal considerations regarding copyright issues.

(g) Examinations Office

(by Professor G Van der Velden, Dr J Heron, Dr D Wood, A Brewerton)

(i) That there was evidence of the Department working with academics and that this this Department works with students through academic departments so it would be difficult to evidence how they have included students in their planning.

(ii) That the Department highlighted that because of the complexity of setting examination schedules, not every student would be content with their personal examination timetable.

(iii) That change was suggested to have to come from 'the University' and in particular, the Review of Assessment, noting that there was a commitment to engaging with further development of provision and communication opportunities if the resourcing were available.

(iv) That there did not appear to be a set of actions that the Department had committed to, nor a set of suggestions the university (or review) may wish to consider, based on the expert evaluation of student feedback undertaken by the Examinations Office, though it was noted that the Examinations Office was an integral part of the Review of Assessment and it was intended that active engagement and planning within this context would take place.

(v)   That it was not discernible whether the action plan was inclusive of all student groups, nor was it discernible whether the action plan drew on a wider range of feedback.

(vi)   That the Department had responded to feedback from students (regarding bags in examination rooms) and that the Department should highlight when they have responded to suggestions from students and academics.

(h)   Student Careers and Skills

(by Professor G Van der Velden, Dr J Heron, Dr D Wood, A Brewerton)

(i)   That the action plan demonstrated that there were good processes in place with more expected in collaboration with the Director of Employability, though it was noted that it was unclear whether students had been involved in the action plan itself.

(ii)   That targets had been set out in broad categories (such as relating to achievement in the upper quartile) and this was in line with the university level approach, noting that some of the targets could benefit from further clarifying.

(iii)   That the service was aware through student feedback that their offer appears too complex/difficult to understand to students though the action plan did not set out how this was being addressed, noting that commitments appeared to be to actions at a very operational level.

(iv)   That it was unclear from the action plan that the aspect concerning inclusivity of all student groups had been addressed, and this may need further action as a matter for further scrutiny, though it was noted that there was already some very good practice regarding particular groups of students in place.

(v)   That the plan did draw on a wider range of feedback and the team is to be complimented on their use of internal data.

(i)   Learning Development Centre

(by Professor C Sparrow, Professor L Garcia, L Jackson, Dr C Hampton and H Pennack)

(i)   That this Department was another example of a department that worked directly with academics rather than with students so was difficult for them to demonstrate that they had worked with students as well as academics in developing their action plan.

(ii)   That there was a paucity of data evident in the action plan so it was hard to answer any of the four questions posed.

(by Dr I Tuersley)

(iii)   That this was a single template form that was not best suited to allow this Department to showcase the work that it did.

(j)   Space Management and Timetabling

(by Professor C Sparrow, Professor L Garcia, L Jackson, Dr C Hampton and H Pennack)

(i)   That there was a strong sense of planning from this action plan with priorities being set by survey results from multiple sources including NSS, SSLCs, their own research

with students through focus groups and the timetabling improvement plan working group.

(ii) That targets were focused on project outcomes and were not as forthright as they could have been.

(iii) That the projects regarding study space and teaching rooms demonstrated that feedback was in the process of being used to improve the student experience, though funding for the work was in the gift of CSAG and not the Department.

(k) International Student Office

(by Professor G Cooke, E Dunford, Dr C MacLean, A Thomas and N Howell-Manning)

(i) That the action plan demonstrated that the Department had a good range of methods and student partners that it worked with, noting however that it was unclear how they involved academic colleagues in their action planning.

(ii) That there was a strong sense of direction but that there were no metrics clearly defined in the action plan.

(iii) That the Department was inclusive because of the nature of the area it was responsible for, however the action plan did not mention any actions associated with students with disabilities.

(iv) That the action plan looked holistically at a wide range of survey results, including the ITLR, the Student Barometer and the NSS.

(v) That the action plan could make a difference but was lacking in some detail.

(l) Wellbeing

(by Professor G Cooke, E Dunford, Dr C MacLean, A Thomas and N Howell-Manning)

(i) That it was unclear how the action plan would be implemented and some aspects of the plan were vague.

(ii) That there was insufficient detail in the plan to ascertain what targets had been set, what surveys had been used to compile the action plan and the action plan seemed inclusive though no specific groups were mentioned.

27/17-18 Survey Strategy Steering Group

RECEIVED:

The draft terms of reference and membership for the Survey Strategy Steering Group (paper SLEEC.11/17-18).

RESOLVED:

That the Survey Strategy Steering Group be established as a sub-group of SLEEC with the Terms of Reference and membership proposed in SLEEC.11/17-18.

28/17-18 Postgraduate Engagement with the Students' Union

RECEIVED:

A paper and oral report from Emily Dunford, SU Postgraduate Officer, on research undertaken by the Students' Union into the engagement and expectations of postgraduate students (paper SLEEC.12/17-18).

REPORTED: (by E Dunford)

(a)   That the research undertaken by the Students' Union into the engagement and expectations of postgraduate students had been considered by the Board of Graduate Studies.

(b)   That the executive summary and the full report contained 39 recommendations, noting that there were time and resource considerations attached to many of the recommendations.

(c)   That using WeChat, which is a Chinese multi-purpose social media platform that many Chinese students used, alongside Facebook, Twitter and other social media platforms was being considered.

(d)   That it would be worth considering sharing this report and recommendations with Professional Services Departments in case there was anything they could learn about postgraduate students' needs from this research.

29/17-18   Study Space Improvement and Strategy Development

REPORTED: (by the Co-Chair, L Jackson)

(a)   That a Study Space Working Group had been established that sat (informally) between SLEEC and CSAG, noting that there was a lot of work underway in this area.

(b)   That some of the work that needed to be undertaken included looking existing study spaces and what could be improved; at study space more strategically; technological study space enhancement and factoring in distance learners and their needs into this; sign-posting students to study spaces; and, considering how to advise students of the availability of study spaces and to consider whether a booking system for these spaces would be viable.

(c)   That S Gallagher from the Strategic Programme Delivery team was undertaking a benchmarking exercise of the University's study space provision with what comparative institutions offered.

(by the Co-Chair, Professor G Van der Velden)

(d)   That the project needed to look at the bigger picture including what should be said to prospective students for 2018/19 entry regarding study space, for example, talking to prospective 2018/19 Arts students about a new building that many will be unlikely to benefit from is not an appropriate approach, noting that investment needs to be made in the existing Humanities and Millburn House provision for the next 3-4 years.

RESOLVED:

(e)   That the annual plans for what work Estates would undertake to improve or create study spaces during the Easter and Summer vacation periods for this year would be shared below the line at future SLEEC meetings.

30/17-18   Future Meetings

REPORTED:

That the dates and venues for the Committee's meetings for the remainder of the academic year 2017/18 are as follows:

(a)   1pm to 3pm on Friday 16 February 2018 in in CMR 1.0, University House:

(i)   Deadline for notification of intention to submit a paper: 12 noon, 26 January 2018;
(ii)   Deadline for draft papers: 12 noon, 2 February 2018;
(iii)   Circulation of electronic papers: 9 February 2018.

(b)   1pm to 3pm on Friday 27 April 2018 in in CMR 1.0, University House:

(i)   Deadline for notification of intention to submit a paper: 12 noon, 6 April 2018;
(ii)   Deadline for draft papers: 12 noon, 13 April 2018;
(iii)   Circulation of electronic papers: 20 April 2018.

(c)   1pm to 3pm on Monday 21 May 2018 in in CMR 1.0, University House:

(i)   Deadline for notification of intention to submit a paper: 12 noon, 1 May 2018;
(ii)   Deadline for draft papers: 12 noon, 8 May 2018;
(iii)   Circulation of electronic papers: 14 May 2018.

31/17-18   Vote of Thanks

REPORTED: (by the Co-Chairs)

That the thanks of the Committee and the previous Working Group be extended to the outgoing Secretary, C Henrywood.