

LEARNING AND QUALITY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Fourth meeting of the Learning and Quality Committee in the 2012-13 academic session, held on Wednesday 9th January 2013 December in Queen Anne 075, Greenwich Campus

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Present: | S. Jarvis (Chair) | Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic Development) |
|  | S. Naylor (Officer) | QA Manager Learning and Quality Unit |
|  | R. Blackburn | DLQ, School of Science |
|  | D. Brander | Student Union, Vice President (Education and Welfare) |
|  | W. Cealey Harrison | Head of Learning and Quality Unit |
|  | C. Delage | DLQ, School of Architecture, Design and Construction |
|  | J. Cullinane | DLQ, School of Business |
|  | A. Grant | DLQ, School of Engineering |
|  | V. Habgood | DLQ, School of Health & Social Care |
|  | D. Hayes | Head of Partnership Division |
|  | C. Ierotheou | DLQ, School of Computing & Mathematical Sciences |
|  | E. Keyhoe | Deputy Head of Office of Student Affairs |
|  | S. Leggatt | DLQ, School of Education |
|  | A.. Murphy | Head of Learning Services, ILS |
|  | Z. Pettit | DLQ, School of Humanities & Social Sciences |
|  | D. Sheppard | SQAO, Faculty of Business |
|  | S. Walker | Head of Educational Development Unit |
| In attendance | S. Alsford | Educational Development Unit |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **LQC/12/4.1** | **Items from Chair** |  |
|  | None to report |  |
| **LQC/12/4.2** | **Minutes of the Previous Meeting** |  |
|  | The minutes of the meeting of October 2012 were agreed as an accurate record subject to one minor change of the QA Code of Practice to Quality Code |  |
| **LQC/12/4.3** | **Matters arising from the Minutes** |  |
| 12/3.6 refers | The LQU reported it had arranged a meeting with OSA regarding the current development of the HEAR. This meeting had identified that there had been resource issues hindering the development in the past but that a full time analyst has been appointed and is working with Schools to ensure the completion of Section 6.1. Some difficulties remained converting soft data relating to mentoring and work experience into consistent HEAR information. All PSRB statements will be built into the HEAR and have been received. The committee noted that the PSRB listing in Banner requires updating to reflect the KIS  A full report on the HEAR status will be made to LQC in February. The committee acknowledged that a draft mock up will be completed by the Banner team in the coming two weeks.. LQC advised the OSA team to utilise remaining pilot monies available to publicise the HEAR to the student population and furthermore requested that the HEAR be considered for issue to those programmes identified as part of the original pilot for the 2012/13 academic session should the mock prove successful. That all students expected to receive a HEAR will do so in2013/14 was acknowledged.  The committee reiterated its requested action from December for a full report to be presented by OSA and the Banner team at the February meeting . |  |
| **Action** | **Full report on HEAR development to be presented to the next meeting of LQC using the request made in December 2012.**  **Update Banner PSRB listing using the HESA KIS listing** | **OSA**  **Banner team**  **Programmes and Course Office** |
| 12/1/3.4 refers | Chair requested confirmation that the outstanding issue concerning the statement for the issuance of CAS numbers to international students at Partners has been sent to the Partner Colleges. |  |
| **LQC/12/4.4** | **University policy on personal tutoring** |  |
|  | The Committee received a first full draft of the revised Personal Tutoring Policy from the Educational Development Unit. The policy was welcomed and engendered a full discussion over both the principles contained within it and the extent to which the base level requirements of the policy can effectively be implemented. The committee fully endorsed the principle of base level student entitlement. Acknowledging that some Schools may already be in effect meeting these through adoption of Personal Planning and Development courses, whilst others noted that implementation stretch School resources considerably.  The committee acknowledged that the twin aims of improving retention and reducing the diversity of institutional systems would be supported by the policy. The committee acknowledged and endorsed the following principles which should be included or strengthened in the policy:  That the School should remain the focus of implementation at this point of University development, with the possibility of Faculty level approaches being built as Faculties develop individual identity and management structures.  The key element to personal tutoring is to build social relationships that may be linked to curriculum development, but not necessarily so.  All students should receive notification of their named tutor PRIOR to registration at the University, though with the caveat that the tutor will be available to see students only once registration has taken place.  Year 1 (including direct entrants) tutoring is critical to retention and the overall success of the University and the importance of timetable sessions either in group or individually is paramount and there will be no reduction of the University commitment to meet with new students every 3 weeks in the first term.  Clause 4.7 Some Committee members considered 40 is too high a commitment but others disagreed.  A3: There was some suggestion that this clause could be flexibly applied to include “individual” as well as group timetabled sessions but the consensus was that the baseline entitlement should remain unchanged  The role of personal tutor should be recognised as an intrinsic element of a teaching academic’s workload; all academic staff who teach should be prepared to engage in personal tutoring at an appropriate level without any option to opt out, the aim being to develop a professional approach across ALL teaching staff.  Schools should consider the specific impact of the policy in respect of distance, flexible and associate students and include comment in their implementation plans  The issue of room booking for group personal tutor sessions (where not attached to a course) was raised as an issue needing to be addressed.  LQC requested that specific attention be paid to the following in a final draft:  A2: Details on contact information from Clause A1 should be moved here.  A5: One meeting per term for PG students was agreed to be too low and this to be revised to 3 per term. This includes MRes students for whom a taught element is a significant part of the programme of study.  Clarify that where requirements that a personal tutor is a “teacher” of the student, that this means in practice a tutor may be from “within the student’s programme of study over the period of registration” (Clause 3.1)  Cross check Clauses to ensure consistency (3.3 and A3, A4)  Consider drawing out more detail on direct entrants within the policy (Clauses 4.3, A3 and A4)  B2: Remove bullets |  |
| **Action** | To make suggested revisions to the paper as indicated above and to take a final draft of the policy to Academic Council for ratification  To circulate indicators and suggestions as to how the first term meetings might be conducted thematically: to provide guidelines on content and structure for the first term’s meetings  Schools to draft implementation plans and present them to both School LQC and University LQC in due course . The plans should indicate how the School will implement the policy.  DVC and School representatives to meet with Head of Information Systems to discuss roll out of a University attendance monitoring system (including Banner tagging, coursework submission and class attendance – tutorial and lecture).  Change use of “Primary Advisor” term in Bannerweb to “Personal Tutor” to help students identify their tutors. | **EDU**  **EDU**  **Schools**  **DVC (Academic Development)**  **Banner team** |
| **LQC/12/4.5** | **Student representation on approval and review panels** |  |
|  | The committee received a summary and details of a 2010/11 survey of university use of students on approval and review panels. Key outcomes indicated that universities found this a valuable contribution to the quality assurance processes, though sometimes finding it difficult to maintain for student coverage at every event.  The learning and quality committee **agreed** the following:   1. The University endorses the proposal to appoint student representatives on approval and review panels as fully contributing members commencing in 2013/14 2. Student members of approval and review panels will be remunerated on the same basis as external members 3. Panels without student member will not be deemed inquorate   In agreeing to this proposal the committee acknowledged that the training and induction of student members is critical to its success as a policy. |  |
| **Action** | **Draft a formal proposal for the appointment of student panel members which will provide details on selection process, timelines, training, and update of quality assurance handbook where appropriate, identifying responsibilities at both School/Faculty and central levels.** | **LQU** |
| **LQC/12/4.6** | **School of Pharmacy: revised protocols for programme approval** |  |
|  | The committee received short paper from the Head of the Learning and Quality Unit which detailed a new procedure for the approval of programmes of study in Pharmacy jointly managed by the University in partnership with the University of Kent. The change of procedure is aimed at making the process more jointly managed with staff from both Universities being represented at every event and with revised reporting procedures being put into place. The committee **endorsed** the proposal and noted that there is already a new proposed programme which can be approved by the new mechanism to test its efficacy. The same protocol is being presented at the University of Kent for endorsement. |  |
| **LQC/12/4.7** | **Professional Body Reports** |  |
|  | No reports have been received or visits undertaken since the last meeting of the Committee. |  |
| **LQC/12/4.8** | **External Examiners** |  |
|  | The committee received an extended list of recently appointed examiners. The Learning and Quality Unit noted that only one position now remains to be filled and the University is fully covered. School members requested a number of clarifications to program allocations and statuses where these might have been inaccurately recorded. They Chair thanked all members for their efforts to secure a full complement of external examiners for the 2012/13 academic session. |  |
| **LQC/12/4.9** | **School LQC Minutes** |  |
|  | LQC received two sets minutes from the Schools of Humanities and Social Science and Science. The process of iteration of the Programme Annual Monitoring Reports in the former was noted as effective practice though building in delays in publication of results. |  |
| **LQC/12/4.10** | **Items from the Directors of Learning and Quality** |  |
|  | New items were presented, the group meeting following the meeting of the LQC. |  |
| **LQC/12/4.11** | **Items for information** |  |
|  | LQC received two items for information   1. the outcomes of QAA consultation on risk based institutional review   and   1. summary of outcomes of institutional review themed on “Assessment”   The committee acknowledged that the former will have a significant impact on preparation for institutional review being undertaken by the Institutional Review Preparation Group (IRPG) particularly in view of the fact that the revised method will remove a separate collaborative audit requirement. The University will remain on a long 6 year cycle of review though it remains unclear if there will be a deferral of the next whilst consultation continues. LQC noted that a final consultation over implementation will take place in February/March 2013 and a University response considered in due course.  In respect of(b), whilst the Committee found the summaries useful it noted that the guidance that QAA could derive from the analyses would be more useful if formally codified rather than merely listed. |  |
| **AOB** | Two points were noted:  HESA have change requirements on reporting Work Based Learning for the KIS. Whilst the impact of this will be dealt with by the KIS Board , Schools were provided with advanced warning that a further round of data collation may be inevitable.  The Head of LQU reminded all Schools to identify exceptions to the requirements of the revised academic calendar where these remain unavoidable |  |
|  | Date and time of next meeting |  |
|  | Wednesday February 13th 2013 at 13.00  Seacole 309/10, Avery Hill Campus |  |

*Officer: Stephen Naylor   
Tel: 8159  
Email:* [*ns01@gre.ac.uk*](mailto:ns01@gre.ac.uk)