

**Notes of the meeting held on Monday 18<sup>th</sup> June 2012, 1 – 3pm – CG23**

**Present:** Andrew Ireland (AI) (Chair), Gillian Bunting (GB) (Clerk), Jill Beard (JB), Andrew Main (AM), Jennifer Taylor (JT), Barbara Dyer (BD), Scott Bellamy (SB), Nikki Finnes (NF), Mark Ridolfo (MR), Fiona Cownie (FC), Kate Jones (KJ), Kevin McGhee (KM), Darrell Fenton (DF), Rebecca Dowling (RD), Liam Sheridan (LS), Kelly Goodwin (KG) (SEC), Murray Simpson (MS) (SUBU VP Education), Ruby Limbrick (RL) (SUBU VP Campaigns), Louise Bryant (LB) (SUBU President), Sophie Chaytor-Grubb (SC) (SUBU VP Lansdowne),

**1. Apologies**

- 1.1. Apologies were received from: Catherine Symonds, Mandi Barron, Amina Uddin, Lianne Hutchings, Joff Cooke, Jacky Mack, Jenny Jenkin, Deirdre Sparrowhawk, Tim McIntyre-Bhatty, Stuart Laird, Samantha Leahy-Harland, Paul Breakwell.

**2. Minutes and Matters Arising from Notes of 30<sup>th</sup> April 2012 – Confirmed Minutes**

- 2.1. **Minute 2.2** – Partner report not received for circulation at meeting, GB to chase JC for this. **Action GB/JC**
- 2.2. **Minute 2.4** – Recommendations to be taken to the next ESEC, also include recommendations from SVC for Mid Cycle Unit Feedback, SES Results Analysis & the New Arrivals Survey. **Action AI.**
- 2.3. **Minute 3.1** – KJ provided a verbal update regarding changes to the SUBU Fresher survey; the main aim is to provide consistency in the survey questions across all schools, from next year Student Reps will receive link to a generic survey which they will then feed out to the students. Any other significant issues which need to be raised, but are not addressed through the survey, may need to be compiled into an additional survey. Action completed
- 2.4. **Minute 4.2** – ESEC are now progressing this.
- 2.5. **Minute 6.2** – action completed
- 2.6. **Minute 7.1** – action completed
- 2.7. **Minute 7.2** – action completed

**3. Mid Cycle Unit Feedback as part of the review of Student Engagement and Feedback Policy and Procedure following feedback from ESEC**

- 3.1. ESEC looked at the current procedure, which was initially devised by SVC, and has now been in place for two years. TMB asked for SVC to consider 'principles of consistency'. The previous system (SUE) did not work due to poor levels of student engagement. SVC was originally tasked to create a new unit level feedback approach which would be owned by the unit delivery team, with a requirement to devise relevant questions and timings to improve student experience for individual units in order to provide valid results.
- 3.2. It was noted that different units obtain feedback in different ways, as there are various channels available including Unit level feedback, Student Reps feedback & SES. Unit level feedback relates more to students' current units rather than once or twice per year as with the surveys. It was agreed that mid cycle feedback works best for students as it is current, but that academics sometimes prefer end of unit feedback as it gives a fuller picture from a teaching perspective, Student Reps have provided feedback which shows a preference for mid-term feedback. It was agreed that we need to avoid over

assessing and going into too much detail, and that preference is dependent on units, academics and students, bearing in mind that different formats work better for individual units. It was agreed that there should be either mid-term or end-of-term feedback, rather than both, to avoid replication.

- 3.3. FC proposed each unit leader follows a set procedure to enable feedback to be given back to students and this was considered a useful suggestion in terms of clarifying principles of consistency.
- 3.4. It was noted that the Student Rep recruitment system could be improved in order to ensure Reps are aware of their responsibilities. SUBU Reps advised this is a work in progress and would be much improved for next term. Last year Student Reps used an online feedback system, which had various advantages including instant reports & anonymous feedback, as well as merging both online & offline feedback which proved beneficial. They were also keen to find out how to provide survey feedback to students to enable them to close the feedback loop.
- 3.5. AI concluded there is a sufficient role for both approaches and suggested two points to be referred back to ESEC.
  - Survey should be conducted at a time decided by the unit team, but at a time that will allow for some actions to benefit students.
  - The unit leader needs to feedback to students some broad themes that were raised by unit feedback.

Following a discussion on the Mid Cycle Unit Feedback consideration, AI agreed to summarise the committee's suggestions for principles of consistency, and will circulate to SVC members to comment prior to the next ESEC. **Action AI.**

#### **4 Review and discussion of reports from input sources e.g. Schools, SUBU, Academic Partnerships and Graduate School**

No reports were submitted for discussion

#### **5 Review of reports from SVC sub groups e.g. Task groups for NSS, SES, PTES**

- 5.1 The NSS sub group has now been disbanded. SES appears as Agenda item 6. PTES closed on 14/6 with 256 responses out of 1,970 giving a 13% response rate which is slightly down on last year. It was concluded the only way to market PTES is via personal logins so this will not produce a rich amount of data, but it is beneficial as it provides comparative results with other institutions:

#### **6 SES Results analysis (paper)**

- 6.1 The number of questions for this year's survey was reduced from 18 down to 14, therefore we cannot do a direct a comparison with last years' results. The lowest cut off rate for each question is 5 respondents. The analysis shows a similar response rate as last year, but is slightly reduced due to the NSS being run separately
  - Place of delivery breakdown: BU Distance Learning scores 100% in most categories, it was acknowledged that distance learning provides a pattern of good feedback similar to the Open University, as it is all about expectation & what is provided for students
  - Agree by level: There are troughs for organisational management, feedback & personal support which score the same as last year, whilst H level & C level responses dip. SUBU Reps conclude this is possibly due to student expectation being too high, although this may increase next year due to the introduction of fees

- Importance by level: This is a similar score to last year, although personal support appears to be less important than others, the survey is due to be re-ordered next year in order of importance
- Proportion of All Positive comments per school: Personal support stands out as a more positive score from all schools
- Proportion of Q.19 Negative comments per school: Support is still an issue, but the largest issue now is course structure.

## 6.2 AI proposed focusing on two specific questions

- **How can other staff access SES results?**  
The qualitative data is being cleaned up and then will be accessible by any member of staff with a view to providing reports. Members discussed what would be the best way to access this data and it was agreed a permanent icon placed on the staff intranet to allow access to both NSS & SES results. This would be institution wide feedback with no restrictions needed. There would also be an alternative email link sent to staff to enable them to access the data. **Action LS**
- **Where do we go from this point?**  
Members agreed to continue sharing good practice (including agenda item 4: Review & discussion of reports from input sources). As there is only one SVC meeting left this year it would be an ideal time to look at prioritising any activity before next term which could bring quick wins and added value. It was suggested that BU needs to re-examine transport links as this always produces a low score in SES. Members agreed to examine the SES reporting tool and report/reflect from a school perspective for discussion at the next SVC meeting. **Actions ALL**

## 7 **LibQual Lite (nationally recognised) survey to expand on the limited information provided from NSS and SES on Library and IT support. the tool has been approved for use at BU as part of the current round of business planning. It is intended to enable critical benchmarking with other institutions and allow us in one short (one off) autumn term survey to engage with staff and students in order to direct future resource to appropriate enhancements and contribute to improving NSS scores**

- 7.1 JB advised that Library & IT support & services are critical but the current surveys do not produce any in-depth data for these areas to enable improvements in the services. JB will put a Business case forward to SAS Exec with the view that most other HEIs use LibQual Lite, but BU held back on this to avoid survey overload. BU needs to deliver support to enhance the student experience and LibQual Lite would be a quick win for a small investment & small amount of staff input.
- 7.2 This survey would provide valuable information about equipment, resources & spaces, through valid responses. The survey only takes approximately 15 minutes to complete and would be open for three weeks. There would be no need for additional promotion as this can be done via the Library. Staff can also take part which provides another useful dynamic.
- 7.3 The Library & IT sections on current surveys are not in-depth enough to develop service quality and service excellence. BU needs to be able to provide an innovative, fit for purpose learning environment; LibQual Lite also provides benchmarking data from other institutions. It was noted that an improved service would in turn improve recruitment rates. SB suggested we need to utilise other options i.e. student forums. SUBU Reps suggested the survey can be promoted via BU Login screens (would include PI's) & the ContriBUte scheme to provide wide range of feedback.

7.4 It was agreed that a huge amount of resource and money is invested into Library & IT so this information is vital. There is also a need to provide evidence of how central services spend money. Members agreed to run a one-off survey in the Autumn term (early Nov) date TBC. **Action JB**

**8 Recommendations to ESEC**

**9 AOB**

---

**2011/12 meetings:**

Monday 23<sup>rd</sup> July – 1 – 3 pm – Committee Room

**2012/13 meetings:**

Monday 10<sup>th</sup> September – 1 – 3pm – TBC

Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> October – 1 – 3pm – TBC

Monday 3<sup>rd</sup> December – 1 – 3pm – TBC

Monday 14<sup>th</sup> January – 1 – 3pm – TBC

Monday 25<sup>th</sup> February – 1 – 3pm – TBC

Monday 8<sup>th</sup> April – 1 – 3pm – TBC

Monday 6<sup>th</sup> May – 1 – 3pm – TBC

Monday 17<sup>th</sup> June – 1 – 3pm – TBC

Monday 29<sup>th</sup> July – 1 – 3pm – TBC