

Notes of the meeting held on Wednesday 5th June – 1 – 3pm – Committee Room

Present: Andrew Ireland (AI) (Chair), Gillian Bunting (GB) (Clerk), Fiona Cownie (FC), Barbara Dyer (BD), Jill Beard (JB), Darrell Felton (DF), Murray Simpson (MS), Toby Horner (TH), Joff Cooke (JC), Andrew Main (AM), Lianne Hutchings (LH), Katy Fisher (KF), Kelly Goodwin (KG), Ross Hill (RH), Liam Sheridan (LS), Paula Peckham (PP)

1. Apologies

1.1. Apologies were received from: Amanda Stevens, Ruby Limbrick, Scott Bellamy (Toby Horner (TH) attending in place), Fiona Knight, Mark Ridolfo.

2. Minutes and Matters Arising from notes of 24 April 2013 - confirmed

2.1 Minute 3.1 - LH advised that due to changes in various areas, the policy is in need of a review (specifically focusing on section 4: General Principles) and will be due for publication in August/September 2013. There is a range of items which feed into the policy i.e. TOR already underway, combining surveys, unit feedback; it will depend on timings of the feedback sub group as to when the paper can be updated. AI proposed members to review and discuss at next SVC meeting with the understanding of the need to be representative at a high level and to allow flexibility. **Action – All – see agenda item 4.4.**

2.2 Minute 3.2.1 - BD presented the paper to ASC in February at which changes were suggested around indicator 6. KF gathered information from partners on how they reported to students any actions taken as a result of student feedback. The outcome of the benchmarking exercise produced a formal action plan. BD mentioned there was a note of caution around Indicator 7. It was noted that the paper regularly referred to 'student engagement' but the term 'student experience' was not used. It was acknowledged paper 5B also mixes up the same terms and uses them interchangeably. Generally it was considered that 'students' engaged' with BU, while a subset of this is the 'student experience' which they receive from BU. Members agreed the terms need clarification which will lead into the Performance Indicator meeting on 8th May. **Action – PI sub-group – see agenda point 4.2.** Meanwhile to avoid confusion regarding the first sentence in Indicator 7 there was a discussion as to whether this should be removed and members agreed. **Action – LH – completed.**

2.3 Minute 3.2.4 - Action point no. 3: To be discussed at the PI meeting on 8th May to determine indicators. This will feed into the next SVC meeting. **Action – PI sub-group - see agenda point 4.2.**

2.4 Minute 3.2.5 - Action point no. 4: LH will send a copy of the finalised document to Anita Diaz & Janet Hanson in order for us to ensure all Policies and mapping exercises correlate with synergy. **Action – LH completed.**

2.5 Minute 3.3.1 - RL explained the new tab for myBU is designed to be a centralised hub of student feedback. There had been discussions around the name of the tab, but this name was agreed upon as it showed a proactive response to students. There are two sections – one for School matters which is updated by the School Champions and the University matters section which is updated by either SUBU and/or an elected member of SVC. The student will only see the tab for their School, but there were some queries around what dual honours students' view would look like, it was agreed this needs to be looked into.

Action – RL/MS - MS provided myBU school tab stats. Further discussion is needed as to how to set up new page for joint honours, IT & Learning Technologists will be able to advise. MS to provide a page mock up at the next SVC.

- 2.6 Minute 3.3.2** - SB explained the journey of closing the feedback loop; various attempts have previously been tried. A key aim is to be able to show that the new tab is populated regularly. There was some discussion as to whether having one place for all feedback will make it as easy as possible for students to access. The two sections need to be in one place to improve the student experience. Currently the plan is for both sections to sit in the Student Reps tab and the School tab. AM commented that the user experience is key and we need to keep the journey as simple as possible. It was agreed it was important for the University matters section to also sit in the School tabs. SB added it is important to set expectations for students around how often this will be updated and it would be helpful to look at the analytics on how well School tabs are currently being used. **Action – SB to speak to each School Champion to progress this further and report at the next SVC meeting – see agenda point 2.6.**
- 2.7 Minute 4.1** - The sub-group recommended combining both SES and SOS using the SES tool, AI met with IT to discuss requirements for this and IT are currently working up specific requirements and changes needed to put it into place. The basic plan is to survey three times an academic year, each time it is delivered there will be different questions relating to different aspects sent to different levels of students. Information can be pulled out of the system immediately; as soon as a student has completed the survey results will be produced in graph form. SVC will own the survey along with SUBU with questions leaning towards student engagement. Once the survey is ready to go to ESEC for approval it will then go live for the next academic year. **Action – sub-group will meet again to determine questions with SVC leading on this AI – see agenda point 2.3.**
- 2.8 Minute 4.2.3** - SES is producing a low response rate of 3.8% but this is in part due to low key promotion campaign and students being 'surveyed out', Promotion has included business cards and social media. There was a request for School Champions to encourage students to complete the survey. It is due to close on 30th April but can be extended if need be, as it has some value in predicting NSS results. Members discussed whether to extend SES but it was thought this would not be beneficial especially during exam time. **Action – School Champions – completed.**
- 2.9 Minute 4.2.5** - AM added there is a risk of students seeing BU as desperate for a high score either from key messages or due to the amount of pushing to complete the survey. Although it was acknowledged the push is to encourage students to complete and not to give a neutral score. It was thought this point could reflect on next year's key messages. It was suggested to publicise the fact we are reducing the number of surveys by combining SES & SOS, this would be ideal for the new myBU feedback tab. **Action – RL/MS – see agenda point 4.3.**
- 2.10 Minute 5.1** - The Assessment and feedback: principles of good practice paper came out of SUBU developing ideas with TMB and went to ESEC which fed back into SVC in order to stimulate discussion around good feedback. Sub-group to discuss and provide recommendations to ESEC. The group initially met on 22nd April and agreed the principles are a good idea but there is not a need for a template to be enforced. Focus should be on working with principles which cross match to our procedures (6E: Assessment and Feedback and Return of Assessed Work Policy and Procedure). This shows good practice is already happening but there are barriers to this and the challenge is how to overcome them. The key points will be to identify the barriers which impact on principles of good feedback being delivered and determine how to resolve these. Lots of good things came out of the initial meeting including working with CELT

and also looking into the role students' play as partners in the learning process. It was noted that staff development needs and cultural differences are a major part of this process. Janet Hansen's guide to assessment produced for students was identified as significant but was not widely recognised but would be helpful in drawing out useful and positive ideas. **Action – Discussion at next SVC to determine recommendations for July ESEC – see agenda point 5.**

- 2.11 Minute 6.1** - KG requested advice on the best approach to take for SUBU 'You're Brilliant' awards, due to some of the winners not attending lectures or Reps training. It was acknowledged that the nomination process has a weakness as it does not require a record of who makes a nomination, leaving it open to abuse. RL explained this was the first year the student category had been included and therefore it was a learning curve as to how SUBU can improve the process. Specifically around monitoring engagement and performance of Reps, who is responsible for checking attendance etc. RL will feed back to SUBU. **Action – RL/MS – SUBU will be reviewing the 'You're Brilliant' awards processes and requirements.**

3. Updates on completed surveys – SES/NSS/PTES/PRES (SB)

- 3.1** PRES now closed FK provided report:
Closing date 16 May 2013
Target response rate 25%
Actual response rate 27.7%
Number of responses 109
Expected number of respondents 394
Initial review of responses very positive. However a full analysis of the data and a sector bench marking exercise will be carried out over the summer and a full report to be submitted to the first SVC of the new year. **Action – FK.**

- 3.2** PTES - FK provided report:
Closing date 17 June
Target response rate 25%
Actual response rate (current) 8%
Reminders have been sent to all taught PG students and messages sent to all PGT framework leaders and administrators to encourage students to complete the survey. Again, a full analysis of the data and a sector bench marking exercise will be carried out over the summer and a full report to be submitted to the first SVC of the new year. **Action – FK.**

- 3.3** TH confirmed the NSS prize draw winners have been selected & prizes collected,

- 3.4** TH confirmed SES received a 4% response rate, prize winners also selected.

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

4.1. Discuss Assessment and Feedback: Principles of Good Practice (AI) (paper)

- 4.1.1** AI introduced the paper, which came out of the sub-group meeting, and invited the members to discuss the series of recommendations. It was felt the BU-wide feedback template was not necessary in its current form, although ASC confirmed feedback templates will be introduced next year. The main aim is to ensure students get a fair experience between schools. MS requested for principles to be made visible to students as they do care about feedback. FC advised that current workload planning models do not allow these principles to be put into practice. It was felt the recommendations are all positive & will link into policy *6E: Assessment and Feedback and Return of Assessed Work*. Members agreed for recommendations to go to ESEC. **Action – AI**

4.1.2 MS suggested students should be told about assessment feedback from induction onwards, so they are aware how important it is from the start. It was thought that the *How to get the most out of your assessment feedback* leaflet was not widely recognised, but it was agreed it is significant and should be included when students' get their first piece of feedback. FC added that in order to get staff buy in we also need students to take responsibility for participating in assessment feedback. There was a discussion around whether this should be included in the School Student Charters – JC advised QAA may recommend this. Members agreed to add framing line at top of paper to note students' responsibility. **Action – Members to provide suggestions for wording via email to AI.**

4.2 Discuss Student Engagement Performance Indicators (AI) (paper)

4.2.1 This paper came out of a benchmarking exercise by the sub-group which aimed to identify what we mean by Student Engagement and then created Performance Indicator's around this. Opened to SVC for discussion: SUBU found the clarification of the three elements very helpful - Quality Assurance, Student Engagement in Learning and Teaching, & Wider Student Experience. FC requested Learning and Teaching to be the top indicator as this is seen as the most important. **Action – AI**

4.2.2 There was a discussion around PI 9 (Engagement in taught sessions) as attendance monitoring could be used to improve this and ensure that a proper measurement of data is possible. LS advised that our system should be able to provide this, but needs to be set up to do so. FC suggested using mid-unit feedback to measure engagement as this could give us a useful indicator in terms of engagement levels.

4.2.3 It was noted that PI 8 (Evidence of appropriate student preparation for taught sessions) is already part of the School Charters, so we should be able to measure this by seeing how the students' respond. It was acknowledged that there are online systems for submitting prep but there was uncertainty around whether this would work at BU.

4.2.3 Members discussed PI 10 (Active reflection on assignment feedback) how much do students actually reflect on their feedback. It was agreed there is a direct correlation between attendance and grades, BD confirmed HSC are trialling QR codes to monitor attendance. It was agreed that attendance registers are important and suggested that perhaps BU needs to introduce some kind of consequence in order to improve attendance levels. SUBU's position has shifted over the last year & they are open to discussion around the matter. As it is felt that students' need to take more responsibility, as low/non-attendance can impact on other students. JC advised the policy shift is significant & agreed with MS to put together discussion point for next ESEC. **Action – JC/MS**

4.2.4 AI advised discussion item for ESEC & also for Centre of Excellence and Learning to take this forward. **Action – AI**

4.2.5 AM pointed out that with regards to targets it is better to use bench-marking rather than percentages, members agreed to replace the column on the KPI calculator with a 'year on year' comparison. This should reflect higher quality student engagement. It was noted that it is important to understand and confirm how we are measuring this, the timeliness, and how much resource is needed to measure. **Action - Members to email suggestions over the next two weeks, AI to amend and put together cover sheet for ESEC.**

4.3 Update on merging SES/SOS surveys (AI)

4.3.1 The paper distributed by AI proposes a move towards an engagement model to reduce survey fatigue by combining surveys. The SES tool does not have the ability to set complex questions & it would cost too much to re-engineer this. The preferred option is to merge with SUBU's SOS survey. There was discussion around the recommendations for actions, requirements, reporting capabilities, plus ownership of questions and how the data is used. It was felt that a three-times-a-year survey is still relevant as SUBU are

currently receiving a flood of feedback which is comparable to first two terms. SUBU have seen a big increase in responses from approx. two thousand last year to approx. seven thousand this year. It was noted that The School of Tourism is currently trialling a new reporting system which will help Student Reps. Members agreed for SUBU to run the combined survey, SUBU will pilot with Snap to facilitate the survey.

- 4.3.2 AI reported that TMB's view was that it seems sensible to merge the surveys, but only at levels C and I, members thought it might not be clear that the survey is aimed at all levels. **Action - AI to confirm with TMB.**

4.4 **Review 5B Student Engagement and Feedback (LH)**

- 4.4.1 The policy is due for review, but members agreed it is important to capture the best position after ESEC in the summer. **Actions - Members to send comments to LH specifically around Forum memberships. LH to ensure the policy mirrors Mapping to B5: Student Engagement.**

- 4.4.2 It was concluded that all schools run either Student Experience Forums or 'You Said, We Did' sessions, while the formats are not all the same, all of these are deemed valuable and encompass the same principles. Members agreed SEF's identify programme and framework specific issues which have not been resolved at this level. **Action – LH to amend policy.**

- 4.4.3 KG provided the updated SEF ToR with revised Core membership, Secretary/Clerk changed from 'Administrator' to 'Representative', Minutes or Notes section amended. **Action – KG to circulate, members to send final comments to KG.**

5. **Recommendations to Education and Student Experience Committee (ESEC)**

- 5.1 Agenda points 4.1, 4.2 & 4.3. **Action - AI**

6. **AOB**

- 6.1 MS announced SUBU have been shortlisted for Higher Education Student Union of the Year, the nomination was based on the Student Rep system and close involvement with SVC.

- 6.2 2013/14 Chair & dates of meetings TBC