**Student Voice Committee UNCONFIRMED**

**Notes of the meeting held on 5th March 2012**

**Present:** Andrew Ireland (AI) (Chair), Jesse Banovic (JB), Mandi Barron (MB), Scott Bellamy (SB), Gillian Bunting (GB), Joff Cooke (JC), Fiona Cownie (FC), Barbara Dyer (BD), Darrell Felton (DF), Nikki Finnes (NF) (Secretary), Stacey Gale (SG), Rachel Geeson (RG), Helen Impett (HI), Kate Jones (KJ), Stuart Laird (SL), Kevin McGhee (KM), Andrew Main (AM), Liam Sheridan (LS), Catherine Symonds (CS), Jennifer Taylor (JT)

**1. Apologies**

1.1 Apologies were received from Jill Beard, Mark Ridolfo, Paul Breakwell and Jacky Mack

1. **Matters Arising from notes of 6th February 2012**

2.1 **Minute 2.1** – AI informed the group that it was not part of the SVC Terms of Reference to discuss the Social Media guidelines so Cress Rolfe had not been invited to attend the meeting. M&C had created some new guidelines for staff in using social media and these were being adapted for students. Members thought the guidelines were important and needed to be understood by students and staff but accepted that SVC was not the forum to discuss them in detail. MB noted that if students used social media inappropriately this would become a disciplinary issue. Action closed.

2.2 **Minute 2.7** – action completed.

2.3 **Minute 3.4** – action completed.

2.4 **Minute 5.3.1** – NF to contact Paul Breakwell regarding incentives for PTES. **Action NF/PB**

2.5 **Minute 5.4.1 and 5.4.2** – on the agenda.

2.6 **Minute 6.1** – the matter of assessment bunching to be referred to ESEC for note. The group felt that this issue would continue to be raised by students until students’ perceptions changed. As part of the CAS project assessment bunching would be considered again, but in order to start changing perceptions the students’ expectations needed to be managed upfront by framework teams.

2.7 **Minute 7.1** – Toby Horner had sent a report to Wilts and Dorset summarising the bus issues and this would be presented to ESEC. As a result of the report there were now more buses at the start and end of each day.

2.8 **Minute 7.2** – DF confirmed that library space would be increased by making some office space into a student space large enough to accommodate a further 23 PCs. Work on this was starting this week. IT support available in the library would be promoted by a number of different people including the Student Ambassadors for the library. MB noted that the specifics of any student issues raised were needed to help clarify and resolve the exact problem.

2.9 **Minute 10.1** - JC agreed to send NF the report on Partner Student Rep training for circulation following the meeting. 16 BPC reps had been trained since the last meeting bringing the total number of reps trained at Partners this year to between 60 and 80%. Accurate records on Partner Reps were now being held so next year this information would be more readily available. **Action: JC**

2.10 **Minute 10.2** – no major issues had been raised at SUBU hedgehog meetings for SVC to consider.

1. **Reporting from SVC members – verbal report (Mandi Barron/Gillian Bunting)**
	1. AI explained that SVC meetings would be changing focus to allow time to discuss and share good practice and feedback during meetings. Two hourly meetings would change from monthly to every six weeks. Papers would be circulated in advance for members to read and bring feedback to the meeting for discussion. Meetings would focus on identifying common themes and sharing good practice; identifying areas which require reporting up to ESEC; communicating actions back through the student communication channels.
	2. Schools and SUBU representatives would be asked to prepare a short report in advance of each meeting identifying emerging themes and trends and areas of good practice worthy of sharing more widely. Some themes may be those which are out of the School’s control to deal with and require discussion and action centrally. The group would spend time at each meeting looking at the feedback received, rather than spending time discussing how feedback is collected. SVC would not resolve issues but would ensure appropriate action is being taken. When and if necessary items would be reported to ESEC.
	3. AI clarified that it would not be prescriptive what should or should not be included in the reports but these should include areas which appear to be an emerging issue or something which would be of interest across the University. The assumption would be that Schools address issues themselves involving other departments e.g. EIS, SAS, M&C etc as necessary, but if any issues cannot be resolved or would benefit from wider discussion these would be included in the report.
	4. Future agendas would include the following standing items:
* Minutes of the previous meeting and matters arising
* Review and discussion of reports from input sources e.g. Schools, SUBU, Academic Partnerships and Graduate School;
* Review of reports from SVC sub groups e.g. Task Groups for NSS, SES, PTES;
* Recommendations to ESEC.
	1. AI would provide the group with a diagram and some bullet points outlining the future of SVC meetings.

**Action: AI**

1. **Student feedback– types of feedback collected**
	1. The *Student feedback project – types of feedback collected* paper was re-circulated to the group following the last meeting and identified the different types and ways of collecting feedback currently in place. It was agreed that the list needed review to see what could be reduced or removed. MB suggested that SB and GB carry out a mapping exercise to expand the information provided and to take into account SUBU’s currently activity. JC would provide SB and GB with feedback from SUBU shortly. AI asked if SB and GB could look at this over the next two weeks so that it could be re-circulated to SVC ahead of the next ESEC on 28th March.

**Action: JC**

**Action: SB and GB**

1. **Draft Policy and Procedure Student Engagement and Feedback**
	1. This new Policy and Procedure included what was previously available in Academic Procedures A2 Student Reps and B16 Unit feedback so much of the text was not new.  The two had been brought together to help capture the main student feedback mechanisms in one document. Feedback on the whole document was welcomed but in particular on Section 10 which would be around closing the loops on feedback received, what we do with it, where it goes and how we communicate the changes made to students.
	2. There was a general feeling that the document held too much detail and could be reduced and simplified. The details about SES and student reps could be reduced. It was suggested that it could be set out by level of feedback, identifying the different types of feedback at different levels. The document provided a good opportunity to clarify a number of areas including when a student should report to their course or School rep, when they should go to SUBU and when they should discuss the issue direct themselves.
	3. SUBU reported that the Society of Reps did not find the current A2 useful and they were currently working on a Handbook for Reps for next academic year. JT noted that the primary audience of this document would be staff rather than students and the various procedures needed to be written somewhere to ensure policy is followed through.
	4. AM noted that unit level feedback definitely takes place but queried the suggestion in the document that the unit data is made available at higher levels. This referred to team delivery of a unit and would be clarified.
	5. It was noted that unit feedback data goes back to the unit leader but if there are any problems these can be hidden. Unit feedback should inform the teaching and learning experience of each unit and any wider issues should filter up through the Student Reps system rather than being left at unit level.
	6. It was noted that the School Student Experience Champion role had evolved over time and was very important but SVC could not decide what this role should involve as this was an HR issue. If any of the policy statements changed approval from Senate would be required, otherwise formal approval of the document was not necessary but it would be useful to send the final version to ESEC for information. The new Policy and Procedure would be published in June as part of the complete Policy and Procedure series. AM noted that June would be too late for preparations for next academic year but this date had already been brought forward from early September to end of June.
	7. It was agreed that a sub group would meet to consider the Policy and Procedure further. The group would include JT, BD, SB and Kelly Goodwin (Student Reps Champion in School of Tourism).

**Action: JT**

1. **Updates on Projects:**
	1. **NSS**
		1. The Moroccan tent would not be brought back as only 17 students completed the survey in the tent on the last day it was up. The majority of students on that day told staff that they had already completed the survey so it was felt that saturation point had been reached with the tent. Instead resources would be targeted elsewhere. This included the Student Reps who were proactive during the tent promotion setting up pull up stands and laptops in the Atrium on Thursday 8th March and in Bournemouth House on Friday 9th March before IPSOS Mori start calling students next week. Reps would also circulate business cards around the library and other facilities reminding students of NSS.
		2. The Task Group had looked at the response rates a week ago and Partners were particularly low at that time. SB had met with the HE managers and had been reassured that sessions were booked in for students to complete NSS this week and next week in IT labs. Sam Neaves would also be taking business cards, pull up stands and laptops out to Partners. SB agreed to follow up on this at the end of the week to ensure action was being taken by the Partners. Marianne Barnard was also following it up.

**Action: SB**

* + 1. SG welcomed any suggestions from the group to attract students who have so far not engaged with the NSS. The Task Group had discussed other possibilities such as a video of the camel being kidnapped and held to ransom, introducing School rivalry using School based plasma screens to display a bar chart tally of where each School is week by week and an email from the Dean.
		2. ApSci had already put a message on the plasma screen in Christchurch House but it was difficult to know if this had encouraged responses. Not all Schools had their own plasma screens so something on the main screens would be preferable. It was agreed that the Staff Portal, Student Portal and the plasma screens in the Atrium and in Bournemouth House could include some text and an image displaying the latest bar chart tally. This would need to be updated each week. SG agreed to arrange for this to happen.

**Action: SG**

* + 1. An email from the Dean was also agreed. SG and SB would draft this and each School could decide when it was sent by the Dean.

**Action: SG and SB**

**6.2 SES**

* + 1. The current response rate was 3.7%. Current breakdowns included: Positive student experience 77%; Organisation and management 56%; Feedback helpful 61%. Whilst the response rate was very low LS reminded the group that patterns tend to establish very early so it was still a useful indicator.
		2. It had been agreed previously by the group to suppress the marketing of the SES so that NSS was the main institutional focus. However it was agreed that it would be timely to email the students again and to pick up with Jacqueline McCaffrey (JMcC) how we can encourage students to complete the SES. SB had already had some discussions with JMcC about this.
		3. There were currently no presentations available for staff to use to promote SES in lectures but there was still opportunity to do more. The group suggested that the NSS Task Group reconvene to consider SES promotional activity which could include a presentation for staff to use, asking the Student Reps to promote the SES and further emails and messages on the Student Portal. SG agreed to prepare a presentation for Schools to use with JMcC and would circulate this before the next meeting for Schools to start using. The presentation could remind students that the SES collects institutional level feedback and the feedback through the Reps system is at programme level. It was noted again that the SES may not be required in the future as the Reps system collects a lot of similar feedback.

**Action: SG**

6.2.4 KJ reported that the second SUBU Speak Week was w/c 12th March. Reps would be visible all over the campus and would be more than happy to talk to students about SES. SG would arrange for more SES business cards to be available for Reps to give out.

**6.3 PTES**

* + 1. LS would provide the student data for the population eligible to be surveyed to Susan Deane (SD) in LLS by 9th March. Once this had been received the survey would be set up and a pilot survey tested before the URL is made available for students to access the survey through. The URL would be <http://www.survey.bris.ac.uk/bournemouth/ptes2012>

* + 1. The group agreed that M&C should identify a coordinator for PTES to agree incentives, draft and send the email to students with the URL on the launch day and any other promotional messages for the Student Portal etc. NF would contact PB to find out who this would be in M&C and would liaise accordingly. NF would also contact Tiantian Zhang as her role included PGT students, to inform her of the current position with PTES and to ask if she had any ideas around the promotion of the survey.

**Action: NF**

1. **Reports from members (e.g. School Research Degree Committees or Student Rep meetings)**

7.1 This agenda item would be embedded into the new agenda structure in future.

7.2 JC mentioned that he would have the combined Synoptic Reports from the six SAB meetings available for the next meeting.

1. **Recommendations for implementation (to be forwarded to Education and Student Experience Committee (ESEC)**

8.1 None

1. **AOB**
	1. SUBU Speak Week would be run by the Reps during w/c 12th March. The week would celebrate the work of the Reps and would champion why it is good to be a Rep. Students’ Unions across the country had been encouraged to take part in a national walkout of students on 14th March in view of the HE Bill being put on hold and the introduction of higher tuition fees. BU students did not feel strongly enough about this so instead had arranged a ‘talk out’ on 12th March with John Vinney, Tim McIntyre-Bhatty and two Deans. Thursday 15th March would be Reps day and all Reps would be encouraged to wear purple and to be around both campuses promoting the Reps system. A Student Rep conference would be held on 16th March with John Vinney and Tim McIntyre-Bhatty attending. KJ would send out more information to the group by end of the week.

**Action: KJ**

**2011/12 meetings:**

Monday 30th April – 1 – 3pm – Committee Room

Monday 11th June – 1 – 3pm – TBC

Monday 23rd July – 1 – 3 pm – TBC