

**GOLDSMITHS
University of London**

ACADEMIC BOARD

LEARNING, TEACHING AND QUALITY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 17 October 2012

- Present: Dr Michael Young (in the Chair), Professor Les Back, Dr Andrew Bremner, Professor Anna Furse, Mr Søren Goard, Ms Mary Claire Halvorson, Dr Veronica Lawrence, Mr James Ohene-Djan, Professor Len Platt, Dr Vivienne Richmond, Mr Daniel Rubie (*vice* Dr Basem El-Haddadeh), Dr Brett St Louis, Dr Anna Traianou.
- Apologies: Dr Jorella Andrews, Ms Laura Kishore, Mr Samson Osun, Ms Siân Prime.
- In attendance: Mrs Clare Blake (Secretary), Mr Gareth Bodrell, Mr Graham Gaskell, Dr Mira Vogel, Ms Sue Young.

OPEN BUSINESS

1 NEW MEMBERS OF LEARNING, TEACHING AND QUALITY COMMITTEE

Noted:

that the Pro-Warden (Students and Learning Development) welcomed the new members of Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee: Dr Brett St Louis, Dr Andrew Bremner, Mr James Ohene-Djan, Dr Vivienne Richmond and Mr Søren Goard.

2 STANDING ORDERS

Noted:

the College's Standing Orders (12-299).

3 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Noted:

the College policy on conflicts of interest (12-300).

4 MEMBERSHIP AND TERMS OF REFERENCE

Received:

the terms of reference, composition and membership of the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee for 2012–2013 (12-344).

Noted:

- (i) that the Library User Group reported to Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee;
- (ii) that LTQC followed an annual schedule of business.

5 MINUTES

Resolved:

that the Minutes of the meeting held on 16 May 2012 be approved subject to the following correction:

Minute 6. The statement regarding the VLE should read that 'issues to do with the Virtual Learning Environment were not always related to the general design'.

6 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Noted:

- (i) that discussions at Sub Warden Advisory Groups had revealed that there was not a consistent, systematic approach to the logging of assessment submission and return dates and therefore the Pro-Warden (Students and Learning Development) intended to present a paper at the next meeting of LTQC on monitoring the timeliness of the marking of course work in order to consider current practice prior to suggesting action;
- (ii) that the Pro-Warden (Students and Learning Development) would be looking to LTQC for support and advice on the implementation of the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy and on mapping how the College would deliver on the Strategy;
- (iii) that two approaches had been proposed to enhance the Strategy and develop it further:
 - (a) developing a website to host the Strategy, with different aims mapped out on sub-pages, and which could be amended and added to over the lifetime of the Strategy;
 - (b) reviewing the strategic aims and clarifying how they could be achieved: how the College can facilitate; asking departments to reflect on each aim, prioritise the aims and produce an action plan; and considering whether indicative or mandatory objectives should be set centrally;

- (iv) that the Strategy would be discussed at the senior staff away day and ideas arising would subsequently be discussed at LTQC, and that the Strategy would be used to facilitate discussion of learning and teaching and to create a framework;
- (v) that the Strategy was expected to be on the website in mid-November.

7 LEARNING, TEACHING AND QUALITY COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT TO COUNCIL AND ACADEMIC BOARD

Received:

the draft Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee Annual Report to Council and Academic Board (12-345).

Noted:

- (i) that the report addressed strategic aim three and the progress made in relevant areas, including a summary of the business of the Committee during the last academic session;
- (ii) that, on the subject of equality and diversity, some students were concerned about the reduced subsidies for dyslexia testing and it was noted that the number of tests taken was being monitored to assess demand;
- (iii) that the introduction of a mental health advisor had previously been proposed and this was still to be considered by the Senior Management Team.

Resolved:

that the draft Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee Annual Report to Council and Academic Board be approved.

8 CAREERS SERVICE ANNUAL REPORT

Received:

the Careers Service Annual Report (12-346).

Noted:

- (i) that the Graduate School had found the involvement of the Careers Service staff useful and that there might be further scope for the involvement of postgraduate research students in supporting undergraduate students, beyond the existing CV checking, such as through peer-assisted learning or mentoring;
- (ii) that the Careers Service would like to expand their work with academic departments because students were more involved if activities were run jointly by the Careers Service and the department or if the activities were embedded in the curriculum;
- (iii) that there was also scope for collaboration across departments and that departmental events could be opened up to students from other departments, with more awareness of such activities;

- (iv) that the Careers Service was constrained somewhat by the size of the team but that the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy included a focus on employability and the College was committed to the idea that the Careers Service would be more embedded in departments;
- (v) that Skype was being used for one-to-one consultation as needed and that there might be the potential for using Big Blue Button, which would also facilitate group work;
- (vi) that the unemployment rate seemed quite high and it was suggested that this was due to the nature of employment in particular fields such as performing arts and art, and the rate was also similar to previous years, although this information was already a year and a half old;
- (vii) that the census was taken on a specific date, six months after graduation, and that there were specific guidelines about graduate level and non-graduate level employment;
- (viii) that the Careers Service was able to give staff access to the data and to provide specific reports;
- (ix) that during a recent visit from HEFCE, the Pro-Warden (Students and Learning Development) had highlighted that DLHE was not necessarily appropriate for Goldsmiths but this was the information that was used; it was also important for departments to keep in contact with graduates.

9 DEPARTMENTAL STUDENT COORDINATORS' ANNUAL REPORTS 2012

Received:

the Departmental Student Coordinators' Annual Report by undergraduate DSCs on the Library and the Annual Reports by postgraduate DSCs on library resources, on course descriptions and on learning spaces (12-347).

Noted:

- (i) that these reports had been written in 2011-12 and that DSCs had been producing reports for a number of years by working in cross-departmental groups and looking at issues that affected all students;
- (ii) that each report included a set of recommendations and that it was important to close the feedback loop and if issues could not be addressed, this should be explained to students;
- (iii) that the Librarian was asked to look at the reports about the Library and write a response for the Committee, including action points that had arisen;
- (iv) that the report on postgraduate course descriptions should be sent to Marketing, Recruitment and Communications;
- (v) that the Dean of the Graduate School would consider the report on postgraduate learning spaces, although progress had already been made: as well as provision in

the library, a graduate study centre had been established in the Whitehead Building and other ideas around using banks of available rooms were being considered to address the uneven provision highlighted in the report;

- (vi) that some concerns were expressed about the way in which particular findings had been reported and interpreted;
- (vii) that the reports could be more explicit about the relationship between issues and best practice because some had highlighted instances of best practice, although this had not been expressed as the aim;
- (viii) that, in the same way that departments write a response to the External Examiner's report, there could also be a departmental response to the DSC reports.

Resolved:

- (i) that the DSCs be thanked for their work and that the Committee looked forward to receiving the next set of reports;
- (ii) that the Librarian would provide a response to the reports on the Library;
- (iii) that the report on postgraduate course descriptions would be sent to Marketing, Recruitment and Communications.

10 PLATFORMS FOR ONLINE ASSESSMENT AT GOLDSMITHS: WHERE WE ARE AND WHAT WE NEED

Received:

a paper from the Goldsmiths Learning Enhancement Unit on platforms for online assessment (12-348).

Noted:

- (i) that online assessment was a key concern of institutions and the NUS and it covered not just online submission but the overall assessment culture;
- (ii) that provision at Goldsmiths was considered to be very varied without a standardised approach and the paper identified a range of priority areas to address;
- (iii) that some successes had been celebrated through the Peake awards and that examples of good practice could be provided in the context of the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy, which would also address some issues;
- (iv) that it was necessary to ensure that students were equipped with the skills to engage with new processes as they were introduced: for example, GLEU had produced induction films for the VLE and for Turnitin and such films were a cost-effective way for a small team to provide training and support;
- (v) that the paper suggested that the most urgent needs were integration, staff skills development, improved record keeping, the approach to third party web services and general issues regarding the assessment of essays;

- (vi) that Goldsmiths' approach to the use of third party web services and how this could be brought in line with the sector had been referred to the Registrar and Secretary.

Resolved:

- (i) that GLEU would reformulate the paper in a more condensed way and that the Learn.Gold User Group could progress the issues;
- (ii) that GLEU would provide a brief follow-up report at the next meeting.

11 MASSIVE OPEN ONLINE GOLDSMITHS

Received:

a paper from the Goldsmiths Learning Enhancement Unit on MOOCs (12-349).

Noted:

- (i) that this was an excellent and detailed report which should be circulated to Chairs of Departmental Learning and Teaching Committees and other stakeholders;
- (ii) that MOOCs were considered to have potential for Widening Participation and the paper should therefore be shared with the Widening Participation and Open Book teams;
- (iii) that Goldsmiths was already involved in a MOOC for the International Programmes Computing programmes and it would be useful for the Committee to hear about their experiences with Coursera in the next calendar year;
- (iv) that the Graduate School was considering using MOOCs to set up the Virtual Graduate School;
- (v) that there were common drivers between MOOCs and iTunesU as well as MOOCs providing opportunities to deliver on Goldsmiths' Strategic Plan so it would be useful for the paper to be made available on the GLEU website and to monitor emerging projects at Goldsmiths.

Resolved:

that the paper be circulated to Chairs of Departmental Learning and Teaching Committees, Widening Participation and Open Book.

**12 UNIVERSITY OF LONDON INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY (UoLIA)
PSYCHOLOGY PROGRAMME**

Received:

a proposal from the University of London International Academy for a new BSc in Psychology (12-198R).

Resolved:

that, on the recommendation of Programme Scrutiny Sub-Committee, the courses being offered by Goldsmiths' Department of Psychology be approved.

13 MA WRITER / TEACHER

Resolved:

that, on the recommendation of Programme Scrutiny Sub-Committee, a proposal from the Departments of Educational Studies and English and Comparative Literature for a new MA Writer / Teacher (12-253) be approved.

14 BSC GAMES PROGRAMMING

Resolved:

that, on the recommendation of Programme Scrutiny Sub-Committee, a proposal from the Department of Computing for a new BSc in Games Programming (12-254) be approved.

15 ACTION TAKEN BY THE CHAIR

Noted:

the action taken by the Chair (12-395).

16 INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMMES SUB-COMMITTEE MINUTES

Received:

the minutes of the meetings of International Programmes Sub-Committee held on 25 April 2012 (12-350) and 15 May 2012 (12-351).

17 PROGRAMME SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE MINUTES

Received:

the minutes of the meeting of Programme Scrutiny Sub-Committee held on 30 May 2012 (12-352).

18 PHD COMPLETION RATES

Noted:

- (i) that projections for Goldsmiths' PhD completion rates within 25 years were low and at the last meeting of Graduate School Board a process to address this had been discussed and potential strategies were being developed;
- (ii) that Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee was keen to engage with matters relating to postgraduate research students and would welcome a paper on the subject.

Resolved:

that the Graduate School would submit a paper on PhD completion rates to the spring meeting of LTQC.

19 FORTHCOMING MEETINGS**Noted:**

that the next meeting would be held on Wednesday 14 November 2012 at 2.00pm in room 110, Deptford Town Hall Building and that the two remaining meetings for the academic year 2012-13 would take place at 2.00pm in room 110 DTHB on:

Wednesday 13 February 2013

Wednesday 15 or 22 May 2013 (TBC).

CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS**20 NATIONAL STUDENT SURVEY 2012****Received:**

a paper from the Quality Administrator on the College's results in the 2012 National Student Survey (12-353).

Exemption 41 of the FOI Act (Information provided in confidence) applies to the paper (due to inclusion of comparative data from other universities)

The Committee thanked the Quality Administrator for producing the report. The Committee noted that overall satisfaction had improved from 4.1 to 4.2 but that the sector as a whole was also improving. Goldsmiths had also exceeded the benchmark for overall satisfaction set by HEFCE of 82% with a score of 84%. There was variation in the benchmarks but most institutions had exceeded their benchmark. The response rate at Goldsmiths was 61%, well under the sector average of 67% and lower than the previous year. The Department of Visual Cultures had achieved a response rate below 50% so the data could not be used publicly. The College analysis of the data had been presented according to percentage agree for the first time, whereas traditionally only the mean score had been used. Suggestions would be welcome on how best to present the data in future.

There had been good results in some subject areas, such as Anthropology, Computer Science and Fine Art, with notable improvements in Computer Science and Drama. There had also been some disappointing declines.

In the optional categories, it was encouraging that the score for B13 ('I would recommend my University to other students') had increased by 0.2 to 4.4. The response rate for the optional categories had been low compared with the main questions so it would be necessary to emphasise the College's interest in the optional categories when promoting the survey.

The scores for some of the questions were included in the Key Information Sets (KIS) and Goldsmiths' performance in these questions had been mixed.

At institutional level, Goldsmiths consistently did well in teaching and the score for this category had increased. Scores for assessment and feedback were consistently low for Goldsmiths but also for the sector in general. There was a need to look at provision that could influence this and monitoring feedback time was the first step. There had been a mixed performance for academic support, organisation and management and personal development and these were the areas that were affecting Goldsmiths' position in the 1994 Group.

The paper included the position of departments relative to their own discipline. This was a mixed story with success for Anthropology, Art, Computing and Theatre and Performance. Some departments were in the bottom fifty per cent in their discipline and for those departments who had not done well, this did not accord with their self-perception.

The Pro-Warden (Students and Learning Development) had received a written response to the results from each department. Departments would be incorporating action plans in their Annual Programme Review reports. The Pro-Warden (Students and Learning Development) would also be holding individual meetings with Heads of Department.

Analysis of the open box comments had been undertaken by the Quality Office, the Students' Union and Market Intelligence and this would look at the correlation between quantitative and qualitative results. The results would also be discussed at the Learning and Teaching Forum.

Consideration would need to be given to whether targets should be set, for example for response rates, and agreeing targets for each department. Goldsmiths needed to have a more precise idea of what it aimed to achieve. It was suggested that, rather than targets, it might be better to set priorities in particular areas. Aspects could be identified with Heads of Department that were genuine areas of concern rather than particularly in the context of the NSS.

It was agreed that academic support and personal development were areas that could be addressed and it was suggested that Departmental Student Coordinators could be asked to investigate these areas.

Assessment and feedback would continue to be priorities. Assessment cultures would be highlighted in the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy and compliance with the feedback policy would be monitored.

The target response rate for the second year survey of 25% had been achieved and the results had been sent to departments. The College was looking at the correlation between the NSS and the second year survey and looking for evidence that concerns raised in the second year survey had been addressed.

It was noted that the Students' Union was disappointed with their score for the new question about satisfaction with the Students' Union. There had been an enormous range in the results at national level. At Goldsmiths there were marked differences in the score for different departments but it was difficult to establish correlations. It was suggested that the age of the building might be a factor, compared with some institutions with more modern facilities. It was noted that the needs and expectations of students depended on the surrounding area.