

**GOLDSMITHS
University of London**

ACADEMIC BOARD

LEARNING, TEACHING AND QUALITY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 21 May 2014

Present: Dr Michael Young (Chair), Mrs Cathryn Thompson, Professor Len Platt, Ms Mary Claire Halvorson, Dr Vivienne Richmond, Dr Veronica Lawrence, Ms Siân Prime, Dr Sarah Pearce (*vice* Dr Anna Traianou), Dr Andrew Bremner, Dr James Ohene-Djan, Ms Sue Dixon, Mr Conrad Grant, Mr Søren Goard

Apologies: Professor Anna Furse, Mr John Ginman, Professor Janis Jefferies, Ms Claire MacLean, Dr Brett St Louis, Dr Anna Traianou

In attendance: Ms Rachel Davies (Secretary), Mr Gareth Bodrell, Ms Sue English, Mr Graham Gaskell, Ms Sue Young, Ms Fairouz Aniq, Ms Catriona Boulton, Mr Howard Littler, Mr Kieron Broadhead (items 7 and 8)

OPEN BUSINESS

1 MINUTES

Resolved:

that the Minutes of the meeting held on 26 February 2014 be approved subject to the following corrections:

Minute 9 Noted. This should also include that students in certain subject areas would emerge in to portfolio careers, self-employment or create organisations; so it was important that the strategy reflected those routes as well as employment and traditional notions of careers. It was recognised that there was a range of research reports that supported these engagement processes that could support the development of the strategy.

Minute 10 Noted. It was felt that the minutes did not clearly reflect the comments that had been made regarding support for the Library in terms of expenditure per student, which was lower at Goldsmiths than comparable institutions.

2 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

- (i) that some departments had made changes to their Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy 2012-16 Action Plans which would be approved by Chair's action (Minute 17).

3 GOLDSTART TRANSITION PROGRAMME

Received:

a paper from the Head of Marketing, Outreach and Recruitment on the GoldStart Transition Programme (14-197).

Noted:

- (i) that the GoldStart Transition Programme, outlined in the College's 2014-15 Access Agreement, was a pre-induction programme introduced to support non-traditional students transition to university;
- (ii) that the programme would be piloted in the 2014-15 academic year and students with no heritage of higher education in their family, mature students, disabled students, students who have been in care and students from areas of low participation in higher education would be contacted by staff in Marketing, Outreach and Recruitment and encouraged to participate in GoldStart;
- (iii) that GoldStart would run the week before enrolment and would most likely have sessions covering academic literacy and writing, study skills, accessing the Library, accessing College services and campus tours;
- (iv) that it was envisaged that there would be a day or two of training in department clusters or peer networks where students would learn what their discipline expected of them;
- (v) that a Coordinator would be appointed to run the programme which would be tied to Welcome Week; however, it would not just be pre-sessional support, it would be a continuous programme which would also support retention,
- (vi) that approximately 500 students would be eligible to participate in the pilot GoldStart in September 2014 and ongoing support following the pre-induction programme would be available through an e-mentor, who would compliment and not duplicate the roles of DSCs, PALs and Student Ambassadors across the College;
- (vii) that monitoring participation on GoldStart could be challenging; however, the Head of Marketing, Outreach and Recruitment and the Associate Pro-Warden for Widening Access and Student Opportunity explained that they would have oversight of the programme and would look at the overall mechanics for it to be sufficiently run;
- (viii) that ICCE would be happy to use their Synapse programme in collaboration with GoldStart.

4 STUDENT RETENTION

Received:

a paper from the Director of Students, Alumni and Library Services on student retention at Goldsmiths (14-192).

Noted:

- (i) that whilst the College averages by department seemed either low or in-line with the sector average for attrition, there were some differences between departments;
- (ii) that SALS and Planning would work together to create an effective process for collecting improved data on student retention as the current statistics did not provide profiles of the students ;
- (iii) that the Director of Student Services was working on a better way of providing central support regarding retention to be delivered within Phase 2 of the Student Record System project and the proposed work around systems integration;
- (iv) that the Personal Tutor System should be made more consistent across the College which could lead to a decrease in the number of students withdrawing from programmes;
- (v) that the Library reading list software could help tutors see how many students were accessing readings which could in turn flag up students in risk of withdrawing;
- (vi) that the data provided by the Quality Office for the APR reporting process included reasons for withdrawal at programme level for the past three years, thus identifying programmes where there were issues with retention.

5 DRAFT FEEDBACK POLICY**Received:**

a Draft Feedback Policy from the Associate Pro-Warden (Teaching and Learning Enhancement) (14-198).

Noted:

- (i) that the previous Pro-Warden (Students and Learning Development) had developed the current Feedback Policy in 2010;
- (ii) that the electronic management of assessments had been challenging with some departments fully adopting electronic submissions and others partially adopting electronic submissions;
- (iii) that electronic assessment was allegedly more time consuming for some academic staff and it was felt that some staff might not be using the technology to the best of its abilities;
- (iv) that there was concern amongst some staff regarding occupational health with the switch from hard copy to electronic marking;
- (v) that there was not a policy requiring departments and students to use only Turnitin or learn.gold; however, GLEU advised that the VLE should be used in preference to Turnitin;

- (vi) that the three week feedback turnaround time in the current Feedback Policy did not take staff workload into account which could impact the consistency, quality and timeliness of feedback;
- (vii) that the policy should be explicit regarding the time frame for feedback to be returned when staff leave periods and College closures were included as there had been some confusion and examples of some students waiting for unacceptably long periods for return of their work;
- (viii) that there was not a policy regarding exam feedback, which students had expressed a desire in receiving; however, it was felt that this would greatly increase staff workload and may not contribute to the learning process as effectively as alternative measures for formative feedback;
- (ix) that it was felt that exams were not set up to provide feedback as students were often given feedback on formative and summative assessment throughout the year and there was a feeling that students should not be taught how to pass exams, they should be taught how to learn the subject;
- (x) that there were questions about the retention of feedback reports generated online, and whether or not it was the responsibility of the department or GLEU to archive reports;
- (xi) that departments needed to be reminded of the correct terminology to use when giving students feedback;
- (xii) that there was a strong call for students to get support for academic writing that was discipline-focused instead of general academic writing, which might help with retention.

Resolved:

that the Associate Pro-Warden (Teaching and Learning Enhancement) would take on further consultation on the Feedback Policy to include the identification of department practice regarding exam feedback and addressing occupational health issues around electronic marking with HR.

6 GOLDSMITHS CAMPUS SPACES AND TIMETABLING

Received:

an oral report from the Director of Estates and Facilities on campus spaces and timetabling.

Noted:

- (i) that a number of key projects were taking place on Goldsmiths spaces which included a new IT Helpdesk in the Library, transforming the ground and second floor of the Students' Union, ongoing work in the Church to be completed in September and new computer labs and research space created in the Richard Hoggart Building;

- (ii) that a number of smaller projects were taking place which included teaching room refabs and the creation of eight new teaching rooms to include five seminar-sized rooms, two performance spaces and one room to accommodate 40-50 occupants;
- (ii) that initial reports confirmed that timetabling was looking healthier for 2014-15 with the addition of the eight new teaching rooms;
- (iii) that Estates, in conjunction with the Space Management Review Group, were working on a policy to create a set of principles that all departments would sign up to in order to improve timetabling;
- (iii) that going forward, the College would endeavour to schedule teaching Monday through Friday from 9:00 to 19:00 and encourage departments to make full use of the week instead of scheduling most teaching on Tuesdays and Thursdays;
- (iv) that academic departments agreed to do an analysis of their specialist space and specialist space needs and any classrooms would be given back to the central room booking system;
- (v) that Estates would not fully use auto-scheduling for timetabling given the additional teaching rooms created and departments releasing classrooms
- (vi) that the link between the Estates timetabling system Scientia with UNIT-e was crucial to ensure that suitable classrooms were allocated accordingly and this was being done as quickly as possible to improve timetabling processes;
- (vi) that it was felt that different programmes taught in different ways and it would be useful for teaching spaces to be adaptable as seminar chairs were not always suitable;
- (vii) that Estates had been consulting with academic departments that ran joint programmes as a priority as their timetabling needs were more complicated and issues with joint degree timetables had been raised year on year in student feedback.

7 GOLDSMITHS LEARNING ENHANCEMENT UNIT END OF YEAR REPORT 2013-14

Received:

the Goldsmiths Learning Enhancement Unit (GLEU) end of year paper from the Head of GLEU (14-199).

Noted:

- (i) that GLEU had encouraged Goldsmiths staff to embrace technical developments which included lecture flipping and the use of a media streaming system;
- (ii) that there had been a shift of approach from GLEU offering more specific thematic agenda for learning enhancement initiatives, tied to the Learning Teaching Assessment Strategy 2012-16;

- (iii) that a learning technology survey with less than 100 responses had found that students were generally happier in 2014 than 2013 with learn.gold;
- (iv) that overall trends with Goldsmiths criteria for VLE 1 and 2 were positive, with increased evidence of compliance;
- (v) that the Head of GLEU was thanked for his period of service, and in particular, for his leadership and enhancements made over his term in the post.

8 POSTGRADUATE ANNUAL PROGRAMME REVIEW REPORT 2012-13

Received:

the Postgraduate Annual Programme Review Report from the Quality Officer (14-200).

Noted:

- (i) that the conclusions at the end of the report were endorsed by the Committee;
- (ii) that the Quality Officer was thanked for her work on the report.

9 STANDARD CRITERIA FOR MERIT AND DISTINCTION

Received:

a paper from the Quality Assurance Manager regarding the standard criteria for merit and distinction with an update on the potential impact that a change might have (13-156R).

Noted:

- (i) that following the 2012-13 annual digest of External Examiners' reports, it was resolved that there should be a discussion of the standard criteria for merit and distinction;
- (ii) that although some departments had been using the standard criteria for the award of merit and Distinction for some time, 2012-13 was the first year in which it was adopted for all Masters programmes across the College;
- (iii) that a small number of instances had been highlighted by departments in which it had not been possible to award a distinction to a candidate even though it was felt that it had been deserved due to the absence of an overall weighted mean mark of above 70% as a criterion for the award of distinction;
- (iv) that the introduction of an overall mean mark as an alternative criterion to the preponderance of modules might be a possible solution;
- (v) that there were conflicting opinions regarding the update of the criteria as some members felt that it would create unfairness by introducing non-linearity in the marking while other members welcomed the change;

- (vi) that it was significant if a student achieved a merit or distinction in certain subject areas which could have repercussions for subsequent funding applications after completion of the programme.

Recommended:

that the amendment to the standard criteria for merit and distinction be approved with effect in 2013-14.

10 GUIDELINES FOR HANDLING THE RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH WORK PLACEMENT PROGRAMMES

Received:

a paper from the Work Placement Manager which provided a framework for departments to apply when establishing work placements (14-201).

Noted:

- (i) that there might be business and reputational risks where there might be a convergence of values;
- (ii) that it was felt that the paper focused on disabled students, but not the race or religion of students which could impact gaining certain placements;
- (iii) that travel costs incurred as a result of a work placement needed to be clearly stated on the programme's website and in marketing materials;
- (iv) that there needed to be an opportunity on either side for the work placement to be terminated and this needed to be explicit in the guidelines;
- (v) that not all academic departments would want placements to contribute to the final grade for the student.

Resolved:

that the guidelines would be amended following comments from the Committee and presented at the next meeting.

11 COLLABORATIVE PROVISION HANDBOOK

Received:

the new Collaborative Provision Handbook from the Collaborative Provision Manager (14-195).

Noted:

- (i) that it was an extensive document that was a useful guide for people who wished to enter into collaborative provision agreements with Goldsmiths;
- (ii) that they were grateful for the work put into the handbook.

Recommended:

that the Collaborative Provision Handbook be approved.

12 INSTITUTIONAL APPROVAL REPORT FOR NORDOFF ROBBINS**Received:**

a paper from the Collaborative Provision Manager on the institutional approval panels in relation to the new collaborative provision partnership with Nordoff Robbins (14-182).

Noted:

- (i) that Nordoff Robbins applied for approval as a Partner Institution of Goldsmiths through a collaborative provision partnership to lead to the validation of a Masters of Music Therapy and MPhil/PhD in Music Therapy delivered at their sites in London and Manchester;
- (ii) that a two day validation event took place in London and Manchester as part of the formal Institutional Approval process with the Panel concluding that Nordoff Robbins had met the criteria for Institutional Approval;
- (iii) that STaCS would be the lead department; however, other departments might also work with Nordoff Robbins.

Recommended:

that the institutional approval in relation to the new collaborative partnership with Nordoff Robbins be approved.

13 STUDENT ENGAGEMENT POLICY**Received:**

the draft Student Engagement Policy from the Pro-Warden (Students and Learning Development) (14-225).

Noted:

- (i) that the policy comprised Part A (Student Voice) and was drafted in consultation with the Students' Union, SALS and Heads of Departments to develop a more consistent and timely approach to responding to student feedback;
- (ii) that a greater degree of uniformity across academic departments was necessary;
- (iii) that the policy outlined a system to respond to student feedback, efficiently and effectively, that would seek to remove duplication of enhancement processes within academic departments, ensure cross-referencing of different information sources and improve communication between departments and the college and between departments and students;

- (iv) that the policy proposed to discontinue programme monitoring and the programme monitoring database which would be replaced by a Department Learning and Teaching Termly Report to be considered at both Staff Student Forum and Department Learning and Teaching Committee;
- (v) that members felt that two Staff Student Forum meetings per term were too many;
- (vi) that the policy was informed by the principle that students were active citizens and not passive consumers.

Resolved:

- (i) that the Pro-Warden would continue to consult and take comment from the panel regarding the content of the Student Voice section of the Student Engagement Policy;
- (ii) that the proposed schedule for Department Student Engagement activities be approved.

14 ACTION PLAN FOLLOWING THE DEPARTMENTAL STUDENT COORDINATORS' ANNUAL PROJECTS 2014

Received:

an Action Plan from the Academic Representation and Student Voice Coordinator following the Departmental Student Coordinators' Annual Projects in March 2014 (14-227).

Noted:

- (i) that following the Departmental Student Coordinator (DSC) Annual Projects, meetings with the Pro-Warden (Students and Learning Development), Students' Union and Quality Office took place to develop an action plan to respond to the issues raised in the reports;
- (ii) that several recommendations were identified by the Academic Representation and Student Voice Coordinator and Quality Officer as priorities to be completed by the beginning of the next academic year;
- (iii) that the Warden and Pro-Warden (Students and Learning Development) would be meeting DSCs on 5 June 2014 to give an update on actions taken or in progress

Resolved:

that there would be an update on progress at the next meeting of the Committee.

15 NATIONAL STUDENT SURVEY PARTICIPATION 2014

Received:

an oral report from the Head of Market Strategy on participation in the National

Student Survey (NSS) 2014.

Noted:

- (i) that there had been a much higher NSS response rate at 77.6% this year compared to 66.1% last year;
- (ii) that all departments exceeded their response rate in 2013, except Psychology, which was 2.1 percentage points short of last year's number, achieving 82.7%, but still well above the college average;
- (iii) that all but 6 of the 44 eligible undergraduate programmes exceeded their percentage response rate from last year;
- (iv) that all but one eligible area, as defined by JACS3, achieved its publication threshold (being both 50% of eligible responses and at least 23 responses);
- (v) that the improvement across the board in response rate could suggest that it was down to the efforts of Goldsmiths as 'online' as a method of response increased significantly, accounting for all the growth in response compared with 2013 with 'postal' and 'telephone' having remained static, the main methods by which Ipsos Mori increases response;
- (vi) that the academic departments, Students' Union, DSCs and SALS were thanked for their hard work in promoting the NSS and increasing participation.

16 ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS REVIEW

Received:

a revised process for resitting and retaking assessment (14-190R).

Noted:

- (i) that the requirements of the assessment regulations were not sufficiently supportive of students' individual circumstances;
- (ii) that a student retrieving failed level 4 and level 5 modules in the third year of an undergraduate degree had a heavy study load;
- (iii) that the credit framework did not condone, it compensated;
- (iv) that the valid attempt rule should prevent students from absenting themselves from assessment, but was impeding completion of assessment within the academic year and progression;
- (v) that Examiners exercised discretion and advised students with a high level of failure to re-sit assessments in the following session and that discretion should still be available;
- (vi) that concerns were expressed regarding the equity between undergraduate and Masters level students with the proposed changes to the regulations;

- (vii) that it was suggested that the £100 re-sit fee be removed for late summer retakes.

Recommended:

that the update to the regulations be approved subject to minor amendments.

17 ASSESSMENT MISCONDUCT

Received:

a paper on a revised process to address assessment misconduct (14-191).

Noted:

- (i) that concerns had been raised in relation to the process for investigating academic misconduct for minor technical offences, definitions of levels of misconduct and the tariff of suggested penalties;
- (ii) that proposals were set out for a revised process that made provision for early intervention to support the student and avoid more serious offences;
- (iii) that a formal approach to minor technical offenses without unduly or doubly penalising a student was proposed;
- (iv) that there was flexibility with the designated senior academic position;
- (v) that reducing the time for students to respond to assessment misconduct to 7 days was feasible;
- (vi) that students who were awarded a 0 could not have a late summer re-sit;
- (vii) that measuring plagiarism as a percentage was not appropriate, as it was felt that it was more about the nature and intention of the student than the amount of plagiarism.

Recommended:

that the revised process to address assessment misconduct be approved subject to minor amendments.

18 ACTION PLAN UPDATE FOLLOWING THE PERIODIC PROGRAMME/DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW OF THE MA / PGDIP / PGCERT IN THE MANAGEMENT OF LEARNING AND TEACHING IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Resolved:

that, on the recommendation of the Standards Scrutiny Sub-Committee, the update on action taken in response to the recommendations of the Periodic Programme Review of the Management of Learning and Teaching in Higher Education programme, undertaken on 25 April 2013 (14-189) be approved.

19 ACTION PLAN UPDATE FOLLOWING THE PERIODIC PROGRAMME/DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW OF THE YOUTH WORK PROGRAMMES IN THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL, THERAPEUTIC AND COMMUNITY STUDIES

Resolved:

that, on the recommendation of the Standards Scrutiny Sub-Committee, that the update on action taken in response to the recommendations of the Periodic Programme Review of the Department of Social, Therapeutic and Community Studies Youth Work Programmes demonstrated that the recommendations had been acted upon and that no further information was required (P; 14-14).

20 AMENDMENTS TO ACADEMIC REGULATIONS 2014-15 – LASALLE COLLEGE OF THE ARTS

Resolved:

that, on the recommendation of the Standards Scrutiny Sub-Committee, amendments to the academic regulations at LASALLE College of the Arts, Singapore from 2014-15 (14-186) be approved.

21 ACTION TAKEN BY THE CHAIR

Noted:

the action taken by the Chair (14-229).

22 REPORT OF THE PERIODIC PROGRAMME/DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND COMPARATIVE LITERATURE ENGLISH PROGRAMME OFFERED THROUGH THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY (INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY)

Received:

the report of the Periodic Programme Review of the UoLIA BA in English, undertaken on 4 December 2013 (14-187).

23 REPORT AND INITIAL ACTION PLAN FROM THE PERIODIC PROGRAMME/DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW OF THE SOCIAL WORK PROGRAMMES IN THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL, THERAPEUTIC AND COMMUNITY STUDIES

Received:

the report and initial action plan in response to the recommendations of the Periodic Programme Review of the Social Work Programmes in the Department of Social, Therapeutic and Community Studies undertaken on 24 February 2014 (14-188).

24 REVIEW OF THE UNDERGRADUATE CREDIT FRAMEWORK

Received:

a report on the introduction of the undergraduate credit framework from the Quality Assurance Manager (14-184).

25 ASSESSMENT REPORT - LASALLE COLLEGE OF THE ARTS

Received:

the assessment report for validated programmes delivered at LASALLE College of the Arts, Singapore (14-185).

26 ANNUAL REVIEW REPORT- LASALLE COLLEGE OF THE ARTS

Received:

the LASALLE College of the Arts, Singapore annual review report from the Collaborative Provision Manager and Collaborative Provision Officer (14-208).

27 REVISED SCHEDULE FOR PERIODIC PROGRAMME REVIEWS 2013-14

Received:

from the Head of Quality a revised schedule for Periodic Programme/Departmental Reviews in 2013-14 (13-228R).

28 SCHEDULE FOR PERIODIC PROGRAMME REVIEWS 2014-15

Received:

from the Head of Quality a schedule for Periodic Programme/Departmental Reviews in 2014-15 (14-202).

29 ANNUAL REPORT TO ACADEMIC BOARD ON PROGRAMMES APPROVED, TERMINATED AND AMENDED

Received:

the annual report to Academic Board on Programmes Approved, Terminated and Amended in 2013-14 (14-203).

30 GRADUATE SCHOOL BOARD MINUTES

Received:

the minutes of the meeting of the Graduate School Board held on 29 April 2014 (14-204).

31 PROGRAMME SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE MINUTES

Received:

the minutes of the meeting of the Programme Scrutiny Sub-Committee held on 7 May 2014 (14-205).

32 STANDARDS SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE MINUTES

Received:

the minutes of the meetings of the Standards Scrutiny Sub-Committee held on 27 February 2014 (14-206) and 14 May 2014 (14-207).

33 FORTHCOMING MEETINGS

Noted:

that the meetings for the next academic year would be confirmed with the Committee members and attendees once scheduled.

RD
June 2014