**Faculty of Humanities Teaching & Learning Committee**

**Minutes of the meeting of 10th February 2016, 2pm – 4pm, 2.217 University Place**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Noted** | | **Action** |
| 1. **Welcomes and Apologies** | Welcome to Ralf Becker, representing SoSS on behalf of Ken Clark; welcome back to Norma Hird.  Apologies were received from: Ken Clark (SoSS); Sharon Clarke (MBS); Bruce Wardhaugh (Law); Amber Guan (PGT Student Rep); Elinor O’Connor (MBS PGT); Katy Woolfenden (Library). | |  |
|  |  | |  |
| 1. **Minutes of the last meeting of 9 December 2015** [HTLC/3/15] | Minutes [HTLC/3/15] were approved as a correct record subject to the following corrections:   * Item 1. Welcomes and Apologies – apologies had been received from Gail Divall and Norma Hird. * Item 13. Teaching Quality – Economics, rather than SoSS as a whole, had piloted the application of a “traffic light system” of red/amber/green to individual unit Survey scores. This practice was not continued, although the idea was to maintain a high profile for Unit Surveys and be proactive in their promotion and use. | | **ACTION:** Emma Sanders to amend Minutes of 09.12.15 |
|  |  | |  |
| 1. **Actions and Matters arising** | **Carried forward from HTLC of Weds 2nd April 2014:**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | ***Item*** | ***Action*** | ***Who*** | ***Update*** | | **13. of 19.02.14 Promoting Languages: to agree ways in which language units can be promoted across the Faculty at UG and PGT level, with reference to new UG and PGT Regulations** | ULC would enhance Level 1 LEAP units to Level 3. Course Unit Specs to be forwarded to TLO for approval | Liam Harte/ Emma Sanders | **Completed:** Periodic Review of ULC (Jan 2016) noted: ‘Enhanced Introductory’ units have been created so that they may legitimately be offered at higher levels of study. Approved by SALC UG Committee – successful German language trial, now expanded to all other languages.” (Contextual Statement, p7) |   **Carried forward from HTLC of Weds 10th June 2015:**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | ***Item*** | ***Action*** | ***Responsibility*** | ***Update*** | | **9. Graduate Destinations and Employability Strategy** | Create an implementation plan to accompany the Strategy. | Matthew Jefferies | Plans for implementation have been discussed with Schools and actions will be fed into each School’s Operational Priorities. |   **Carried forward from HTLC of Weds 7th October 2015:**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | ***Item*** | ***Action*** | ***Responsibility*** | ***Update*** | | **12. Consultation on revised University Programme Specification template** | Get Anna Goatman’s example from MBS and a good “free text” example from the past and circulate it to the central group and HTLC. | Emma Sanders | **Ongoing:** ECS to email HTLC members. |   **Carried forward from HTLC of Weds 11th November 2015:**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | ***Item*** | ***Action*** | ***Responsibility*** | ***Update*** | | 1. **Draft Moderation Procedure: Faculty of Humanities (Lisa McAleese)** [2/15/6] | Circulate Draft Moderation Procedure plus Marking Policy to UG and PGT Exams Officers in Schools, for feedback and for implementation at 1516 BoEs if possible. | LMcA | **Ongoing:** a working group to be established. LMcA |   **Carried forward from HTLC of Weds 9th December 2015:**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | ***Item*** | ***Action*** | ***Responsibility*** | ***Update*** | | * 1. **Chair’s Verbal Report (Fiona Smyth)** | Email Schools’ responses to a proposal discussed at TLG to require students to take 20cr outside of their home subject, related to University College for Interdisciplinary study. | T&L Directors | **Ongoing**: Fiona Smyth to report back to TLG that staff were opposed to making this compulsory (and to query whether it was intended to apply to all levels of UG study). | | 1. **Employability Update (Paul Gratrick)** | Add data on graduates who continue to study within UoM to the data on graduates who progress to further study anywhere, for comparison. | Paul Gratrick | **Completed:** See Minute 12 of 10/02/16, below. | | 1. **Distance Learning Update** | Fiona to get information on International Law tuition fees for the new DL programme. | Fiona Smyth | **Ongoing.** | | **14. Recommendation for dealing with suspected plagiarism in group work assignments [3/15/14]** | Take Faculty recommendations to the TLSO and determine what the University is doing in this area. | Lisa McAleese | **Ongoing:** the proposals are being looked over by the University’s lawyers. | | | |
|  |  |  | |
| 1. **Chair’s Report** |  |  | |
| **4.1 Verbal Report** | **4.1.1 Faculty Annual Performance Review (APR) of 1415 and Operational Plan (OP) for 1516**  APR of Humanities had taken place in November and was influenced to some extent by the government’s proposal to introduce the Teaching Excellence Framework. It had looked at:   * assessment levels * employability/progression to PGT * retention: as long as intake quality is good, we should be able to retain students. Should we be making more use of “repeat the year”? * attainment (and any correlation between entry standards, attainment and employability) * moderation * benchmarking teaching quality, assessment and feedback with external competitors at JACS3 subject level * the attainment gap for different groups of students, e.g. WP students, BAME students, white male working class students etc.   **4.1.2 The University’s Operational priorities for 1617 are:**   * building Distance Learning capacity * tackling differential attainment * preparing for TEF * improving international student recruitment   **4.1.3 Senate: GPA proposal**  A paper proposing introduction of a GPA (Grade Point Average) – which had been circulated to HTLC members by email with little time for consultation – had been taken to Senate.  The University understood that assessing by GPA will be a condition of being able to attain higher levels of TEF. That being the case, the paper was to seek agreement that the University could and would go down this route, if necessary.  The proposal was that all 3 principles should be adopted:   1. GPA should exist alongside degree classification 2. 13-point scale 3. GPA will only be for final classification (not really a GPA, just an alternative way of calibrating/reporting attainment)   Senate had APPROVED the proposal. The AD understood that the earliest implementation would be 2017, if it does turn out to be a requirement for TEF.  **Discussed:**   * HTLC members expressed disquiet about poor consultation around this proposal – it had been circulated with unclear information about the background to the proposal, the options staff were being asked to approve, and very little time for consultation. * The Chair explained that, because the impression given by BIS was that adoption of a GPA is not optional, this was not exactly a consultation: there was no question that the University should ensure it is in a position to attain higher levels within TEF. * We need to keep in mind the impact on employers and how graduates results are presented to them, e.g. they could end up looking at a narrower range of GPA students than they do currently, if they look at all 1sts and 2.1s. * GPAs will still not be comparable across institutions, as HEIs may continue to include results from different years and with different weightings. * The Chair anticipated further discussion about the detail of the GPA scheme within HTLC and the wider University.   **4.1.4 PGT loans**  Reported (per Briefing Note):   * the age range has increased to 60 – students must be “under 60 at the time of starting the course”, i.e. 1st September, 1st January, 1st April or 1st July * residency for UK nationals is that their ordinary residence over past 3 years is in England (they cannot have moved to England to study) * residency for EU nationals is their ordinary residence over past 3 years. * DL programmes/students can apply * UK students can apply for any UK institution * EU students can only apply for institutions in England. * There is no subject restriction and covers Taught, Research based, Professional Masters and DL. * The programmes cannot have an element to study overseas that equates to more than 50% of the programme. * Part Time programmes are also eligible, 50% must be taken in the first year and a maximum of 4 years to complete (loan will be given during first 2 years whether it’s a 2,3 or 4 year programme). They are “subject to a minimum 50% intensity requirement”. * If students hold ANY Masters of equivalent or higher from anywhere they are not eligible including integrated Masters. * Only offered for Masters students not PGDip or PGCert, though loan is not retracted if awarded exit award. * Students can apply if receiving NHS bursaries, DSL funding.   A Policy Summary can be found on the website for [Student Finance England](http://www.practitioners.slc.co.uk/policy-information/postgraduate-loans-201617.aspx)  **4.1.5 The University’s Response to the BIS Green Paper**  Ours was one of 600 responses, to which BIS will respond in April. However, BIS have already indicated that graduate salaries will NOT be used as an indicator of excellence.  **4.1.6 Student Lifecycle Project** – looking at AMBSWW.  **4.1.7 Changes to Taught Degree Regulations**  PGT Dissertations awarded a mark of less than 30% will not be able to be resubmitted. This will be applicable to new students registering from September 2016.  **4.1.8 Peer Review**  The Peer Review Group will look again at descriptors, and how to share good practice –the review documentation will remain confidential, but an additional sheet will be available for circulation.  **4.1.9 PTES**  PTES will continue to run from February - April 2016, and the [intranet](http://www.staffnet.manchester.ac.uk/supporting-students/student-experience-surveys/ptes/) notes “PTES 2016 is substantively the same as 2015.”    However, the Chair understood that the questions about students’ experience of the dissertation would be removed for the 2017 survey. |  | |
| **4.2 Briefing Note** | **Received:** [HTLC/4/15/4.2] |  | |
|  |  |  | |
| 1. **Student Comms (Paul Govey)** | To consider whether revisions are required to the Student Communications Strategy (2013) [4/15/5]  **Reported:**  Paul, as Head of Student Communications and Marketing, is based in the Directorate for the Student Experience. The University is unusual within the sector in having a single source of communication and therefore single tone of voice from recruitment through to graduation.  The six Principles largely still stand:  1. The University adopts and promotes a set of principles for effective communication with students. These principles will inform all developments and operational matters relating to student communications;  2. The University is committed to a continuous and two-way communication process around all matters that affect students, providing opportunities for students to provide feedback and mechanisms to inform students where action has been taken;  3. The University adopts appropriate communications channels and technology to provide easy and convenient access for students to a wide range of relevant resources and information;  4. The University will segment and personalise its electronic communications with students to ensure greater relevance;  5. The University will strategically deliver joined up, coherent, consistent and timely communications to all students from initial enquiry and throughout their University life;  6. The University is committed to working closely with relevant partners (e.g. emergency services, Student Finance England, Student Loans Company, other Universities, the City Council and NHS) to achieve effective communication of relevant messages to students.  However, there was room to redefine priorities.  Paul acknowledged that although the Student Charter had come into being it had not been very successful in terms of visibility or becoming a living document. Consequently Clive Agnew, as VP for Teaching, Learning and Students, is taking forward a project to improve use of the Student Charter.  The MyManchester Portal will be refreshed in May 2016, and staff will for the first time be able to access a “student view”.  The MyManchester Portal will be launched (in an appropriately limited fashion) to offer-holders as a conversion and welcome/induction tool. Currently 1/3 UG offer-holders become registered students with Manchester, while 2/3 take up an offer from elsewhere.    **Discussed:**   * The extent to which there is appropriate support for staff who engage with students within Humanities: * TLAN requested mandatory training in student communication i.e. themed sessions spread across the year, for both PSS and academic staff * TLAN also requested a Toolkit that staff could dip in and out of * How does HTLC feel communications are going at a local level or corporate level? * Fred as UG Student Rep noted a discrepancy between the levels of communication he receives from two departments as a Joint Honours student. He feels he knows one department a lot better than the other; * The Chair noted that the Strategy talks a lot about two-way communication, but that the Deliverables are almost all one-way. Is that a problem, or is the University’s role actually about getting information disseminated out to students? Paul said that although some deliverables included working with the Student Union and improving communication of the formal feedback mechanisms of NSS/PTES/PRES, seeking more opportunity for feedback is important, e.g. via Peer Mentors and PASS leaders. * How should the Faculty support schools in developing governance, professional advice and guidance for front line staff, to ensure a consistent approach across all areas of Humanities, particularly at times when consistent messages are needed across Schools (i.e. industrial action, incidents overseas etc.)? * TLAN felt that Schools should be trusted to deliver messages at local level. * Principle 3 talks about adopting appropriate forms and channels of communication. HTLC members asked whether email is seen as passé, now? Paul said that although the centre had cut down emails in favour of MyManchester, which is great as a “front page”, email would remain the primary means of communication for Schools and Programmes. The Strategy had intended to weed out general emails issued from various central sources, which had diverted attention and created unnecessary “noise” at central level. * Schools are best placed to communicate information about guidance and support to their students. * Content works best if it’s shareable. |  | |
|  |  |  | |
| 1. **Student Matters** | The Student Reps requested an update on the idea of formalising a mid-Semester break, i.e. Reading Week, in Semester 2.  At HTLC on 7 October 2015 item 13. was about Reading Weeks – Humanities was the only Faculty that had them. Should we continue with them, and if so, should they be formalised? The discussion had focussed instead on the desirability of an inter-Semester break between the end of January exams and the start of Semester 2.  **Reported:**   * The discussion on the timing of the January exam period and whether to extend it from 2 to 3 weeks was still under discussion centrally. * In terms of a mid-Semester break / Reading Week, there was no University requirement either to observe one or not to observe one. (See Secretary’s Note below).   **Discussed:**   * SoSS had reported at the meeting of 11 November that it designates the first week of Semester 2 as a Reading Week. However, in terms of a mid-Semester 2 “reading week”, Ralf Becker said this must be just a couple of course units where academics let them have a no-teaching-week before an assessment deadline. * Easter is a natural break in Semester 2 anyway, so why would it be beneficial to have an additional mid-Semester Reading Week?   *Secretary’s Note*:  *TLSO guidance states,*  *“****Mid-semester timetable break***  *A change of pace midway through a semester gives students a chance to catch up and catch breath as they move into the second half. This is particularly valuable for students in the first semester of their first year, as they adjust to the demands of University life, looking after themselves, and (for the majority) living away from home. A timetable break may mean a change of pace via a reading period or some other change in the nature of the scheduled work, such as a mini-project or group work.*  ***Policy***  *A School may decide to suspend the normal timetable for a mid-semester break and, if so, for how long, but no School is compelled to do so.*  *The mid-semester break must be wholly contained within week 6 of the semester and must finish with the Friday of that week, adding earlier days within the week as necessary.*  *The Faculty will decide whether or not to allow the break. It will also decide what variations in practice, if any, it will allow between Schools.*  *In such a large university, different Schools and different Faculties are likely to adopt different practices. Students taking cross-school or cross-faculty programmes must therefore be informed clearly what the arrangements are for each component of their programme.*  *A suspension of timetable is not a holiday. Students must be told that they are expected to remain in Manchester, and staff must be available as normal.”*  <http://www.tlso.manchester.ac.uk/map/teachinglearningassessment/teaching/timetablebreaks/> |  | |
|  |  |  | |
| 1. **Distance Learning (DL) Update** | **Reported:**  It was still unknown whether the University would sign a deal with Pearson’s, and if it went ahead, it would not be before April.  Becki Bennett reported that the MA Health Care Ethics and Law is expected to “launch” Sept 2016 – but as Becki pointed out this is a longstanding Distance Learning programme. SoL are hoping for renewed material to enable a relaunch in September but they have not been able to get confirmation of this from the centre.  Becki Bennett noted that programme redevelopment will be supported by the central DL team, and three new posts have been advertised on the central team to support the 5 “flagship” programmes.  However, it was Pearson’s marketing reach and expertise that SoL wanted to benefit from rather than eLearning support. SoL’s strategy is to put in extra effort on the curriculum development side on the understanding that the relaunch will attract a lot more students, and enable several intakes a year.  Becki Bennett will meet Richard Reece on Friday 12th February to find out whether is there marketing resource that the University can provide over and above School-level marketing officer.  The new flagship Distance Learning programme MA/LLM International Law is expected to launch 2017. |  | |
|  |  |  | |
| 1. **Humanities IT Priorities - Updated (Guy Percival)** [4/15/8.1 & 8.2] | To agree Humanities’ priorities for IT, following consultation within Schools which has been fed back to Guy Percival  **Reported:**  The Faculty is establishing a process for prioritising IT requirements required to deliver the 2020 Strategic Goals.  This document presents the initial outcomes of a stakeholder consultation for activity around Teaching, Learning and Students.  The key message was that we must first get the basics right before more ambitious projects are requested, to avoid building on sand.  Humanities requirements thus fall into the following main themes :   1. document management and workflow 2. appropriate teaching space 3. eAssessment, e.g. online language tests, video submissions 4. student management and reporting systems   Since the process was initiated there have been two further developments of note:   * The establishment of a Student Systems Review Group (SSRG) led by the Director for the Student Experience and intended to be the place where all TLS requirements are reviewed and prioritised for delivery. * The establishment of a Student Lifecycle Project, again led by the Director for the Student Experience, which will deliver new and improved systems across the range of student related activity. It is anticipated that many requirements identified within this exercise will fall within the scope of this project.   The intention was to effect a shift in IT support from a position of struggling to meet with constant and various demands to a more strategic prioritisation and identification of funding and resource.  The recommendations in the IT Priorities Report will generally fall into one of the following categories:   1. existing projects – these will continue to a full business case, at which point they will be passed to the SSRG; 2. well known requirements but no specific project established - these should be documented and also passed to the SSRG; 3. less well-known requirements – further local consultation to understand the requirements will take place before being passed to the SSRG.   **Discussed:**   * Amend the list to make our priorities clearer to the central SSRG. * Whilst we would like to see more ambitious projects proposed, staff won’t commit to them currently because the basics aren’t yet trusted, e.g. students can’t get their timetable. * T&L requests will be sent directly to the centre: are there different channels for work above and word below a certain cost level? Yes. £250K+ goes to University committee. The process for approving any bids worth less than £250k is as yet unknown. But all will go through to the SSRG, which doesn’t yet have clear Terms of Reference yet but is understood to encompass anything with a student impact. * It was understood that Humanities was represented on the SSRG by SEED’s Head of School Administration.   **AGREED:** Ad hoc requests can come to HTLC for adding to the Humanitites IT Priorities list. This will enable us to check whether any other schools would be interested in getting on board and benefiting from a proposed project.  **AGREED:** The IT priorities should be circulated for information at every HTLC, to keep members apprised of progress. | **ACTION**  Guy to amend the Report in response to HTLC recommendations, and send to DAG and HPRC.  **ACTION**  Guy, Fiona and ER to meet and work out who will take these forward.  **ACTION:** FS to find membership of the SSRG and agree who (else) should represent Humanities if an academic presence is required and not already accounted for.  **ACTION:** Emma Sanders to add IT Priorities List to the standard HTLC Agenda. | |
|  |  |  | |
| 1. **University Guidance on Late Submission (Lisa McAleese)** [4/15/9] | To raise any issues not covered by the University’s new Guidance for Late Submission (which has recently been approved by TLG and accompanies the Policy on Submission of Work for Summative Assessment).  **Reported:**  The University has now issued guidance to support the University Policy on Submission of Work for Summative Assessment.  The Chair understands from the Head of Academic Policy that the Guidance is open to consultation. (As opposed to the Policy, which is approved).  For the current academic year, Schools must abide by whatever practice is published in their handbooks. But Schools should ensure that the new Policy on Submission of Work for Summative Assessment is published in handbooks for 1617.  **Discussed:**   * SALC said the guidance was inconsistent with other policies, e.g. the Policy on Feedback doesn’t include weekends but this Guidance does. Other members argued that it would be disproportionate to not include weekends when calculating late submission, (and that it is different from expecting staff to be marking and providing feedback at weekends). * There was still concern that without an (unpublished) grace period to act as a buffer, the Policy could result in disproportionate penalties: students don’t have control over outside infrastructure, which could result in an unfair penalty e.g. slow uploading of the document pushes a student over the boundary. However, the majority felt it was better to be transparent and ensure that the same rule applies to all in order to be fair. * University policy was that students cannot use IT problems as a Mitigating Circumstance. * Page 3, para 4.7 states that the mark awarded will be reduced by 10 marks a day for 5 days. This could mean that a student decides not to submit at all. But then they can only get a maximum of 30% (UG) for a resubmission. * What was the academic rationale for making the student submit an additional essay – the guidance refers to “a new piece of work”? What does this mean? Must we set a new question? Must they submit a new piece of work? TLSO needed to clarify this. * p1 – last two sentences. “Boards of Examiners may use classification review if they think a penalty is disproportionate.” HTLC were concerned that if a student’s average is outside the boundary zone s/he can’t be considered for Classification Review, but if a student has a Late Submission Penalty s/he can be considered. (The Guidance does not mention whether the student has to be in the boundary zone). This seemed wrong. TLSO needed to clarify this. | **ACTION:**  Lisa McAleese to forward feedback on draft Guidance on Late Submission to Emma Hilton-Wood. | |
|  |  |  | |
| 1. **Assessment Procedure and Practice (assessment for learning) draft V6 + Appendices (Lisa McAleese)** [4/15/10.1 & 10.2 & 10.3 & 10.4] | To agree Humanities’ procedure and practice, following consultation within Schools emailed to HTLC members 11/12/15 .  Faculty had been accused at APR of over-assessing. The statistic rolled out is that AMBS had 21K pieces of first year work submitted in 14/15.  **Discussed:**   * AMBS teaches 10cr rather than 20cr units for BMAN, which will mean more assessment. * AMBD in-class/online tests are very different from a 5,000 piece of coursework in terms of staff and student workload. * Why does the Faculty document focus on setting a “maximum” summative assessment? Should there not be a minimum, too? The word counts should be set as guidelines, not maxima. Maxima are not helpful as don’t encourage reflection/focus on pedagogy. * Word count is not an accurate way of assessing how difficult a task is. Fewer words can be more difficult. * There was concern that the document diverges greatly from what SALC do – it was interpreted as being too restrictive and stamping out diversity. It was clarified that “equivalent” covers any type of assessment and, as outlined in footnote 7, coursework means “not done in timed conditions”. It was therefore not intended to restrict or prioritise methods of assessment. * SALC would have to significantly reduce word count limits almost across the board, e.g. coursework essays. SALC’s UG Assessment Board felt that a) their autonomy was being undermined by rigid guidelines and that b) reduction could mean that not all ILOs were being assessed. * What are the impacts on the requirement to provide formative feedback? If formative assessment is not “compulsory” then students don’t engage with/prioritise it. It was suggested that breaking formative assessment into bite sized chunks means students are more likely to engage with it and keep themselves on track. * Heads of School say their staff are over-assessing but students are saying they want more personalised and detailed feedback. * Are we sure we assess all ILOs at Level 1, without duplication? * Or should part of the learning experience be to repeat tasks so that one builds up expertise and applies feedback. * Staff should make use of Curriculum maps within the Programme Specification to determine which ILOs are assessed where, and eliminate unnecessary/unhelpful duplication. * Who sets the assessment strategy? Who monitors it? | **ACTION:** Faculty to consider hosting a Workshop on assessment and ILOs.  **ACTION**  T&L Directors: issue Faculty paper on Procedure and Practice to colleagues in Schools and return School / discipline assessment norms (for both UG and PGT) to Lisa McAleese by 1 March 2016. | |
|  |  |  | |
| 1. **Revised University Marking Policy (Fiona Smyth)** [4/15/11] | The Marking Policy has been APPROVED at SENATE.  A very draft paper on moderation in support of the Marking Policy went to TLG in March 2015. A revised version was expected to go to TLG later this month, which can be distributed at a later date to prompt discussion.  Consequently the Faculty Guidance on Moderation that was its development may not be required.  T&L Directors were asked to keep an eye out for circulation of the University’s guidance on moderation, so they could consult on it and report back to Fiona in time for TLG on 04 April 2016. | **ACTION:** T&L Directors to be prepared to consult on University Guidance on Moderation when it comes out, and report back to Fiona Smyth in time for TLG on 04 April 2016. | |
|  |  |  | |
| 1. **Employability (Paul Gratrick)** | To receive a report on the latest employability activity from HESC: carried forward to March HTLC meeting.  **Reported** (action arising from HTLC 9 December, Item 6.):  Based on the latest DLHE data (13/14) -   * 23.5% (404) of Humanities graduates went on to further study * Of these, 41% (166) graduates stayed on to undertake PGT study here at UoM   At School-level this breaks down as:   * SoSS - 56% (45 students) * SALC 44% (85 students) * Law - 30% (21 students) * SEED - 24% (11 students) * MBS - 17% (2 students) | **ACTION:**  Emma Sanders | |
|  |  |  | |
| 1. **Student Representation (Fiona Smyth)** | To consider how to improve representation, following discussion at TLG. Some Schools have better representation on committees than others. Students aren’t always clear what they are expected to do – it was suggested that this should be made clearer in Terms of Reference. The Chair proposed that HTLC should ask Schools at the start of year how Schools are getting on recruiting student reps. | **ACTION:**  Emma Sanders | |
|  |  |  | |
| 1. **Operational Priorities 1617** [4/15/14] | **Received:** A draft of the Faculty’s Operational Priorities for 1617 so as to inform School Operational Plans concerning teaching and learning and the student experience:   1. Recruitment - to meet UGT and PGT Student recruitment targets for 2016 entry and to attract and enhance the quality of students and support exemplary fair access by using contextual data, access programmes and financial support to identify the most able students from all backgrounds 2. Portfolio - to continue to enhance the Faculty’s portfolio of UG and PGT programmes, increasing the attractiveness and efficiency of the programmes offered 3. Student Experience - to continue the on-going enhancement of the academic student experience for UG and PGT students, resulting in higher levels of satisfaction as measured by indicators such as the National Student Survey, Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey, and the Unit Survey 4. Employability - To improve graduate employability rates through the Humanities Employability Strategy 5. SSR - To continue monitoring SSRs in schools across the Faculty to ensure that the staff student ratios do not negatively impact upon the student experience |  | |
|  |  |  | |
| 1. **Admissions Update** | Emma Rose’s update on UG and PGT admissions will be circulated by email. | **ACTION:** Emma Sanders | |
|  |  |  | |
| 1. **Any Other Business** | None. |  | |
|  |  |  | |
| 1. **\*For information** | None. |  | |
|  |  |  | |
| 1. **Date of Next Meeting** | Wednesday 9th March 2016, 2 - 4pm |  | |