

**Faculty of Humanities
Teaching & Learning Committee
Wednesday 16th January 2013 2pm – 4pm
University Place 5.206**

Present

Prof. Matthew Jefferies	Assistant Associate Dean for Teaching, Learning & Students (Chair)
Dr. Judy Zolkiewski	Assistant Associate Dean for Teaching, Learning & Students
Mrs. Lisa McAleese	Senior Faculty Taught Programmes Administrator
Prof. Catherine Cassell	Deputy Director, MBS
Dr. Abigail Gilmore	Director of Graduate Education, ALC
Dr. David Williamson	Director of Teaching and Learning, School of Law
Mrs. Diane Slaouti	Director of Undergraduate Studies, Education
Mr. David Hall	Acting Director of Postgraduate Studies, Education
Dr. Veronique Pin-Fat	Director of Undergraduate Studies, SoSS
Mr. Luke Newton	Education Officer

In attendance

Prof. Richard Reece	Vice-President for Teaching, Learning and Students (for item 1)
Ms. Norma Hird	Director of Undergraduate Studies, Law
Mrs. Nicola Lord	Faculty QAE Administrator (Secretary)
Ms. Emma Sanders	Faculty QAE Administrator
Ms. Cath Dyson	Faculty eLearning Manager
Mrs. Katy Woolfenden	JRUL Director of Teaching, Learning & Students
Mr. Guy Percival	Head of Faculty IS

1. Prof. Richard Reece, Associate Vice-President for Teaching, Learning and Students

Prof. Reece was welcomed to the meeting and invited to provide an outline of the projects with which he is currently involved. He reported that many of his projects cover electronic resources, online materials and areas in which technology can assist teaching, learning and the student experience.

Podcasting / Lecture Capture

Received: Update on the Podcasting Project from Project Lead, Stuart Phillipson (circulated to members by email).

The system is currently available in 10 lecture theatres. Academics can produce recordings of the projector output and theatre microphones. This simplified form of lecture capture greatly reduces cost and avoids legal consent issues surrounding the capture of full motion video of students. Academics wishing to use the system need no training, no technical skills in video production and do not have to operate any recording equipment or software in the theatres. The capture process is fully automated and completely invisible to the end user. The videos are then automatically made available to students as a downloadable file, supporting many different operating systems and mobile platforms. Podcasts can be accessed through iTunes using a University username and password. Students can use it in line with the University's regulations surrounding the distribution of materials. The decision to use the software is down to the individual academic.

A new project will bring the technology to 70 centrally timetabled lecture theatres and 30 of the busiest seminar rooms. The project has now entered a second phase, the rollout of replacement technology (Matterhorn) after the original technology used was not found to be scalable. Phase two will be complete by the start of teaching in Semester 2.

The third phase of the project involves the scaling of both server systems and in theatre technology to reach the required 100 installations. Additional development work will take place during this phase to meet academic needs gathered from teaching staff using the pilot system. Phase three will finish during August 2013, leading to a new internally supported service being offered by IT Services in every centrally timetabled lecture theatre before teaching begins in September 2013.

Online assessment

In some cases, a small number of students have encountered problems with online exams, although they are still going ahead as the problem is relatively easy to resolve. A speech has been prepared for invigilators to read to students before the exam regarding the action students and invigilators should take in the case of problems. Students are being given extra time if necessary.

A small number of online exams are taking place in Humanities but the University is keen to increase the number as it is part of the eLearning Strategy and there are efficiencies to be gained from the ease of marking for staff. There are also benefits for the student experience. Sarah Taylor, an eLearning Technologist from MBS, is part of the University's eAssessment Working Group.

Timetabling

The University feels that there is much to be gained from the introduction of a University timetable, including the ability to produce individual timetables for students and to ascertain more accurately rooms which are not in use at any given time in order to ensure that the estate is being used effectively and to identify the type of rooms which are needed. Three new lecture theatres are being constructed in the Simon Building and decisions also need to be taken on how to populate a new teaching building.

Syllabus Plus software, manufactured by Scientia, will be used. A 'Proof of Concept' was undertaken last year followed by a pilot. In 2013 the software will be rolled out across the institution. However, given the range of concerns expressed by the Schools during the consultation process, the VP for TL&S will meet the University's Teaching and Learning Group (TLG) in early January to and then with Heads of Schools at a meeting on January 22nd to discuss the concerns and make sure that Schools are on board. There are a number of 'break points' built in where the project can be stopped for commencement in September 2013, with a later commencement date set.

There is a proposal to provide 'at-elbow' support for users in Schools. Scientia will train staff based in the University.

The system will allow some flexibility for determining a venue, but subject to the constraints of the existing estate.

Discussed Some concerns were expressed that the need to keep the timetable as a single point of truth may become the overriding concern at the expense of other issues. There were also concerns that as students are asked about the timetable in the NSS, any problems with the system could affect the response. Prof. Reece noted that the new system is much better than that which we currently use, and that there is some demand from the student body for the benefits this system will bring.

Access to Blackboard

1) Student access to archived materials

In terms of archiving materials, there is an institutional content folder where materials can be stored, although this process can take some time and it is not clear for how long materials will be stored. eLearning Teams will not transfer the materials as a matter of course but academics are able to do this. They should take the decision on what is to be stored. Students do not need access to archives of entire courses and tend to want information such as lecture slides and notes.

The course catalog component can be enabled to provide access to future courses. Access and privileges need to be determined.

2) Staff access to courses other than their own

Prof. Reece reported that access by all staff to all courses is not felt to be required. In some Schools, requests for access to other courses in Blackboard are being facilitated by eLearning Technologists. Cath Dyson noted that it would be preferable if staff could self-enrol as this would otherwise be a time-consuming manual process for the Team or PSS colleagues in Schools. Prof. Jefferies noted that the benefits to be gained from making access easier so that colleagues can view other spaces for the purposes of sharing good practice and peer review. Prof. Reece felt that Schools should decide on who should add colleagues to Blackboard using the existing process.

Cath Dyson noted that there is no role in Campus Solutions to define a colleague as an observer, or peer reviewer, although this would be beneficial. Prof. Reece stated that some time needs to be spent defining the role and agreed that Campus Solutions is currently limited in this respect.

Cath Dyson noted that the eLearning Team and HTLC can feed in further comments on the need for access by staff.

3) Access by External Examiners

Such access is being pursued although there are questions about whether Examiners should be able to see all of the information or just a selection. The former is preferable as it is complicated to restrict access, but could lead to complaints from Examiners. They would need to be provided with direction on suggested scripts and documents. Policy will be forthcoming. No dates have been set as yet. It may be possible for this to happen by June, but in all likelihood this will be in place for next year.

Academic Advising

90% of new students know that they have an Academic Advisor but this figure is lower for returning students. The way in which attendance of students at meetings with advisors is monitored differs across Schools. Interaction with Advisors could be made compulsory. The Manchester Working Environment (MWE) is to have a set of tools for advisors to make the interaction more useful and allow records to be kept. This can build in help for students.

The need to ensure that the Advisor can see the relevant parts of the student record (e.g. grades, the HEAR) was noted as well as the need for Academic Advisors to be able to access Blackboard for their students and to be able to see examples of the formative feedback they have received.

2. Apologies

Received from: Arthur Baker, Chris Davies, Mark Elliot, James Garratt, Ilias Petrounias, Emma Rose.

3. Minutes of the last meeting

The minutes of the last meeting (HTLC 3/12) were approved as a correct record.

4. Matters arising

Actions List from Wednesday 12th December 2012 meeting

Item 3.3 Portfolio Review *The AD TL&S will discuss the possibility of an extension to the deadline with the VP TL&S.*

Reported It is not likely that there will be any flexibility in the deadlines already set for Phase 1, which is to be complete by the end of February, but the Review will now run until the end of May.

Item 4 Teaching Quality *Emma Rose will circulate the Student Barometer Summer Wave 2012 data to members by email*

Reported The data had not been circulated at the time of the meeting (it was circulated to members later that day).

The AD TL&S to discuss the points raised at DAG and report the issues relating to the Unit Survey to Prof. Richard Reece.

Reported The AD T&L will provide an update at the next meeting

Arthur Baker will send a reminder to students to complete the Unit Survey.

Reported Arthur had emailed Humanities Course Reps and promoted it via the major societies' Facebook pages.

Item 10.1 Recording of lectures *Nicola Lord to request an update on the Podcasting Project from the Project Lead, Stuart Phillipson, in advance of the January meeting.*

Reported This had been circulated to members by email earlier that day.

Actions outstanding from Wednesday 7th November 2012 meeting

Item 4 Ethnicity / gender and degree attainment *The AD TL&S to investigate whether there are various disciplines within the Faculty which could conduct research into gaps in attainment and cultural (and gender?) learning differences*

Reported Judy Zolkiewski and Nicola Lord to sketch out a project and take a funding proposal to DAG.

5. Chair's report

5.1 Briefing Note (HTLC 4/12/5.1)

The note contained the 'Communication to Schools from the VP TL&S over the Timetabling Project (TUM)' (18.12.12) as sent to the Timetabling Forum and Heads of School Administration.

In the absence of the AD TL&S, Prof. Jefferies provided a short verbal report.

5.2 The criteria for the Portfolio Review are currently being determined by the Faculty TLO. A communication will then be sent to Heads of Schools and T&L Directors, followed by a meeting with the AD TL&S and Emma Rose. The PGT data has not yet been received. The TLO has had the UG data for a short period of time.

5.3 A report had been provided to the University's Teaching and Learning Group (TLG) by the TLO's T&L Manager on the exams process for 2011-12. In semester 2, only 44% of exam papers had been provided to the Exams Office by the April deadline. The deadlines are set as late as possible by the Exams Team as papers cannot be printed later.

Action Schools were asked to investigate whether there is a blockage within Schools. The data which had been provided to a meeting of TLMG would be circulated to Schools.

5.4 Dr. Judith Zolkiewski of MBS has been appointed as the Faculty's second Assistant Associate Dean for Teaching, Learning and Students alongside Prof. Jefferies. Judy will chair the eLearning Strategy Group and IS and Web Sub-Committee of HTLC.

6. Distinguished Achievement Awards (UG and PGT) nominations

Received: For consideration, nominations for the above awards as follows (HTLC 4/12/6):

School	UG Student of the Year	PGT (for PG Student of the Year)
ALC (1)	Eleni Papadopoulous	Jessica Coatesworth
ALC (2)	Meaghan Couture	No nomination received
Education	Samantha Levitt	No nomination received
SED	No nomination received	No nomination received
Law	Jeff LeBlanc	No nomination received
MBS (1)	Andrew Scanlon	Francesca Lopez
MBS (2)	Daniel Gospodinov	Ioulianna Demetriades
SoSS (1)	Roberta Akpan	Emma Ford
SoSS (2)	Zuzanna Marciniak	Samer Matta

Agreed After a vote, it was agreed that Eleni Papadopoulous (ALC) should be put forward for the award of UG Student of the Year and that Emma Ford (SoSS) would be the PGT nomination. The PGT nomination will need to be considered along with the PGR nomination (to be agreed by PGRC on 23rd Jan) and the Chairs of both committees will then meet to decide on which student should be put forward as the Faculty's nomination for Postgraduate of the Year.

Discussed The problem of nominating one student based on the criteria as the students may have excelled in different areas, making it difficult to choose one nomination above another. This problem had been reported to the University after last year's meeting.

Reported The decisions should not be conveyed to the students until University Awards and Honours Group has considered the nominations on April 15th.

7. Penalties for exceeding word count (Lisa McAleese)

Received Paper proposing the adoption of a Faculty penalty scheme (see paper HTLC 4/12/7).

Reported Following discussion at the July and October 2011 meetings of HTLC the issue of a consistent penalty for exceeding the specified word limit was raised with the central TLSO. It was agreed that there would not be a University policy and that it was within the remit of Faculties to determine a consistent approach. In order to ensure that students are treated consistently, and that any penalties are transparent, TLC members were asked to consider a set of proposed schemes and agree the following:

- the adoption of a Faculty penalty scheme;
- whether or not the agreed penalty scheme will be applicable at both UG and PGT level;
- whether or not the penalty scheme will be applicable to all written assignments (e.g. essays, dissertations or equivalent, projects, reports etc);
- what should be included in the word count (e.g. quotations and footnotes or endnotes in the essay itself are included; the bibliography or any appendices are excluded);
- when the agreed penalty scheme should become effective.

Discussed Issues of ensuring that the word count is correct. It was noted that a page length in a specified font is also difficult to administer. Grademark has a word count facility but this includes all the words in the document (bibliography, footnotes etc.).

It was noted that James Garratt had expressed a preference for scheme E, as used in ALC. Despite some support for this scheme it was agreed that it could be difficult to administer. Luke Newton reported that he had spoken with some students who had expressed a preference for scheme D.

Agreed After a lengthy discussion Scheme D was agreed, as follows.

Extent to which limit is exceeded	Penalty to be applied (deduction)
up to 10% over the limit	none
10% - 25% over the limit	10 marks
25% - 50% over the limit	50 marks
in excess of 50% over the limit	the work will not be marked and a mark of zero will be recorded

This will apply to the word count for all written assignments at UG and PGT level. The decision as to what should be included is to be determined locally and clear information should be conveyed to the students. Schools, or in some cases supervisors, should determine the word count for dissertations.

The penalty scheme should be effective from September 2013.

Action Lisa McAleese will write up the principles for confirmation at an upcoming meeting of HTLC.

8. Revised NPP & amendment process

It has been agreed that from 2012/13, NPP2s and major programme amendments will be approved at specific programme-approval events, particular to each proposal. The "Appendix 2" proforma for Internal Advisors on NPP2 has been turned into an *aide memoire* to aid discussion at the programme approval event. HTLC members were asked to provide approval for agenda documents for the meetings for NPP2 (HTLC 4/12/8a) and Major Programme Amendments (HTLC 4/12/8b).

Agreed The documents were agreed for use.

9. Library

Reported Katy Woolfenden reported that the Learning Commons has reopened and is open 24/7. The main library will also be open until midnight during the examination period.

10. A.O.B.

Abi Gilmore requested an opportunity to discuss the purpose and role of the Media Centre in supporting teaching and editing of film projects, at an upcoming meeting of HTLC.

Action Trevor Byrne, Media Centres Manager, to be asked to attend an upcoming meeting to discuss this.

11. Date of next meeting

The next meeting of HTLC will be held on Wednesday 3rd April 2013 in Committee Room A (Whitworth Building).

Kim Comer and Emma Hilton-Wood of the University's Teaching & Learning Support Office are to attend a pre-meeting of HTLC on 3rd April at 1pm to present on how semester 1 surveys went and report on the process for semester 2 and beyond. Members and other interested colleagues are invited to join this section of the meeting over lunch.

Please contact Nicola Lord (Nicola.lord@manchester.ac.uk) to confirm whether you would like to attend.

NB: The meeting which was originally scheduled for Wednesday 27th February 2013 will instead be a meeting of the Faculty UG Sub-Committee. This meeting will take place from 2 – 4pm in Committee Room A (Whitworth Building).