**Faculty of Humanities**

**CONFIRMED Minutes of the Teaching & Learning Committee of 12th June 2014,**

**2pm – 5pm, Ken Kitchen Room, John Owens Building**

**Present**

Christopher Davies Associate Dean for Teaching, Learning & Students (Chair)

Matthew Jefferies Assistant Associate Dean for Teaching, Learning & Students

Emma Rose Head of Faculty Teaching and Learning Support Services

Lisa McAleese Teaching and Learning Manager

Veronique Pin-Fat Director of Undergraduate Studies, SoSS

Fiona Smyth Director of Teaching and Learning, SEED

Dave Williamson Director of Teaching and Learning, SoL

Judy Zolkiewski Assistant Associate Dean for Teaching, Learning & Students

Rosie Dammers Education Officer, University of Manchester Student Union

Virinder Kalra representing Mark Elliot, SoSS PGT

**Ex-officio members:**

Sarah Helsby Faculty Teaching and Learning Officer

Norma Hird Director of Undergraduate Studies, School of Law

Guy Percival Head of Faculty Information Systems

Ilias Petrounias UG Director, MBS

Emma Sanders Faculty Teaching and Learning Officer

**By invitation:**

Anna Verges-Bausili Faculty eLearning Team (for item 5. only)

1. **Apologies**

Members

Sharon Clarke (MBS T&L); Mark Elliot (SoSS PGT); Abi Gilmore (SALC PGT); Katy Woolfenden (Head of Teaching, Learning & Students, University Library)

Ex Officio Members

Iain Brassington (Law PGT); Cath Dyson (Faculty eLearning Manager); Elaine Ferneley (MBS); Elinor O’Connor (MBS PGT)

Invitees

None

1. **Minutes of the last meeting**

RECEIVED:

Minutes of 02.04.14 [HTLC/5/13]

**APPROVED**

The minutes of 02.04.14 were approved as a correct record.

1. **Actions and Matters arising**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Item*** | ***Action*** | ***Responsibility*** | ***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 | James Garratt / Emma Sanders | **Ongoing:** ECS to follow up with James Garratt following email exchange of 17.03.14 to request Course Unit Specifications…. |
| **8.6 Mitigating Circumstances** | Look into the regulations around Mitigation and automatic Compensation with Norma Hird, and report back to Chris. | Lisa McAleese | **Ongoing:** Norma Hird is a member of the University’s central working group looking at marking procedures. |
| **10. Change to the Faculty’s Late Submission Policy** | Bring the issue of late penalties back for a subgroup discussion including students and eLearning technologists and MBSWW plus a rep from each School. | Lisa McAleese and Fiona Smyth | **Ongoing:** asub group to look at Late Submission Penalties is being established by LMcA. |
| **11. eLearning Strategy Group and IS and Web Sub-Committee** | Merge eLSG and IT and Web ToR into a single sub-committee, and agree who should be on the new committee, looking at roles, responsibilities and representation. | Judy Zolkiewski | **Ongoing:** new ToR to be disseminated at July meeting of HTLC. |
| **12. Faculty Guidelines on Independent Study and Directed Reading** | Incorporate a review of Faculty Guidelines on Independent Study and Directed Reading into the working group’s work on PGT Contact Hours. | Lisa McAleese and Matthew Jefferies | **Ongoing:** Date of next PGT Contact Hours Working Group t.b.c. by LMcA. |
| **14. Summary of External Examiner Comments (PGT) 11/12** | Put “Penalties for Exceeding Word Limits” as an HTLC Agenda Item for June. | Emma Sanders | See Agenda Item. |
| TLSO Summaries need to be disseminated to Schools – check when and how these are disseminated to Schools. (TLO have anonymised these reports for HTLC purposes). | Emma Sanders | **Ongoing:** Emailed TLSO 03.06.14 |

1. **Chair’s report (Chris Davies)**

**Reported:**

* The financial situation in Faculty means that we still need to do all we can to fill our recruitment targets with highly-qualified students. The Committee were reminded that 75% of UoM income derives from tuition fees. Last year there was an unforeseen shortfall within Faculty, which has been taken on board when adjusting for 2014/15 budgets and targets.

**Discussed:**

* Schools such as Law can recruit high numbers if as directed to by Faculty, but this will have an impact on their ability to improve their position in league tables.

**4.2 Report from 12 May and 9 June TLGs (Judy Zolkiewski)**

**Reported:**

* Demands on the University’s English Language centre in supporting Overseas students have started to cause problems. Additional staff are to be funded by the University.
* TOEFL: the University has agreed to continue accepting TOEFL. A recent BBC documentary raised concerns which were focussed on a particular organisation that has since been shut down.
* Proof-reading: discussions were ongoing as to when and to what extent proof-reading of student work is acceptable.
* Alternatives to a new teaching building are being discussed. One alternative is that MBS East will become a new teaching block, rather than building a new teaching block from scratch (which was supposed to replace the Reynold Building which has many large lecture theatres across 8 floors).
* Feedback from the Student Union on feedback – let students know if we will miss the 15 day deadline; signpost where we put the marking criteria. Important to ensure University policy is enforced. The Policy itself is good! Also we must clarify that 15 days only applies to: 10 or 20 or 15cr units and only in term time (not including weekends or bank holidays).
* Dissertation binding – for large documents we can request a hard copy but not to be hard bound. The students must know up front “in advance of the start of the programme” (per Policy on Additional Costs) that a hard copy is required – and/or Schools who give printing credits are ok. PGT presentation guidelines must be amended by TLSO to reflect this.
* A Revised Policy on Academic Advising would be coming to Faculties via for dissemination for putting in place for 14/15, where possible. **Action: TLSS to get hold of the revised Policy on Academic Advising for taking to TLC on 9th July.**

***Secretary’s Note:***

* + *Geoff Carter, Teaching and Learning Manager in the TLSO, stated in an email of 16.06.14 that, ”The Policy was not approved by TLG on 9 June 2014, so was still out for consultation itself, as well as the ways in which the revised Policy should be implemented.  Full implementation would therefore be from October 2015/16.*
  + *The TLSO would be developing an ‘Advisor toolkit’ over the summer, to supplement the documentation.*
* Attendance Policy: Lisa McAleese’s feedback about requiring 100% attendance had been taken on board as part of the consultation.
* CHERL (title t.b.c.) – to be established. Two members of Faculty have been nominated to represent Humanities in the CHERL.

**4.3\* Briefing Note**

* Received for information. [HTLC/6/13/4.3]

1. **Awards and Prizes**

***Secretary’s Note:***

* + *UG student of the Year: Ibrahim Olabi*
  + *Teacher of the Year: Paul Middleditch (Lecturer in Macroeconomics, SoSS)*
  + *The University Awards and Honours Group have formally endorsed all of the recommendations for the Distinguished Achievement Awards from the Faculty in the Teacher, UG, PG and Researcher Categories.*

1. **Student Matters**

**Reported:**

* There had been discussion at the centre as to whether the Student Discipline Policy should extent to behaviour off University premises, following complaints from residents associations in heavily-student-populated areas.

**Discussed:**

* HTLC felt that if a criminal act were committed then this would be dealt with by the police, not the University. However, repeated complaints were the issue, and whether the University should play a role in monitoring these, as non-criminal anti-social behaviour brings the University into disrepute.
* The Student Union were opposed to any involvement of the University in monitoring or taking action over student behaviour off-campus. HTLC were broadly in support of the Student Union in this.

***Secretary’s Note:***

* + *The University of Manchester’s* [*Statute XXI*](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=16238) *covers, “Conduct, discipline, and academic**progress of students” and*[*Regulation XVII*](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=6530) *concerns the “Conduct and Discipline of Students”. These state that senate has the power to impose a penalty or fine, or to expel, suspend or exclude from programmes of study any student found guilty of misconduct or breach of discipline, through the Student Conduct and Discipline Committee.*

1. **Tii/Online Assessment Issues – continued (Anna Verges)**

Anna Verges-Bausili spoke to the paper [HTLC/6/13/5]:

* The first page outlines UoM’s strategy for dealing with Tii, which is a multi-national company
* The paper identified 32 issues that had raised by Schools and which eLearning had lobbied Tii about on their behalf
* eLearning leads had been asked to prioritise these issues –p9 lists the top 8 priorities as:

1. Offline marking
2. Ability to identify submissions by number
3. Enhancements to document viewer
4. Assignments by group enhancement
5. Notification of late submission
6. Moderation ability
7. Second marking ability
8. Group submission and marking

**Discussed:**

* SALC said that the inability to get meaningful word counts was a hindrance. At present a manual workaround was required on a paper by paper basis to get selective word limits.
* SoL said that a significant number of staff in Law did not like the clunkiness of Grademark or technical glitches and vulnerabilities involved e.g. file corruption.
* SoL added that as a result of online submission and marking administrative tasks were being put onto academics, which caused dissatisfaction, e.g. giving Externals access. External Examiners are now able to activate access to BB9 themselves. eLearning could look at the processes used in individual Schools and attempt to streamline them in line with best practice, rebalancing tasks where appropriate. Some of the complaints from academics were not necessarily a fault of Tii but of particular administrative procedures and ways of using the tools.

1. **Humanities Review of Laboratory and Related Facilities (Chris Davies)**

**Received:**

* Executive Summary of the Humanities Review of Laboratory and Related Facilities. [HTLC/6/13/6]

**Reported:**

* The full review was a very large document, which had been summarised for the Committee. The purpose of the exercise was to help the Dean persuade the University that Humanities was not just concerned with books and paper, but had diverse resourcing needs. The report had identified £1.8m resource requirements for lab- and equipment-enhancement funding (not including Steinways for Music)! Fiona Smyth as incoming AD would become custodian of the list of School-by-School requirements, which should be updated annually and prioritised for capital funding bids if above £50k.
* For bids of less than £50k, Faculty occasionally had surplus funds and the report would mean that requests for bids within a short timescale could be met more easily.
* Sarah Helsby was commended for the work she had done to pull this together.

1. **Policy on Additional Costs (Schools to report)**

**Reported:**

* Lisa McAleese reminded HTLC that there was a duty on Faculty to ensure that Schools were implementing the University’s policy on additional costs (circulated as HTLC/6/13/7, as an aide memoire) and were embedding it into the cycle of continual monitoring (formerly annual review).
* A written report had been received from MBS.

**Action: SoSS, SoL, SEED, SALC to email Lisa McAleese with information on how they are implementing the University’s Policy on Additional Costs and embedding it into their annual monitoring procedures. Respond by 4th July at the latest.**

1. **Mark Review (continued from previous meeting) (Lisa McAleese)**

**Received:**

* Draft procedures for conducting Mark Review at UG / PGT level, “Faculty of Humanities Mark Review Process”, [HTLC/6/13/8].

**Discussed:**

* Where a student is in the boundary zone but does not fulfil the ‘preponderance’ requirements for automatic upgrade, Mark Review should be used.
* New PGT (2012) regulations had already in effect for the first time in 12/13 Boards of Examiners, which had resulted in varying practice.
* The new (2012) regulations for UG would take effect for the 14/15 Boards of Examiners.
* SALC had noted disparity amongst its Discipline Areas, to the extent that that some areas weren’t doing it at all whilst others were doing it forensically, resulting in potential injustices.
* It was suggested a School creating its own additional criteria was not against the spirit of mark review.
* How literal was “mark review”? It was not logical to review another’s marks when one had no expertise of the topic. It was noted that under mark review, no mark should actually be changed. Even External Examiners should not change any marks (unless marks were scaled up or down for a whole cohort).
* Rather, Mark Review meant reviewing the spread of a student’s mark profile, taking into account relevant factors (t.b.c.) and deciding which classification they should be given.
* It was not necessary look at the actual pieces of work to do this. (Moreover it was not practical to do this, given the numbers of students and pieces of work involved in SoSS or SALC, for example. It was argued that Mark Review should not duplicate the moderation process.
* Mark Review could also involve looking at feedback.
* SEED have implemented it already for UG students and have used it in the past. They conducted an exercise this year where they didn’t look at the actual scripts, and compared the decisions with those that had been made where marks WERE looked at again.
* Need to look at stats for courses – e.g. if there are units that are marked low across the board, then it might have an unduly detrimental effect on a student’s classification.
* Need to be careful we don’t undermine fairness to all students, the decision of the External Examiners, the moderation process itself.
* SoSS conducted a review exercise and none of the classifications were raised.
* Another exercise looked at second year averages cf: final year averages: i.e. positive progression; (but

1/3 weighting of second year to 2/3 final year already takes this into account); average in final year 50% or a above award a 2.2, if 60% or above award a 2.1. This meant 1 more first on BA Econ, 11 more 2.1s and 2 more 2.2s. Quite significant. Also External Examiners say that it’s harder to get a degree at Manchester.

* Should we look at papers or not? Can Schools use criteria without papers? Criteria can be School or Subject-specific… External Examiners’ role – they feel they don’t have enough power!

**ACTION: Lisa McAleese to establish a sub-group and report back to HTLC. PGT will be coming up again in November boards. No availability of staff over the summer, so take up after welcome week in the Autumn.**

1. **Degree Regulations: Automatic Compensation (Lisa)** [HTLC/6/13/9]

**Reported:**

* The paper that had been circulated [HTLC/6/13/9] was incomplete: Lisa McAleese was awaiting feedback from Emma Hilton-Wood on circumstances over and above Mitigating Circumstances where compensation may not be automatic.

1. **Draft penalty scheme for exceeding word limits (Lisa McAleese)**

**Received:**

* Proposed Faculty Scheme for applying a penalty where an undergraduate or postgraduate taught student exceeds a specified word limit. [HTLC/5/13/10]

**Reported:**

* This paper was first discussed at HTLC on 5th May 2013, following agreement at the January 2013 meeting of HTLC that a Penalty Scheme for Exceeding the Word Count should be implemented from September 2013 in order to ensure consistency of practice across the Faculty, especially for students on joint programmes.
* As noted at the last meeting, External Examiners had raised this as something that was applied inconsistently, so ECS had been asked to put it back on the Agenda for discussion.
* External Examiners were concerned about penalties not being applied consistently within Schools. This was to some extent a separate issue from the Policy itself. However, Joint Programmes that spanned two Schools would cause problems if practices across Schools were inconsistent.

**Discussed:**

* It was suggested that the function of the Policy was to deter students from writing too much, not to enact penalties.
* There was no way for Tii to be able to count word counts appropriately – it counts words globally. Therefore, any penalty for exceeding word limits was unenforceable unless individual staff members applied manual workarounds to count words. Hence the inconsistent application of the policy.

**Agreed:**

* The draft Faculty Policy on Penalties for Exceeding Word Limits was therefore not approved.
* Any penalties must be applied consistently within disciplines.
* It is important that students know what is expected of them, including on joint honours where practice may differ between Schools.

1. **HESA Performance Indicator data** 
   1. **Recruitment and Retention 11/12 (Rec’d March 2014) (Emma Rose)** [HTLC/6/13/11a.i ; HTLC/6/13/11a.ii]

**Tabled:** HESA Performance Indicator data on recruitment and retention: notes for consideration and discussion

**Noted:**

* Members were thanked for their responses to Emma R on the data.

**Widening Participation**

1. Noted a lot of good practice and effort from schools to improve WP (NSSEC and LPN). ER could circulate a summary of good practice identified in Schools’ responses.
2. Data for the current admissions cycle shows again an increase in the number of applications, offers and acceptances from WP students (although it was acknowledged that the ‘flag’ is not necessarily accurate at this time of the year).
3. There appeared to be a relationship between increase in WP and decrease in demand for subjects (data 1213 and demand was down that year; WP up).
4. Correlation between WP and tariff: some schools mentioned that there could be a correlation between increasing the WP population and decreasing tariff scores. UoM policy is that we do not accept lower grades for WP students: Even in cases such as MAP (Manchester Access Programme), tariff points are awarded, which should be bringing applicants up to the appropriate entry tariff. Was there an issue about the admission of WP students? It was acknowledged that not all students were included in the tariff population.
5. Correlation between WP and non-continuation: Based on 1112 entrants and looking at institutional level, UoM had 3.7% not in HE. However, of the population from a Polar 2 background, 6.9% were no longer in HE. It was noted that the actual numbers were smaller and this had an impact on percentages, but it nevertheless indicated that there could be a relationship. [Sept 13 report] WP students had higher attrition rates. However, when entry qualifications were controlled, non-continuation was higher for non-WP students. MAP (Manchester Access Programme) students were less likely to leave than other WP students – should we increase on campus engagement?

**Tariff Scores**

1. Noted that tariff scores contribute to league table position, and for the Guardian it amounted to 15% of the position calculation. This will influence applications. Only Music has a higher average tariff than the UoM average tariff. The rest of the Faculty is below the UoM average (according to recent Guardian League Tables).
2. Perhaps there was a relationship between demand for subjects and tariff – the quality versus quantity debate. Our portfolio has to attract high quality students and compete in the marketplace. Otherwise in order to meet costs we have to drop grades and bring in lower quality students. The SNC (student number control) cap should have been pushing us to take in more high quality students but our tariff has dropped between 2011 (pre SNC) and 2012.
3. Can we increase entry criteria? Review and ask this each year. There was a risk to achieving student number targets, but a high entry tariff indicates a quality programme. Could we develop more popular high tariff programmes, e.g. Integrated Masters, popular combinations such as joint History and English, Language and Literature? This would contribute to a rise in league table position and a rise in the quality of applications.

**Non-continuation at end of first year**

1. Relationship between tariff and retention: A correlation between entry tariffs and retention was noted: analysis at national level [Sept 13 report] showed that attrition, particularly in post-1992 institutions, was strongly influenced by entry qualifications. SALC data had been examined over a number of years and no clear pattern had emerged at subject level. However, lower quality students meant more resource was required for academic and pastoral support.

1. Retention was generally improving across Faculty but drops were noted for MBS and SEED.
2. [Data from Sept 13 report] Males were more likely to drop out than females; disabled students were more likely to drop out than their able-bodied peers. Those living at home were more likely to drop out. [Data from Oct 13 report] International males were more likely to drop out: 6.6% compared to 5.1%. This figure increases for mature males. International students tend to fail rather than drop out. Should Schools direct more academic advising and support to these students?

**Discussed:**

* Drivers were incompatible with each other – lower tariffs to increase intakes, increased intakes threaten NSS, lower tariffs affect retention/continuation etc.
* We look at Classifications because there is a need to ensure parity of outcomes e.g. for BME students. In theory, every student should be able to get a 1st – the UK classifications scheme is not competitive in that sense. Would be sensible to look at norms within discipline areas – we currently rely on External Examiners to ensure parity within the sector. It can be difficult to conclude when a spike of firsts is defensible, or whether it’s statistically worrying and could imply that standards are too low.
* It is possible to get comparisons with other HEIs on request from the Planning Office to address External Examiner comments, e.g. Law have done this recently.
* SoSS will share the outputs of the research they’ve commissioned into BME outcomes. They have invested c. £6k in this with the expectation that they will be able to influence policy as a result.
* SALC argued that making no distinction between interruption and withdrawal as “non-continuation” is unhelpful. SALC are being identified as having poor continuation rates but this masks the fact that students interrupt and return.
  1. **Degree attainment by gender, ethnicity and domicile** [HTLC/6/13/11b.i ; HTLC/6/13/11b.ii]
* Dan Swain (Planning Support Office) had produced a paper “An Exploration of Factors linked to University Attainment of Students v1.1” which was considered at the 11th December 2013 meeting of HTLC. The paper had since been updated with further information regarding attainment across Humanities faculties split by gender, ethnicity and domicile. The domicile of a student is an important factor and the revised document “Equality and Attainment v1.3” provides information regarding patterns of attainment across countries (see page 22).
* There were numerous factors that impacted on attainment and the research attached mainly considered static factors linked to students entering the University and it was also important to consider the academic career of students and what happened during their time at the university (e.g. living arrangements, employment status etc.).

**Questions on Degree attainment**

1. Entry tariffs were decreasing but in the most part, attainment was increasing. This could be said to indicate valued added but not necessarily reflected in league tables – we don’t yet understand how value added is calculated other than it reflects entry versus exit.
2. Note SoSS were undertaking research on relationship between BME, domicile and attainment.
3. Law’s marking was being reviewed as a result of a significant rise in % (12) over last three years.
4. It had been noted by SALC that, prior to 2013/14, exam board procedures were implemented inconsistently across disciplines and this was impacting on attainment (i.e. potential different ways of implementing mitigating circumstances decisions could lead to inconsistency in raising affected students to a higher classification).
5. More females got a good degree than males (4.1% difference) at Faculty level. The differential varied across disciplines. How much did this reflect the intake differential? A greater proportion of UK students achieve a good degree than non-UK (23.1% more). If students were entering at an equal level, why was there such a differential? 11.3% more white students get a good degree than BME students (UK domiciled).
6. **DLHE data (Emma Rose)** [HTLC/6/13/12.i ; HTLC/6/13/12.ii ; HTLC/6/13/12.iii]

**Noted:**

* The data must not be shared outside of the University at this time.
* Further data comparing our performance with that of other HEIs will be forthcoming.
* Faculty achieved 65.8%, so had not met our target of 69% positive graduate destinations.
* SoSS and MBS had increased, SoSS by 3%+ which was quite significant.
* Law had dipped so it was queried whether there was anything affecting Law at UoM in particular or whether it was a national trend. It was not clear that there were any fewer training contracts available last year than there had been before.
* Sector-wide reports by Discipline would be forthcoming, which would be more useful than comparing within the University’s different disciplines and Schools.

**Discussed:**

* There was a danger of directly linking increased activity within Schools with improved DLHE performance outside, e.g. anecdotally, some of the most active employability leads are in areas where DLHE scores had gone down.
* Tim Westlake has learned how important SALC is to the institution – more than 20% of UoM’s DLHE return is made up of SALC, who have a predominance of Home UGs.
* 91 to 92.2% - UoM was top or very near the top in getting students into a job or further study, but these were not necessarily graduate jobs.

1. **Teaching and Learning Data Dashboard (Emma Rose)**

**Reported:**

* Emma Rose gave a verbal report on a project being taken forward by the Faculty and the University to produce a data dashboard of teaching and learning information at programme, discipline and school level.
* The project had come out of discussions with Jane Hallam, Head of Planning and Simon Eley of the Data Warehouse team. Helen Barton would be taking it forward on behalf of the University, involving all four Faculties.
* Should be drillable down to programme and/or discipline level, where appropriate. The dashboard will collate and report on any data contained in “data cubes”, for interrogation by Heads of Discipline, School etc. to aid planning.

1. **\*Faculty Operational Plan for Teaching and Learning 13/14**

Received for information: a progress report against Humanities T&L targets. [HTLC/6/13/15]

1. **\*Response to Mitigating Circumstance Review**

Received for information: a summary of the above from Richard Reece. [HTLC/6/13/16]

**Noted:**

* A Task and Finish Group had been set up to discuss elements of the feedback, in order to conclude revisions to the policy and look at the areas to support it.  The group has representation from each Faculty and is Chaired by Ian Bradley (EPS Head of Academic Services).

1. **\*Interruption Requests**

Received for information: a list of interruption requests received by Schools since the last meeting. [HTLC/6/13/16]

1. **\*Information circulated since the last meeting**

Received for information. [HTLC/6/13/17]

1. **\*Minutes of sub-groups**

18.1 \* [IMG minutes of 20.01.14](file:///\\uk-ac-man-ss2a\vol2\HumanitiesAdmin\Teaching%20and%20Learning\Committees%20and%20Groups\HTLC\2013-14\12th%20June\Minutes%20of%20the%2020th%20January%202014%20Meeting) (hyperlink)

18.2 \* [IMG minutes of 20.03.14](http://www.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/humnet/committees/facultyintakemanagementgroup/) (hyperlink)

18.2 \* HUGSC minutes (unconfirmed) of 21.05.14 were circulated on 27.05.14

18.4 \* HPGT minutes of 28.05.14 (unconfirmed) of 21.05.14 were circulated on 02.05.14

18.5 \*[eLSG minutes of 16.10.13](http://www.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/humnet/committees/elearningstrategygroup/) (hyperlink)

18.5 \*[eLSG minutes of 29.01.1](http://www.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/humnet/committees/elearningstrategygroup/)4 (hyperlink)

1. **A.O.B.**

**Reported:**

* SALC and SoL were experiencing a peak in the number of students requesting retrospective interruptions: students were applying in May/June to repeat the year on medical grounds. Numbers had gone up dramatically this year.

**Discussed:**

* There was a need to differentiate between Interruptions and requests to Repeat the Year. At this point in the academic year students had received results from Semester 1 plus some coursework from Semester 2, and then argued that they need to Repeat the Year, backdating their date of last attendance to months before. In some cases students had been excluded for non-attendance and then submitted a backdated interruption request with medical evidence.
* The Mitigating Circumstances Policy required there to be good reason for not submitting a case for mitigation at the time.
* If a student had been absent for some time this should have been noted through Attendance Monitoring and the Academic Advisor system.
* **Action: HTLC to actively check the interruption reports received quarterly from the Schools. Action: The Interruptions Reporting Proforma must be amended e.g. add another column to highlight where requests are retrospective.**

**Noted:**

* The AD wished to record his thanks to the Teaching and Learning Team (including Nicola Lord who was currently on secondment in MHS) who had supported him in his role.
* The AD also wished to thank the members of HTLC for their help in supporting the AD TL&S in improving teaching, learning and the student experience across the Faculty.

1. **Date of next meeting**

9th July 2014, 2-5pm, University Place 6.208