**UNCONFIRMED Minutes of the Faculty of Humanities Teaching & Learning Committee of**

**14 November 2018, Ken Kitchen Room, John Owens Building**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Noted** | **Action** |
|  |  |  |
| **1.**  | **Welcomes and Apologies****Present:** Thea Cameron- Faulkner (AD); Ken Clark (SoSS); Kieron Flanagan (AMBS); Paul Gratrick (Careers – PG); Chris Godden (SALC); Matt Jefferies (SALC); Matt Langford (SU); Lisa McAleese (T&L Manager – LMc); Claire McGourlay (SoL); Isabel Meisl (Student representative); Olivia Meisi (SU); Elinor O’Connor (AMBS); Emma Rose (HTLSE); Brenda Sanderson (secretary – BS); David Spendlove (SEED); Fiona Smyth (Chair -FS); Anna Verges-Bausili (eLearning); Rachel Walton (TLO).**In attendance:** Therese Reinheimer-Jones (Director of Campus Life)**Apologies:** Helen Davenport (TLO); Xavier Duran (AMBS); Saanya Afroze (Student representative); Damien Tolan (TLO); Yuanxu Zhang (student representative) |  |
|  |  |  |
| **2.**  | **Campus Life Update (Therese Reinheimer-Jones)****Reported:*** A presentation was given by the Director of Campus Life to provide an update on the work that is being done in Campus Life for student well-being.
* There was an aim to develop a wrap-around care model which was expected to launch in 2019.

**Action:*** Comparison data to be circulated.
 | **FS** |
|  |  |  |
| **3.** | **Student well-being****Discussed:*** DoTLs were asked to report on student well-being issues, challenges and initiatives in place to support students in the Schools.

**Reported*** AVB noted that Schools were keen to create online courses to support student well-being and there were questions about whether this should be done at school or central level. This matter was discussed at APR. It was discussed that caution should be exercised when developing new Blackboard material and members were asked to consult the TLSE team for guidance on development.
* Elaine Clarke in AMBS had been due to commence study leave to work on a first year academic advising unit which would introduce the concept of resilience. The aim would be to embed resilience skills in the curriculum. The contact details for DoTLs would be given to Elaine Clarke to seek feedback on this work.
* In SALC, a session on building resilience had run for History students and the first intake was popular with two thirds of students attending; this was followed up in English however only 10% of students attended.
* SEED had focussed on academic advisors supporting student well-being.
* LAW noted that focus should be paid on encouraging academic advisor’s supporting student wellbeing and training advisors should be prioritised.

**Action:*** Elaine Clarke to be invited to talk about her work on embedding resilience into the curriculum when she returned from study leave.
 | **Secretary** |
|  |  |  |
| **4.**  | **Minutes of the last meeting****Received:** [HTLC/2/18/3]* The minutes were approved as an accurate record.
 |  |
|  |  |  |
| **5.** | **Matters arising****Received:** [HTLC/2/18/5]**Actions arising from HTLC of Wednesday 3 October 2018**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Item*** | ***Action*** | ***Responsibility*** | ***Update*** |
| 2. Leadership in Education Awards Programme | DoTLs would highlight the LEAP programme to staff in their Schools and asked for further information about the programme which could be disseminated.  | DoTLs | Completed |
| BS would send this information to DoTLs once it had been received by the LEAP Programme Administrator. | BS | Completed |
| 8. 17/18 HTLC Actions Arising | Members were asked to update the secretary on the outstanding actions. | All | No updates had been received  |
| 9. NSS / PTES reports | Law’s start of the year video would be shared with HTLC.  | CM | Completed |
| It would be beneficial to celebrate excellence in teaching more frequently, for example, in University buildings. FS would discuss this further with the Dean. | FS | Completed |
| 10. First year assessment strategy | The Programme Approval checklist to be revisited to ensure it includes engagement with learning design.  | LMc | Completed |
| DoTLs to identify programmes where it would be possible to trial different assessment strategies. | DoTLs | Ongoing |
| A student focus group to be convened to explore different options in the first year. | Faculty / LMc | Ongoing |
| 11. Academic Advising | Academic Advisor online training link to be circulated. | LMc | Completed |
| SoSS academic advising guidance document to be circulated. | KC | Ongoing |
| 13. HTLC Discussion  | Members were asked to send any ideas they had for future meetings to the secretary. | All | No ideas had been received |
| 14. Consultation on the Policy on Additional Costs | An alternative form of words to be developed. | KC | KC confirmed that he was now satisfied with the form of words. |

 |  |
|  |  |  |
| **6.** | **Chair’s Report**  |  |
| **6.1** | **Chair’s Verbal Report****Reported:** * At TLG the Augar review was discussed and what that meant for Humanities. There had been discussions around the implications of a reduction of in fees and sourcing other potential additional income. The Augar review could have a significant impact and further information was to be reported in early 2019. Applicants may defer their applications and a University group was to be set up to discuss contingencies.
* The SU were not boycotting NSS in 18/19 and were to remain neutral on the matter. SU would not promote NSS however would release a statement about what it is and the benefits of it. It was noted that it was acceptable to ask student representatives to help promote NSS.
* The late submission policy had been approved by TLG; this will go to Senate in February 2019 for implementation in 19/20.

**Discussed:*** Programme level surveys and low response rates were discussed. Student ‘pizza’ forums were noted as producing good response rates in one School, but in another School some students felt that they were being bribed with food. Another idea would be for students to pick a charity which would benefit from their completion of survey feedback, but this has been tried with limited success. It was noted that students needed a tangible benefit in completing the feedback in order to encourage engagement and members were encouraged to share more ideas on this.

**Action:*** Clarification to be sought on when the next PTES would take place.
* A review on how to encourage student engagement with programme level surveys.
 | **LMc****MG** |
| **6.2** | **TEF Update****Reported:*** The institutional and subject level assessment would be running as an independent exercise until 2021 and then at that point there would be a subject level TEF.
* The institutional TEF grade inflation data would be included.
* The new subject level pilot added two additional measures and it would maintain half of the NSS measurements. The aim was to increase meaningfulness to students and strengthen student engagement.
* More guidance would be developed on the content of submissions. Subject level submissions would provide a two page summary and institutional level a five page submission.
 |  |
| **6.3** | **Chair’s Briefing Note****Received:** [HTLC /2/18/6.3] |  |
|  |  |  |
| **7.** | **TEF Preparation (Fiona Smyth)** **Reported:** * The TEF Strategy Group had met and they would be seeking better data and more analysis of that data.
 |  |
|  |  |  |
| **8.** | **Humanities Operational Priorities 2019/20 for Teaching, Learning and Student Experience (Fiona Smyth)****Received:** [HTLC /2/18/8.1]**Discussed:** * The 18/19 priorities were high level and the discussion focussed on if Humanities priorities should be more specific and achievable within a year.
* Some themes discussed were: Social responsibility, student well-being and mental health, understanding TEF better, setting ambitious targets for online delivery and teaching more broadly through eLearning, staff engagement with technology, course approval with a view to a more continual monitoring process, learning design, assessment, student engagement and a review of Blackboard to provide a more standard course structure.
 |  |
|  |  |  |
| **9.** | **Ethical Grand Challenges (Fiona Smyth)** Received: [HTLC/2/18/9]**Discussed:*** The data showed that few students were eligible for Stellify and discussion took place on how to increase the uptake. There was a general consensus that students still weren’t aware of what Stellify was and time was needed to bed in the label.
* It was felt it was necessary to explain to students the point of ethical grand challenges and target specific students for the award.
* 5000 students engaged with the sustainability challenge, however in 2018 there were slightly less involved and it was felt that staff encouragement could grow engagement and it would be easier to promote it if staff members complete it themselves. It was noted that Welcome Week was the wrong time to hold the challenge however there were catch up sessions after Welcome Week.
* Clear communications with the student body about what the Grand Ethical Challenges, directly linking Stellify to employability would be required.
* It would be beneficial to work with SU on student engagement.

**Action:*** Departmental breakdown of student engagement with the sustainability challenge to be requested from Jane Ratchford.
* Archaeology had high levels of engagement and their approach was to be shared.
 | **SecretarySecretary** |
|  |  |  |
| **10.**  | **Inclusive teaching and learning (Thea Cameron-Faulkner and Rebecca Bennett)** **Received:** [HTLC/2/18/10]; [HTLC/2/18/10.1]; [HTLC/2/18/10.1]**Reported:*** Inclusive Teaching, Learning and Student Experience Strategy [HTLC/2/18/10.1] - There would be a move away from separate groups to make it more inclusive for all. The report was the first step but there was concern about how it would be put into action. It was noted that the report was vague however it was a strategy therefore a further policy and action plan would be developed. TCF would keep the committee updated on progress.
* Towards a Smarter Curriculum Project Report [HTLC/2/18/10.1] – two groups had been established and the report was the output of that work. There would be more work on a number of areas and there was a discussion about whether there were things to be done as a result of the report. Teaching intensity was noted and whilst the Faculty had guidelines on the minimum contact time, it would be good to explore this further. The report provided an average minimum contact for PGT but just a minimum for UG; it was felt that PGT had more flexibility.
 |  |
|  |  |  |
| **11.** | **Online exams (Fiona Smyth)** **Received:** [HTLC/2/18/11]**Discussed:*** It was noted that there was a framework for scheduled examinations but there were 23 examinations held outside the exam period and some were significant in terms of the credits awarded, the ones with a lesser value inform a more formative process. Questions were raised about mid-term examinations and if they are treated as a ‘normal’ exam or more pedagogically.
* The guidance on mid-term examinations was minimal and queries were raised about how to regulate this area.

**Action:*** eLearning Network Subcommittee to review situation and make recommendations to the next HTLC meeting.
 | **AVB** |
|  |  |  |
| **12.** | **Awards (Fiona Smyth)****Reported:** * An event was held on 16 October 2018 to celebrate those who were awarded with distinguished achievement awards. The awards were celebrating students however it was discussed that it would be beneficial to broaden those recognised, including staff. For example, programme teams and School level awards for students. The event could be expanded to make it a bigger event.
* In terms of awards for staff, it was felt the nomination process was a significant amount of work and whist it should be a robust application there should be a less onerous application process.
* Helen Davenport was thanked for organising the event.
* It was noted that there was an error in not inviting T&L PS staff, which would be rectified in the future.
* An audit of school level awards should be completed.
 | **LMc** |
|  |  |  |
| **13.** | **Recruitment and Admissions****Received:** [HTLC/2/18/13.1]; [HTLC/2/18/13.2]**Noted:*** It was noted that there were uncertainties as to whether or not it was appropriate to continue with operating this matter through IMG. The tariff data was not available at the time of the meeting to assess how effective it had been.
* Applications were up 15% and the University was outperforming competitors at that point. Contractual offers were being made and it was noted that the University was attracting the best students, whatever their background.
* All subject areas were performing well, apart from drama, religions and theology and philosophy.
* There was an issue with diversity and work was being done with the international office to understand how and where to target potential students.
 |  |
|  |  |  |
| **14.** | **Programme Approval (Thea Cameron-Faulkner and Rachel Walton)****Received:** [HTLC/2/18/14]**Reported:*** The proposal to amend the Programme Approval Process aimed to make the process more agile and less cumbersome without losing rigour.
* Proposals were made to change NPP1 panel meetings and programme amendments. It was felt that it was more appropriate to allocate more time to NPP2 and working with DoTLs earlier in the process.
* There was an aim to spread the load with colleagues other than DoTL’s attending panel meetings

**Agreed:*** HTLC agreed in principle to move forward with the proposal.
 |  |
|  |  |  |
| **15.** | **Student Matters*** The new student representatives were welcomed to HTLC. The student representatives had reported that it would have been useful to have known about meeting dates further in advance and discussed their role on the committee.
* The Chair noted it would be helpful to meet with the student representatives when they are new to the committee.

**Action:*** HTLC ToR would be sent to the student representatives.
 | **Secretary** |
|  |  |  |
| **16.** | **Report on AP(E)L monitoring\*** Received: [HTLC/2/18/16] |  |
|  |  |  |
| **17.** | **A.O.B****Reported:*** An all-day event on assessment and feedback, organised by Claire McGourlay, was due to be held on the same day at the next HTLC. The next meeting of HTLC would be cancelled to accommodate attendance at this event.

**Action:*** The event details would be circulated to the Committee.
 | **CM** |
|  |  |  |
| **18.** | **\*For information** |  |
|  |  |  |
| **19.** | **\*Date of next meeting*** 6 February 2019
 |  |
|  |  |  |

**HTLC Actions Arising from 14 November 2018**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Item*** | ***Action*** | ***Responsibility*** |
| 2. Campus Life Update | Comparison data to be circulated | FS |
| 3. Student wellbeing | Elaine Clarke to be invited to talk about her work on embedding resilience into the curriculum when she returns from study leave. | Secretary |
| 6.1 Chair’s verbal report | Clarification to be sought on when the next PTES would take place. | LMc |
| A review on how to encourage student engagement with programme level surveys | MG |
| 9. Ethical Grand Challenges | Departmental breakdown of student engagement with the sustainability challenge to be requested from Jane Ratchford | Secretary |
| Archaeology had high levels of engagement and their approach was to be shared. | Secretary |
| 11. Online exams | The elearning team to work with the elearning champions via their network and propose suggestions to the next HTLC meeting | AVB |
| 12. Awards | Audit of school level awards should be completed. | LMc |
| 15. Student Matters | HTLC ToR would be sent to the student representatives. | Secretary |
| 17. AOB | The event details would be circulated to the Committee. | CM |