Faculty of Humanities
CONFIRMED Minutes of Technology in Teaching and Learning (TTL) Sub Committee
22nd October 2014 2pm – 4pm (Williamson Building, 2.06)

Present:

Judy Zolkiewski	Assistant Associate Dean for Teaching, Learning & Students (Chair)
Liam Harte	Undergraduate Director (eLearning and Assessment), SALC
Karen Niven	eLearning Lead, MBS
Dan Rigby	eLearning Lead, SoSS
Neil Cobb	eLearning Lead, Law
Gary Motteram	Online Learning Lead, SEED
Guy Percival	Head of Faculty IS
Lisa McAleese	Teaching and Learning Manager
Anna Verges	Humanities eLearning Manager (Minutes)

By invitation:

Linda Irish	Assistant eLearning Manager
Angela Gardner	eLearning Manager Executive Education (MBS)

1. Apologies

Received from Harriet Pugh (Education Officer), Jade Kelsall (Library), Cath Booth (Hum eLearning), Emma Rose (Head of Teaching and Learning Support Services).

Student representatives for 2014-15 not yet confirmed

2. ISTTL Terms of reference

Chair noted it was the first meeting of the Information System and Technology in Teaching and Learning Subcommittee. A decision had been made at the end of last academic year to merge and review the IS Committee and the eLearning Strategy group. New terms of reference were then discussed and agreed and these were approved by Humanities Teaching and Learning Committee (HTLC).

Chair opened the floor for comments or amendments to the Terms of Reference of June 2014.

LMc noted that, as regards who does the Subcommittee report to, HTLC will not be necessarily reviewing the minutes of the ISTTL Subcommittee, rather the Chair would report any issues to HTLC

> Action: JZ to remove the reference in the Terms of reference relating to minutes of ISTTL meetings to be received by HTLC for information.

Chair noted that eLearning leads would be receiving HTLC agenda and documents for information. This had already started happening.

KN and LH proposed to shorten the name of the Subcommittee to: Technology in Teaching and Learning Subcommittee (TTL hereafter). Proposal was approved.

DR sought clarification as regards the meaning point 12. After some discussion, agreement was reached to rephrase the paragraph. GM offered to propose a new wording.

> Action: GM to propose a rewording of paragraph 12

3. **Minutes of the last meeting** [eLSG of 18/6/2014 and IS Web 4/12/2013].

Agreed: The minutes of both eLSG of 18/6/2014 and IS Web Committee 4/12/2013 were approved as a correct record.

A discussion on future dates of TTL took place. Next meeting of the committee was confirmed as taking place on 4th February. The initial date (21st January) was changed as Chair would have been away. As the February and March date would be too close agreement was made to move the March date for a date after Easter in April.

Action: AV to find a new convenient time to meet in April

4. **Matters arising**

Report on actions of eLSG of 18/6/2014

Assigned	Actions	Progress
LW/ER	Louise Walmsley/Emma Rose to clarify to eLearning leads the outcome and timelines of the eLearning review. (c/f)	Done
JZ	To take forward as a formal paper to the next TLC the proposed merging of IS and Web Sub Committee and the eLearning Strategy Group. (c/f)	Done
JZ	To forward comments on Unit Survey best practice to Will Carey.	Done
AV / eL team	AV / eLearning team to consider alternative approaches to gathering wider student feedback for 2014/2015.	Survey in courses will be promoted. Plus involving student reps.
AV / eL team	AV / eLearning team to ensure effective ongoing communication plans that work to address gaps in knowledge raised by staff evaluations of Tii/TM.	eL Team followed up responses by academic staff where those responses demonstrated being unaware of Tii capability
AV	To amend eAssesment report and reorder tables prior to sending to HTLC.	Done and forwarded to HTLC
eLearning Leads	To feedback to AV any further comments on eAssessment report.	No further comments from eL Leads
AV/eL team	AV/eLearning team to send report and any other documentation on eAssessment issues to Fiona Smyth and Norma Hird and approach TLSO to arrange a fuller briefing for all members.	Faculty WG on Assessment Feedback dissolved.
AV	To proactively request feedback from IT Services re: outcomes of discussions with iParadigms and feedback to eLSG as outlined in the eAssessment report.	Ongoing

JZ	To discuss whether Canvas/ other VLEs have been considered by the University	Done
GM	To demonstrate Canvas at next meeting	Arranged for 22 October (now to be done at 4th February meeting)
AV	To clarify with eLSG what students get as notification from Blackboard/Tii that their feedback is ready.	Neither tools offer an email notification. Tii displays feedback date. Bb provide global notification.
CB	Cath Booth to note potential for having AR apps in different languages and organise meeting between Susan Brown / Gary Motteram / eLearning developers and language tutors when AR app complete.	Further clarification needed

GM noted that Student Surveys were closing too early with no apparent reason. It would be helpful to be able to control the time when these are available to students rather than it being prescribed uniformly from the centre. Surveys ought to close a week after teaching finishes. Fundamentally, Schools wanted to be able to decide when to carry out the surveys. eLearning leads asked JZ to raise the matter with Teaching & Learning Support Office/ Kim Comer.

Some academic staff emailed students to encourage completion of the surveys (e.g. PTES) and following up on students increased personalisation. However, LH noted that there was a minimum threshold in number of students completing the survey from which staff were able to know who had not submitted a response. This system was not helpful.

> Action: JZ to formally ask to extend the time survey is available and Schools to have a choice as to when and for how long Student Surveys are available.

LMc noted that the Faculty's Working Group, established to investigate reduced scale descriptor based marking, has been disbanded. The University's Assessment and Marking Sub-group (of the Teaching and Learning Group) are investigating developing consistent grade descriptors across the University.

> Action: AV to clarify whether University Working Group on Assessment and Progression was pursuing the mapping of assessment processes.

AV noted the lack of progress in influencing Turnitin and the difficulty in making Faculty's voice heard across the University. This was a continuous and ongoing process to influence iParadigms as well as other faculties, central IT teams and committees. GP proposed to try to influence the IT planning cycle. The planning cycle was strategic and Schools and Facultie plans are done by each School and the Faculty – the issues around Tii could be added as a threat in the SWOT analyses.

JZ noted that if Bb delivered on the eAssessment requirements, the University may consider moving away from Tii/GM.

> Action: AV to re-send the current list of priority eAssessment issues.

LH noted that the system ought to deliver an email notification to students that their feedback is available to collect. Other eLearning leads noted that they email students on the feedback date and use this as an opportunity to communicate with students.

AV had observed a few examples of confusion about what Faculty policy actually said as regards esubmission and marking and asked LMc to clarify Faculty position. LMc read verbatim from the policy:

> *2.2. Point 14 of the UoM eLearning Strategy states that 'over the course of the next five years, the University will move towards the submission and marking of all substantial written course material through the VLE'*
> *2.3 (Faculty) approved a 3-year timeline for moving towards full online assignment submission and feedback.*
> *3.4. The Faculty's recommended method of marking online is by the use of the Grademark tool in Tii.*

LMc highlighted that Faculty policy only required submission and feedback to be on-line and recommended the use of Tii/Grademark for marking, however off-line marking can be used.

In addition, a draft policy on the Submission of Work for Summative Assessment was under consultation and deadline was 10th December. Schools were currently taking different approaches to submission and marking of dissertations. LH and DR noted that SALC and SoSS would prefer to retain a system of dual submission and avoid having to cover the cost of hard copies. The draft Policy states that 'where a School requires alternative methods of submission, any printing costs must be met by the School. These costs must be met directly by the School, e.g. by issuing printing credits to students'.

Report on Actions from IS Web Committee of 4/12/2013

CD to send JT info on where CTU rooms with recording devices can be found on Link and Knowledge Base	Done
GP to circulate Wi-fi 'dead spots' timetable	Completed GP to report on progress of wifi-project
GP to find out figures on lecture Capture and circulate to group	LH offered to distribute 2014-15 opt-out rates for Humanities
CD to invite Stuart Phillipson for this item	Superseded

With respect to Lecture Capture it was noted that a new QR code had been introduce to pause recording. LI provided location for QR code in the My Podcasts website (http://www.mypodcasts.manchester.ac.uk/support/qrcode/) and that there is a website dedicated to the Podcast system http://www.mypodcasts.manchester.ac.uk/

GM noted that a project in SEED was looking at how lecture recordings could be used for teaching and other purposes. GP advised that there could be limitations to the use of podcasts.

5. **Chair's report**

Chair noted that there was not a lot to report. AV had attended the Online Education Strategy Group OESG on behalf of JZ. AV reported on OESG meeting

1. Allan Copley communicated that a contract renewal with Bb was about to be signed. University have negotiated a 5 year renewal at the same cost but with additional functionality notably Bb would provide free licences for Collaborate, Mobile Learn, Bb

Analytics and Bb Connect. Whether these products would actually be deployed remained to be seen as there were hidden costs associated with their use e.g. storage. In addition a partnership agreement had been signed to collaborate in the development of the Bb product – this partnership were likely to including eAssessment

2. OESG also discussed online submission and marking. For consecutive years Turnitin users had faced service disruption at key times in the assessment cycle. Both iParadigms and Bb had limitations in functionality. Richard Reece noted that iParadigms had proven to be unresponsive to Manchester, as well to sector, demands. The partnership agreement with Bb offered an opportunity to pursue eAssessment requirements.

3. OESG also heard presentation from Paul Govey, Head of Student Communication and Marketing on My Manchester including a recent consultation with students on My Manchester and the iManchester App. New functionality was available in My Manchester for students and student perceptions were highly positive.

6. IT Report

GP reported that IT was going through a restructure. No affects were going to be noted in the short term but in a year's time the differences would be apparent. The new Director of IT services was keen to focus on quality of service which inevitably would mean having to say no to a range of projects and make adjustments to current levels of service and project support work. IT were having a conversation about how to prioritise IT services for Education and indeed there would be prioritisation in this area too.

AV had asked GP to communicate for the benefit of the Subcommittee the processes relating to software and procurement. Schools no longer were able to purchase any hardware or software unless going through Head of Faculty IS. SoSS had recently benefited from new equipment. A budget on Innovation was available and the method of approval varied according to a hierarchy of cost (below £250, between £ 250-£2000, over £2,000 and above £2500).The latter required approval from the Associate Dean. A new budget would need to be ready by December.

DR noted that ordering of laptops, screens, etc. was taking a lot of time and it was unclear to the user the status or progress of orders. GP provided the name of person responsible, David Lloyd.

GM asked who was making the decision as to what equipment was being used and in which rooms- e.g. projectors. The set up of projectors was not always appropriate. GP advised GM to contact Media Centre as regards display equipment.

JZ noted the impact of the failure of IT infrastructure has on student experience – not only Bb or My Manchester being down but also infrastructure issues such as Wifi drop-out in lectures. The IT infrastructure has to be able to support the number of students that use it. Moreover there was an issue of communications, with Schools not always feeling they knew about what was happening and asked whether we had in place an effective system and communication strategy to inform Schools as students would in the first instance approach Schools when systems don't work. GP noted that often communication issues occurred within Schools. JZ asked whether anyone was taking ownership of IT communications within Faculty.

Action: GP to oversee ownership of communication of service issues within Faculty.

7. eLearning Report
7.1. Briefing note

7.2. Restructure and embedding of eLearning

AV had distributed a Briefing Note and a Summary of progress on eLearning review and embedding eLearning in Schools.

With regard to embedding of eLearning, AV talked around the contents of the document and the current state of play. The implementation of the eLearning review has started by putting in place new structures. Roles and responsibilities for School-facing Learning Technologists (LT) have been developed and it was noted that a document would also be distributed shortly outlining roles and responsibilities of LTs and academic/PSS staff. The target date for LTs to start their School shifts was 1st (or early) November. The target date was being influenced by recruitment process and the relocation of some LTs away from previous posts. DR noted that the Faculty-level work of School-facing technologist involved a two way communication between Faculty and School priorities.

KN reported that the relocation of MBS LTs was raising support issues in MBS and asked how best to reach the wider Faculty team. AV noted that new School-specific email addresses will be introduced for all Schools to support embedding but the generic elearning@manchester.ac.uk would remain and be managed by the Faculty-facing team. If there were capacity issues in MBS the Faculty team would step in to support as would happen in any other School.

LI used the opportunity to communicate that the new incident management system process (replacing current Remedy) would be using a web form as the preferred online method of accessing the service desk, rather than the current email system we use. The reasoning was that it would be a more effective method of capturing complete and relevant information at point of contact, in order to provide a better service. However this development had appeared unexpectedly and was a less 'personalised' approach than the one we had been trying to implement in Schools. Group was concerned and dissatisfied that no consultation with academic staff appeared to have taken place even if GM had been identified as the Humanities academic stakeholder. The new system was scheduled to be introduced by March 2015.

Action: JZ to contact John Greenwood and invite him to attend next TTL meeting

As regards the review and co-delivery of training, DR asked what Training and skills can be expected from LTs. GM noted that would like to see a co-delivery model where Schools generate the aims and syllabus and LT support the delivery.

7. 3. Start of Year (SoY) Report

Given the short time available, the Chair asked LI to distribute the SoY report to all members via email.

Action: LI to circulate Start of Year Report.

8. **Student Matters**

None received.

9. **Innovation and development**

Presentation by Gary Motteram was adjourned to next meeting.

Action: Gary Motteram to demonstrate Canvas at next meeting

10. A.O.B.

Standardised course structures were raised but it was agreed that these would be discussed at the next meeting.

11. Date of Next Meeting

Wednesday, 4th February, 2-4pm, venue TBC