**Faculty of Humanities**

**Notes of the Teaching & Learning Administrators’ Network (TLAN) Meeting 15/12/14**

**Present:** Lee Felvus, Fiona Fraser, Morag Guilfoyle & Louise Stewart (School of Arts, Languages & Cultures - SALC); Katrina Clark & Janice Dodds (School of Environment, Education & Development – SEED); Jackie Kan, Madeleine Ryan & (Manchester Business School – MBS); Amanda Brereton & Bernadette O’Connor (School of Social Sciences - SOSS), Lisa McAleese (Chair); Emma Sanders and Rachel Walton (Faculty); Gail Bradbury (Manchester Leadership Programme – MLP); Joanne Davidson (HERA).

**In attendance:** Erika Buzink (International Student Support) for item 4.

**1. Apologies**

**Received:** Apologies were received from: Sara Latham & Elizabeth Nolan (SALC); Suzi Edwards, Catriona Fraser & James Walker (SEED); Abigail Robinson (School of Law); Melanie Crank, Emily Marner & Lynne McCormack (MBS); Gemma Grimshaw (Student System Office – SSO); Nicola Lord (Faculty); and Laura Watson (MLP).

**2. Previous Notes (2 October 2014)**

**Confirmed:** The notes from the meeting on 2 October 2014 were confirmed as an accurate record.

**3. Matters Arising**

**Ref 4 Ethical Approval**

**Reported:** At the November 2014 meeting of the Teaching & Learning Group (TLG) ethical approval in UG & PGT dissertations / projects was discussed. The University’s Research Ethics Committee does not want to handle ethics approval for independent work done by students on taught programmes. It was agreed that TLG would be responsible for the oversight of the ethical approval of taught dissertations but that this should be a devolved responsibility to Faculties. Faculties should ensure that all Schools have mechanisms to approve research in undergraduate and postgraduate taught dissertations when ethical approval is required. It was agreed that signposting students to these procedures is the role of the dissertation supervisor.

The central Teaching and Learning Support Office (TLSO) has been actioned to produce some guidance for taught students seeking ethical approval.

**Discussed:** All Schools have procedures in place, for the screening of all research activity undertaken by taught students, to address / approve any ethical considerations and risks. SALC has a stepped process for such considerations. Concern was expressed that the ethical consideration / approval forms provided by the University are unwieldy.

**Agreed:**  It was agreed that it would be helpful for the Faculty to establish a small working group to look at the approval of ethics procedure and related forms.

**Action: Lisa McAleese** to establish a Faculty working group, with relevant Professional Support Service staff in Schools.

**Ref 8 Faculty Course Unit Database**

**Reported:** Lisa McAleese had sent an email (01/12/14) to T&L / UG Managers about the development of the new Faculty Course Units web page on the Faculty’s corporate pages and asked Schools to check the data and submit any anomalies to Philip Moores by 16 January 2015.

**Noted:**  Having briefly checked the data, some Schools reported there are some anomalies and it is not clear where in Campus Solutions (CS) the information is being pulled from. However, members agreed that the development of the new Course Units page was a welcome development.

**Action:**  Schools to check the data and report back any anomalies to Philip Moores by 16/01/15.

**Ref 8 Student Exclusion and access**

**Reported:** The issue of student exclusion and what happens to their access was discussed at the SAMG Student Records Maintenance sub-group meeting in October 2014.

If a student fails their programme and is administratively withdrawn from their programme in CS, they will get a status of CN in CS. If a student has status of CN or DC they are not included in feeds to IT systems and their account is immediately deactivated, meaning that students cannot view their results on-line.

It was agreed by the sub-group that the sensible approach seemed to be that students who were failed were written to by email on the same day that results were made available on-line and they were not withdrawn until 20 days post result (the length of time they have to appeal). Such an approach would however potentially have an impact on Tier 4 reporting (Sian Nash has met with Sophie Hargreaves) and on the HESA returns (Sian Nash will be meeting with Roger Starling to discuss this further).

**Noted:**  It was suggested that a sensible work around could be to administratively withdraw the student but then ask IT to grant them IT access for 20 days following their withdrawal.

**Action: Lisa McAleese** to update TLAN with any agreed actions.

**4. Guidance for Staff on the International Student Census**

**Received:** Draft Guidance for Staff on the Internal Student Census.

**Reported:** Erika Buzink has recently taken up the position of International Student Support Adviser. She has been working on the census between July – October 2014 and has taken the opportunity to rewrite the Guidance to reflect feedback from colleagues involved in administering the census and from UNIAC.

The Guidance is still draft at the moment and staff will be notified of the signed-off Guidance via the DSO Bulletin.

*Secretary’s Note: Information about the Tier 4 Student January Census and the rewritten Guidance appeared in the DSO Bulletin of 16 December 2014.*

**Reported:** There are four census points a year (January; May; July; October) to provide points of face to face contact with international students, in addition to the attendance monitoring of registered students undertaken in Schools.

Section 2.3 of the Guidance refers to a ‘short face to face interaction with each Tier 4 student’ which is a requirement in the regulations for institutions with Highly Trusted Sponsor status and it is important that if we are audited we have records of where each Tier 4 student is. It is important that students know that they are being seen for UKVI purposes.

In the Guidance there is a sample email which can be sent to students to inform them of the International Student Census. In SALC the initial email sent to PGR students has been softened and this has worked well in ensuring that students attend the census point.

**Action: Erika Buzink** to consider including a softer email communication in the Guidance and the current example being used where Schools are struggling to get their students to attend.

There is a facility in CS to create a checklist to record whether or not a Tier 4 student has attended the census point. A number of codes are available to note the reason for a student absence from a census point; these have now been split into the academic career of the student (i.e. UG / PGT / PGR). There is a query code (QRY) available which can be assigned to the checklist when it is unclear what code should be assigned to a student or what action should be taken. The Student Immigration Team will be running reports every couple of days during the census periods and will contact those Schools who have assigned a QRY code to the checklists.

The website <http://www.raid.manchester.ac.uk/international-office/tier4/census/>) is being further developed and will contain the list of codes for ease of reference as well as a sharing practice section of the different activities / events Schools are using to tie in with the census dates e.g. CEAS are using a compulsory careers event, during the census period, as a Tier 4 contact point. Events being used as the check points during the census period should be checked with the Student Immigration Team. Where events attendance has substituted attendance at a census check point students should be informed, by email, that this is the case and be sent the leaflet in appendix 5 of the Guidance; a record should be kept of such emails.

It was suggested that the census points be allocated a course unit code so that they can be added to the students’ timetable. It was also suggested that Academic Advisor meetings could be scheduled during the census points which could be used as a substitute for the census check point.

**Action: Schools** to check with Erika Buzink / Sophie Hargreaves whether events that are held during the census points are appropriate to be used for the Tier 4 contact point.

**Action: Schools** to provide Erika Buzink with any other comments on the Guidance and the census process.

**5. Common Faculty dates for publication of student results.**

**Agreed:** The following dates for the publication of student results were agreed for 2015:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Results** | **Date 2014** | **Date 2015** |
| Final Year UG course unit marks | 17 June 2014 | 16 June 2015 |
| PGT course unit marks (progression) \* | 17 June 2014 | 16 June 2015 |
| UG resit marks \*\* | 5 September 2014 | 11 September 2015 |
| PGT final results | 21 November 2014 | 20 November 2015 |

\* In order for Masters’ level students who were exiting with a PG Certificate or PG Diploma to be included on the graduation lists (July ceremonies) their results need to be entered on Campus Solutions by the same date as final results for UG students.

**Noted: \*\*** The start of the 2015/16 academic year is a week later than in previous years; the 1st semester starts on 21 September 2015.

**Action: TLAN members** to disseminate the publication dates to relevant members of their team.

**6. Recording of Data on Student Placements and Fieldwork in Campus Solutions**

**Reported:** On 30 July 2014 the SSO Bulletin (142) detailed information on the requirement to record minimum information on Campus Solutions for all students registered on campus-based undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes but studying away from the University on a placement or equivalent activity for more than one day.

The purpose of collecting this data is:

•To enable staff to find information on students away from the university without need to look at School based spreadsheets.

•To allow for a number of users across the institution to draw off data to be used for managing emergency situations.

At the University’s Annual Performance Review meeting in November 2014 Clive Agnew sought confirmation that all faculties were using this facility.

**Noted:**  A new student placement management system is being implemented for use across the University for the purpose of managing placement data. This is due to be rolled out for use over the next academic year. In the interim limited information should be recorded on CS.

**Discussed:** Schools are recording the required data on CS.A large number of PGT students are away from the University during the dissertation period of their programme, it was queried whether or not information should be recorded for these students. It was also queried whether or not information should be recorded for those students undertaking fieldwork. A number of students can undertake placements / fieldwork in dangerous countries, these are all risk assessed before students go. It was queried whether or not a field could be added to CS to indicate that a risk assessment had been undertaken.

**Action: Lisa McAleese** to seek clarity on the above queries.

**7. Changes to the Faculty’s Policy for Late Submission**

**Reported:** In September 2012 the Faculty of Humanities introduced a Penalty for Late Submission Scheme whereby coursework (including dissertations) submitted after the published deadline, without authorised approval, would be subject to a loss of 10 marks per day, for up to 10 days.

**Noted:**  Late submission penalty schemes ensure that students who submit coursework / dissertations late do not receive an unfair advantage over their peers who submit by the published deadline.

**Reported:** At the Humanities Teaching & Learning Committee (HTLC) meeting of 8 October 2014 it was agreed that where a student has demonstrated that they have achieved the intended learning outcomes (ILOs), as indicated by the initial award of a pass mark prior to the application of the late penalty that the student should NOT be required to resubmit the assignment, rather the assignment submitted is treated as a resubmission and the Regulations applied accordingly.

**Discussed:** In SALC, wherea student is required to undertake a resit of a component element of a course unit, the resit normally takes the form of an examination (in August) which assesses the intended learning outcomes of the whole course unit.

There is no way of noting down on the examination grid that the initial submission is being treated as a resubmission.

**Reported:** Implementation of the Penalty for Late Submission Scheme has caused some concern about potentially disproportionate impacts on either a student’s progression or the classification of the final award e.g. implementing the penalty scheme for coursework submitted 2 minutes after the deadline could result in failure of the unit, which could bring down an overall borderline mark, or mean that a PGT student could not be awarded a Distinction. This was felt to be disproportionate, as 2 minutes would not confer an unfair advantage, but 23 hrs. and 58 minutes may, yet the same 10 mark deduction is applied to both.

It was agreed by HTLC that when a student submits a piece of work late, but on the same day as the published submission deadline, the penalty should still be applied, but a note should be placed on the examination grid to indicate that the work was submitted within the same calendar day of the submission deadline, to ensure that the impact is taken into account e.g. on progression or overall outcome.

**Discussed:** There are logistical problems involved with placing a note on the examination grid, such as:

* Keeping records of every student’s late submission penalty for every piece of work, which would require checking each piece of work to see if a record needs to be produced;
* Checking to see if a penalty had been applied and if the late submission was on the same day as the deadline and then recording this somewhere;
* Collating the records for the examination boards and adding them to the examination grids would be extremely time consuming;
* There would need to be a mechanism in the system to allow a note or suffix to be applied to the examination grid.

A number of Schools set a deadline for submission but then have a grace period of an hour whereby any assignments submitted in this period are not penalised (this hours grace period is not advertised to students). This is to allow for any issues with Turnitin timing out when students are trying to submit their assignment close to the published deadline or to ensure that mitigating circumstances do not need to be submitted for unforeseeable circumstances which have led to a delayed submission.

The Global MBA programmes ensure that the submission deadline is set to the local time in the centres across the world, due to the time differences.

SALC has a late submission box for hard copy assignments to be posted when the office is closed.

Some suggested ways forward were:

* A diktat is issued from the Faculty that all Schools allow an hours grace from the published submission deadline in which a late assignment will not be penalised; this must apply to both on-line and hard copy submission.
* The Late Submission Penalty is revised to a loss of 5 marks for submission after the published deadline but on the same submission day.
* It is investigated as to whether or not a suffix can be applied to the examination grid indicating that a piece of work was submitted after the published deadline but on the same day. Further work would then need to be done to work out how this is managed administratively.

**Action: Lisa McAleese** to inform HTLC of the above discussions.

**8. Attendance Monitoring and Resit Examinations Processes**

**Received:** Humanities Attendance Monitoring Review scoping document and Humanities Resit Exams Review scoping document produced by the Change Management and Process Improvement Team.

**Reported:** Following the last TLAN Sarah Featherstone, Morag Guilfoyle and Lisa McAleese met with Mike Smith and Cath Dyson from the Change Management Process Improvement Team (CMPI) to look at how they could help the Faculty with Attendance Monitoring and Resit Exams processes.

**Noted:**  The workshops will take between one and two days to deliver and will be hosted in H15 Sackville Street in the CMPI Team offices. The timing of the workshops should not be around the first semester examination period or the start of semester II, but should be held before May 2015.

**Agreed:**  The scope of the proposed projects were agreed.

**Action: Lisa McAleese** to inform Mike Smith / Cath Dyson that the project scopes have been agreed and to arrange for a doodle poll to be issued for suitable dates for the workshops.

**9. Process for reviewing Higher Education (HEAR) statements**

**Reported:** At the Faculty’s Teaching and Learning Away-day held in September 2014 which was attended by Teaching and Learning / UG / PGT Directors we discussed what is our teaching, learning and student experience story in Humanities and came up with a number of themes:

• Research-led teaching applied to real-world relevance (Not just about staff research inputting into the curriculum but about learning through research)

• Innovative (teaching, application of technology, blended learning)

• International (Students, staff, curricula)

• Opportunity (to select from and benefit from a full portfolio; Inter and multidisciplinary study [joint programmes, University College]; Mentoring; UG contact hours; engagement between staff and students)

• Self-development (Confidence and self-belief of our students; Soft skills, transferable skills; employable)

• Manchester (Opportunity to involve the City of Manchester in the student experience [curricula, use within teaching])

It was discussed how we communicate our story to different audiences (prospective students, current students, employers, staff) and a number of actions were determined one of which was to define a process to ensure all HEAR statements are reviewed & that the aforementioned themes are reflected.

Having looked at a small sample of HEAR statements there are a number of grammatical and spelling errors which does not portray the University in a good light. The central TLSO were responsible for initially collating and entering the Academic Plan Achievement data (i.e. HEAR statement) into CS.

*Secretary’s Note: It has also been noted that the Academic Plan Achievement data has not been added to new programmes which have recently been approved and set up on CS. A process needs to be put in place to ensure this happens routinely.*

Currently Schools do not review the HEAR statements and do not have access to change the Academic Plan Achievement data on CS.

**Action: Lisa McAleese** to discuss the process of updating the Academic Plan Achievement data with the central TLSO.

*Secretary’s Note: The University has a Monitoring Approval and Review (MAR) working group and the issue of updating / reviewing the Academic Plan Achievement data could be factored into the business of this group in terms of programme approval and continual monitoring which the group is looking at. Geoff Carter (Chair of the Group) is currently discussing the HEAR with colleagues in the TLSO and this will be an agenda item for discussion at the January 2015 meeting of the University’s Teaching and Learning Management Group (of which Lisa McAleese is a member).*

**10. Industrial Action**

**Received:** A document entitled ‘Preparation for industrial action’,prepared by the Associate Dean for Teaching, Learning and Students.

**Noted:**  The document is an initial draft outlining what needs to be undertaken in preparation for any further industrial action, with Heads of School being the intended audience. Fiona Smyth, Associate Dean Teaching, Learning and Students is meeting with Clive Agnew Vice President Teaching, Learning and Students on 17 December 2014 to discuss the potential implications on the Faculty for any further assessment boycotts.

**Reported:** On 6 November 2014 University and College Union (UCU) members began an assessment boycott which impacted on some of the PGT Examination Boards, resulting in the Faculty holding a Faculty level Examination Board.In January 2015 it is highly likely that there will be a call for further action.

As with the previous action short of a strike, it is likely that any additional action will include a boycott of student assessment and examinations activity; as previously this will include traditional essay setting and marking, but also setting and assessment of any student work which contributes to the award or classification of a degree, including, for example, the setting or assessment of projects and dissertations, laboratory and other practical work, performance (e.g. in music or drama) and supervised practice (e.g. in teacher education). As previously it is likely that all administration associated with formal student assessment would also be included in the boycott.

**Discussed:** The document states that ‘Schools should look to collect in assessments early so as to ensure that where assessments are not set there is sufficient time to prepare alternative assessments. SALC have already approached their disciplines about this and they are unprepared to do this as it goes against what the action short of a strike is about.

The document states that ‘external markers can be ‘bought in’ so long as they are not bought in through an agency. It was queried whether the external markers have to be appointed officially and if so by whom and whether or not they would have to be treated as casual staff and therefore go through the same process for appointment as is being put in place for external examiners. It was queried whether or not there will be guidance issued from the University / Faculty on how to ‘buy in’ external markers.

The document states that ‘GTAs may act as markers for modules’ clarity is sought as to whether or not GTAs can mark level 3 UG work and PGT work.

The document states that ‘marking completed by external markers and GTAs should be overseen by a member of teaching staff in line with the University of Manchester Assessment Framework’ and concern was expressed that those staff who were not involved in the boycott would be expected to do this and the impact on their WAM.

The document states that ‘Markers should have access to the BB site’ and it was noted that we will need a faster IT process for this as external markers will need to be given a spot ID to access BB.

The document states that feedback should be provided in a timely fashion in line with the University’s Assessment Framework and that if ‘feedback is not available within these timescales, schools should communicate this to students’ and confirmation was sought that this meant that, in these circumstances, that the feedback policy does not need to be adhered to.

The document states that feedback and marks must be released to all students at the same time and clarity is sought that this is the University’s position as there is concern that if feedback / marks are available but not released that the student would have the right to appeal. Concern was also expressed that the boycott may lead to an increase in student appeals as students could feel that they could claim that delays in feedback on one module meant that they were not informed about what they needed to know / do to improve for their next assignment.

The document states that ‘if internal moderators cannot be found, then external markers may be able to act as moderators…’ clarity was sought that the intention was for the external markers and not external examiners to do this.

The document states that ‘when a case of academic malpractice has been identified by the school academic malpractice officer then the case will be referred onto the school or the Faculty in line with normal practice’ and it was queried what would happen if that person is involved in the boycott.

TLAN members would like clarification on what the process is if an academic member of staff, with a specific role e.g. assessment officer, is involved in the boycott. Who would undertake this role and who is responsible for ensuring the role is undertaken?

TLAN members would like to know whether or not the semester I date for publication of results can be moved by the University.

TLAN members want to know how the PSS will know which academics are on industrial action. Staff are under no obligation to inform management in advance as to whether they will be taking part in strike action or action short of a strike. The way the PSS did this during the last boycott was to check marking activity on BB, however this is not a fool-proof way of dealing with this as some staff leave marking to the last minute. PSS don’t want to issue scripts / assignments to those staff on industrial action in case they sit on it and don’t mark it (there is also potential for scripts / assignments to be misplaced if the boycott drags on).

TLAN members would welcome a standard response to be included in FAQs to students about what we are doing to ensure minimal disruption in order to mitigate against student appeals.

TLAN members are concerned that some final year students will already have jobs lined up dependant on their final classification / results and that we could potentially face appeals from students (or even be sued for potential loss of earnings).

**Action: Lisa McAleese** to inform the Associate Dean of these discussions.

**11. Changes to the Timetable (room bookings) and when students have made their Course Unit Choices**

**Received:** Papers ‘Changes to the Timetable’ and ‘numbers of students selected course units by 27/08/14’

**Reported:** The papers have been produced by the University’s Timetabling Manager.

**Discussed:** It was suggested that, the graph indicating the volume of remedy calls to CTS changes by day for the period 01/09/14 – 03/10/14 should also have included the month of August, when the actual room allocations are made. It was noted that non room allocations impacts on the change requests needing to be made.

**Discussed:** In order to produce personalised timetables a common deadline for course unit selection for returning students was agreed as 10 August 2014. A report of the number of returning students who had completed by 27 August 2014 had been produced; SALC 69%; Law 85.3%; SEED 3.1%; SoSS 65.3%; MBS 51.4%. It was reported that a large number of students in SEED want to make their selections in September when the course unit meetings are held. In SALC it is difficult to engage those students who are on study abroad with the process by 10 August as they don’t receive their marks until the August resit examination boards and are therefore not on the right academic standing to be able to make their choices.

**12. Text Messaging Students.**

**Reported:** The Faculty ofMedical and Human Sciences (MHS) is currently working on implementing a text messaging system, in order to communicate with students in the event of a lecture being cancelled, reminder of exam rooms etc. The system being implemented is managed by a company called Meercat. MHS wondered if Humanities would be interested in joining MHS in implementing this system so that Meercat could be approached to see if they would be prepared to come to some agreement regarding reduced costs for the service.

**Discussed:** SALC, SoSS and MBS all currently use the Meercat system to communicate with their undergraduate students for a variety of reasons e.g. room changes, DLHI, Tier 4 census etc. The system is quite labour intensive as the School has to input all the students’ mobile phone numbers. It was suggested that, in order to potentially achieve maximum cost reductions, this should be a University initiative rather than one taken by individual schools / faculties. SALC, SoSS and MBS are happy for MHS to include their usage of the system in their negotiations. It was also suggested that advice should be sought from the University’s Communications Team as to whether such communications would be better delivered

**Action: Lisa McAleese** to inform Vanessa Mulholland of the above discussions.

**13. A.O.B**

**13.1 Dissertation Submission**

**Discussed:** It was queried whether or not, as prescribed in the Guidance for the Presentation of Taught Masters Dissertations, it is still a requirement for dissertations to be soft-bound or hard bound with gold lettering on the spine. It was agreed that given that dissertations are no longer kept in the library and that on-line submission is becoming more commonplace than this strict requirement is no longer applicable. If a School requires a hard copy submission then this must adhere to the Additional Costs Policy.

*Secretary’s Note: This issue was also discussed at the 3 April 2014 meeting. The following is an extract of the notes of that meeting: ‘It was agreed that the requirement for a hard / soft bound copy is no longer required. Historically this was a requirement as the dissertations were kept in the Library. It was agreed that if a School required a hard copy submission of the dissertation then another form of binding e.g. channel binding / spiral binding would be sufficient for the purposes of marking and that Schools should not require their students to conform with the requirement for a hard / soft bound copy (as stated in the Presentation of PGT Dissertations guidance). If a student wishes to hard / soft bind their dissertation then that is their choice. TLAN members to ensure that all staff and PGT students are informed (via the appropriate means) that where a hard copy of the PGT dissertation is required for marking purposes then channel binding / spiral binding is acceptable.’*

**13.2 Use of the Marquee for Graduation**

**Discussed:** SALC have 600+ guests for graduation celebrations and are finding it difficult to find a venue to accommodate such numbers. The School has approached Jonathan Minshull (Head of Catering Operations) to see whether or not it would be possible to add extra sections to the marquee used at graduation to accommodate extra numbers, to no avail.

**Action: SALC** to contact Michelle Harper (Faculty Estate Officer) for advice.

**Summary Action List**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item** | **Action** | **By Whom** |
| 3 – Ref 4 | Establish a Faculty working group, with relevant Professional Support Service staff in Schools, to look at the ethical approval process / forms in the Faculty. | Lisa McAleese |
| 3 – Ref 8 | Check the data in the new (draft) Faculty Course Units web page on the Faculty’s corporate pages and report back any anomalies to Philip Moores by 16/01/15. | Schools |
| 3 – Ref 8 | Update TLAN members with any agreed actions re student exclusion and IT access. | Lisa McAleese |
| 4 | Check with Erika Buzink / Sophie Hargreaves whether events that are held during the census points are appropriate to be used for the Tier 4 contact point. | Schools |
| 4 | Provide Erika Buzink with any other comments on the Guidance for Staff on the International Student Census and the census process itself. | Schools |
| 5 | Disseminate the agreed publication of student result dates for 2015 to relevant members of team. | TLAN members |
| 6 | Seek clarity on the following in relation to the Recording of Data on Student Placements and Fieldwork in Campus Solutions:   * whether or not information should be recorded for students who are away from the University during their dissertation period. * whether or not information should be recorded for those students undertaking fieldwork. * whether or not a field could be added to CS to indicate that a risk assessment had been undertaken. | Lisa McAleese |
| 7 | Inform HTLC of the discussions re the Faculty’s Late Submission Policy | Lisa McAleese |
| 8 | inform Mike Smith / Cath Dyson that the project scopes have been agreed and arrange for the CMIP Team to issue a doodle poll for suitable dates for the workshops. | Lisa McAleese |
| 9 | Discuss the process of updating the Academic Plan Achievement data in CS (HEAR statement) with the central TLSO. | Lisa McAleese |
| 10 | Inform the Associate Dean of the discussions re the document Preparation for industrial action. | Lisa McAleese |
| 12 | Inform Vanessa Mulholland of the discussion re the use of text messaging system. | Lisa McAleese |
| 13.2 | Contact Michelle Harper (Faculty Estate Officer) for advice on suitable venues for graduation events. | SALC |

**Date of next Meeting** – 5 February 2015, 10.00-12.00, Ken Kitchen Room, John Owens Building.