

### Present

Professor Andrea Buraschi, Ms Leila Guerra, Professor Richard Jardine, Ms Krystal Lau, Heather Lincoln, Dr Ralf Martin, Dr Edgar Meyer (Chair), Dr Yuri Mishina, Dr Iro Ntonia, Ms Veronica Russell, Dr Paolo Taticchi Ms Karen Tweddle (Secretary), Ms Kirstie Ward

### Apologies

Mr Alejandro Luy, Dr Anne ter Wal

### 192 Welcome and Apologies

Apologies, as above, were noted. Dr Ralf Martin, who was attending on behalf of Dr Namrata Malhotra whilst she was on sabbatical, was welcomed to his first meeting.

### 193 Minutes of Previous Meeting and Matters Arising [BEC2018.19]

193.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> November 2018 were considered. It was noted that Professor Buraschi was present and that there was a typo in 176.1 which should read ESMT. With these amendments the minutes were approved as an accurate record.

193.2 [BEC172.2] Discussions regarding the purpose and format of the student satisfaction question were ongoing and were being considered in the wider context of College discussions on the right way to evaluate teaching and the student experience. The student satisfaction element of the School's current evaluation form was where students provided a score out of 5 in response to the statement: "overall I am satisfied with the programme this term". In addition students were asked to provide comments on the best aspects of their programme (encouraged to provide 3 highlights) and what could be improved (encouraged to provide 3 suggestions). It was suggested that if we could not analyse the reasons for a declining student satisfaction score then the School should stop asking it or ask additional questions that will be more useful, although there was concern regarding asking additional questions due to survey fatigue and over-surveying students. It was agreed that the Chair would ask the Deans' Student Advisory Council for their views on the student satisfaction question and whether they found it meaningful.

**Action: Dr Edgar Meyer**

193.3 [BEC177.1] Diversity Committee had recommended that all students undertake unconscious bias training. This would be discussed further under 'Any Other Business'.

### ITEMS TO CONSIDER

### 194 Surveys

#### **UG SOLE Lecturer/Module Autumn Term Results [BEC2018.20]**

#### **PG MODES Lecturer/Module Autumn Term Results [BEC2018.21]**

194.1 Members considered the above results. The School's action in relation to faculty and Teaching Assistants receiving low scores was queried. The Associate Dean for Education Quality monitored all scores and followed up with Heads of Department when scores were below the School's minimum threshold to discuss how to support the faculty member. This has included sending them on external courses or attending voice coaching sessions. Faculty scoring below the minimum threshold also trigger the School's teaching observation process where both the faculty member receiving the low score was observed but they were also encouraged to observe sessions taught by experienced faculty members. In relation to Teaching Assistants, all TAs were required to complete the GTA courses and the School was looking into providing further bespoke training on how to deal with difficult students and was working closely with the Doctoral Programme Student Representative to review how TAs were prepared for teaching.

194.2 It was suggested that going forward a brief summary in relation to the teaching scores be provided to put the scores in context, particularly for non-School members who were less familiar with School programmes.

**Action: Karen Tweddle & Edgar Meyer**

194.3 The response rate for JH/IBSc in the autumn term at 23% was below the 33% minimum requirement for the scores to be reportable. This was disappointing as the response rate for this programme last year had been one of the highest in the School. The following comments were noted in relation to response rates:

- Faculty were encouraged to ask students to complete the evaluations during the last ten minutes of the module
- Response rates for JH/IBSc were lower than the College averages but the students were only with the School for one year (like the majority of the PGT students) and therefore did not benefit individually from any changes resulting from their feedback. The response rates for the School's PGT programmes were in line with the College.
- The timing of the release of student evaluations coincided with revision and coursework submission dates and students often gave this as a reason for non-completion. The School could consider moving evaluations to the end of the year although this would mean that surveys were completed after exams and result release which was not considered to be good practice by faculty.
- Over-surveying students has resulted in survey fatigue.
- The School needed to consider what the incentive was for a student to complete an evaluation if they were satisfied with its delivery.
- Programmes which achieved response rates of 70% and above had additional funds awarded for social events.
- Making evaluations compulsory, providing credit or releasing results earlier for those that completed them would have a positive effect on response rates.

**195 PGT Entry Requirements for 2020-21 entry [BEC2018.22]**

Members considered the PGT entry requirements for 2020-21 entry. It was noted that the MSc International Management programme was not listed. There were no other amendments.

**Action: Karen Tweddle**

**196 New College Regulations for Taught Programmes of Study 2019.20: Borderline Classification and Discretion Consultation [BEC2018.23]**

196.1 The College had approved a single set of regulations for 2019/20 entry. These had previously been considered by this Committee. The College intended that the 2019/20 regulations would apply to new undergraduate students only, in part due to the expectation that programmes would not be fully aligned with the new regulations until Curriculum Review had taken place. The School was planning to request to apply the 2019/20 single set of regulations to all PGT programmes from 2019/20. This was because Curriculum Review within the School was scheduled on a programme by programme basis over a three-year period and it was not considered advisable to have different programmes on different regulations within the School during that time, particularly when different programmes shared elective modules. It was proposed that the School move to the new regulations and ask for exemption for the regulations that do not apply. It was likely that exemption would be required for only a few regulations.

196.2 In relation to the new regulations, there was a general consensus across the faculties for continuing to operate a borderline zone (reduced from 2.5% to 1%) for consideration of students who had narrowly missed out on achieving a particular classification band. The College would like to align the criteria for awarding an uplift for students who fell into the borderline zone. The agreed classification criteria in the 2019/20 regulations for PGT was that the Programme Overall Weighted Average (POWA) had to be above the threshold *and* that the final project/dissertation or equivalent also achieved a mark above the threshold. The proposed borderline criteria was:

- Where the POWA for a candidate falls between n8.50% and n9.49%, at least half of

the taught modules fall in the higher classification band and the student has achieved a mark in the higher classification band for the dissertation or equivalent, the student will be granted the higher classification.

- Or where the POWA for a candidate is at the threshold for a higher classification however the student has failed to achieve a mark in the higher band for the dissertation or equivalent the student will be granted the higher classification if the mark for this falls between n8.50% and n9.49%.

196.3 The Committee discussed whether there should be borderline consideration at all. It was commented that incorporating a borderline enabled institutions to expand where their classifications lines were, which was not necessarily a good thing. However, members did feel that it was necessary to consider exceptional cases where students had narrowly missed the higher classification. Members of the Committee were in agreement that it should be individual contribution rather than module marks that should form the basis of the borderline criteria. It was also suggested that the borderline criteria should not consider an individual that had a mark from 2 grade bands below (e.g. when considering a borderline distinction, the student should not have any marks in the 50s) so that it was only students who missed the higher classification marginally that were uplifted.

196.4 Some of the School's programmes had moved away from having a final project/dissertation. It was noted that during each Curriculum Review, programmes would need to identify the 'final synoptic piece' that would count as the final project/dissertation equivalent for the classification criteria. The group capstone projects that were now in place of some final project/dissertations might not be suitable for determining the final classification of students and an alternative may need to be identified. This should be discussed in Curriculum Review.

196.5 As mentioned above the criteria for classification in the 2019/20 regulations would be based on Programme Overall Weighted Average (POWA) and final project/dissertation or equivalent only. If the School moved to this approach for determining distinction and merit awards and away from basing classifications on performance in elements/components (grouping of modules) then we would expect to see a significant increase in the number of distinctions awarded. It was noted that the School would be able to retain additional criteria for classification in individual programme marking schemes although it was noted that this would not be in the spirit of 'a single set of regulations'. Members were asked for their views on whether it would be acceptable to increase the number of distinctions awarded. It was commented that if the School was admitting better than average students on to its programme because of high entrance requirements then this should be reflected with higher than average distinction rates upon completion. It was noted that a high distinction rate was not a result of over-marking or grade inflation. There was no evidence from External Examiner reports that the marks awarded to students were excessive. The Committee was concerned, however, about increasing distinction rates. It was suggested that the School consider marking to a curve. It was noted that this would require approval from Senate. The Chair agreed to see if there was demand for this in the School by raising it, in the first instance, with Management Board.

**Action: Dr Edgar Meyer**

**197 Admissions Reports: PGT Admissions End of Year Report 2018 Entry [BEC2018.24] and MRes Admissions End of Year Report 2018 Entry [BEC2018.25]**

Members noted the reports. It was queried why these reports looked at quantity of applications only. It was suggested that it would be helpful for them to include a quality indicator too. Karen Tweddle agreed to feed this back to the College.

**Action: Karen Tweddle**

**198 New Programme Proposal [BEC2018.26]**

Members noted a proposal that had been submitted to the College's Online Learning Innovation Group (OLIG) for a blended MSc Strategic Marketing programme. The proposal had been approved. The proposed start date of the programme was September 2020 but this was linked to faculty recruitment and may well be delayed until 2021. This programme had been identified as having a suitable growth marked and an initial cohort of 60-70 was expected. It was queried whether this would cannibalise the attendance programme but it was

commented that research suggested that students who wished to do an attendance programme did not consider online alternatives.

**199 Student Protection Plan [BEC2018.27]**

The Committee noted the Student Protection Plan. The production of this plan was an annual requirement for the Office for Students.

**ITEMS TO NOTE**

**200 Chair's Report**

Nothing to report.

**201 Senate Minutes**

The Committee noted the latest Senate minutes.

**202 Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee (QAEC) Summary Report for Senate**

The Committee noted the latest summary from the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee.

**203 FEC Reports**

The Committee noted the latest reports from the other FECs as reported to the last QAEC.

**204 Minutes of the Postgraduate Professional Development Committee (PPDC)**

The Committee noted the latest minutes from the Graduate School's Postgraduate Professional Development Committee.

**205 Any Other Business**

205.1 It was suggested that the FEC papers should (i) include consecutive page numbers and (ii) summary notes be provided for all papers wherever possible.

**Action: (i) Karen Tweddle; (ii) Edgar Meyer & Karen Tweddle**

205.2 It had been recommended that the School introduce a policy on the use of experiential/ applied learning activities asking faculty to ensure that this did not impact other scheduled modules. The following was suggested and agreed:

"When organising experiential activities such as simulations, competitions etc, that involve significant student engagement outside of lectures, faculty are asked to discuss arrangements with the relevant Programme Director and Assistant Programme Director to ensure that there is no timetabling clash or negative impact on other faculty members whilst the activity is ongoing."

205.3 Issues with student conduct had been raised in recent annual programme review meetings. It was noted that the School did have a Student Code of Conduct that was provided in the Information Guide issued at the start of the programme. It was suggested that this be moved into the Student Expectation presentation given to students during induction. It should also be shared with faculty. A stronger entry on using social media would also be added. This should mirror the current policy that was in place for staff and faculty.

**Action: Karen Tweddle**

205.4 The School is committed to providing unconscious bias and active bystander training to all students and staff. The best way to deliver this training was discussed. It was felt that it was not viable to deliver this in a face-to-face format to all. It was agreed that training should be offered online with a session in class to reinforce the key messages.

**206 Date of Next Meeting**

Tuesday 9<sup>th</sup> April 2019 at 2.00pm

*Karen Tweddle, 27/2/19*