Imperial College
London

QUALITY ASSURANCE & ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE

The minutes of the Quality Assurance & Enhancement Committee (QAEC)
held on
Tuesday 8th October 2013

Present:
Professor Debra Humphris, Vice Provost (Education) - Chair
Dr Simon Archer, College Tutor
Professor Nigel Gooderham, Senior College Consul
Professor Dot Griffiths, Head of Programmes, Imperial College Business School
Ms Natalie Kempston, ICU Deputy President (Education)
Dr Paul Lickiss, Reader in Organometallic Chemistry, Department of Chemistry
Dr David McPhail, Deputy Director of the Graduate School
Ms Lorna Richardson, Academic Registrar
Professor Alan Spivey, Director of Education, Faculty of Natural Sciences
Ms Sophie White, Senior Assistant Registrar (Quality Assurance & Enhancement)

In attendance:
Dr Collin Cotter, Senior Lecturer, Department of Mathematics – for item 9
Dr John Gibbons, Director of Postgraduate Studies, Department of Mathematics – for item 9
Mr Chris Harris, Quality Assurance & Enhancement Manager, Faculty of Medicine
Dr Julie King, Director of English Language Support Unit – for item 7
Mr David Lefevre, Director of Educational Technology Unit, Imperial College Business School – for item 11
Mr Colin Love, Director of Undergraduate Studies, Imperial College Business School – for item 8
Mr Calum MacLeod, Management Trainee
Mr Richard Monk, Assistant Registrar (Senate & Academic Review)
Professor Richard Thompson, Senior Consul, Faculty of Natural Sciences - for item 10
Mrs Clare Scheibner, Assistant Registrar (Quality Assurance & Enhancement) – Secretary

Apologies:
Professor Peter Cheung, Vice Dean Education, Faculty of Engineering
Professor Sue Smith, Deputy Director of Education, Faculty of Medicine
Mr Andreas Thomik, GSU President
Professor Denis Wright, Director of Student Support

Agenda

Paper

1. Welcome and Apologies

Professor Debra Humphris welcomed members to the meeting and apologies, as listed above, were noted.

2. Minutes **QAEC.2013.01**

The minutes of the Quality Assurance & Enhancement Committee (QAEC) held on 1st July 2013 were approved.

3. Matters arising from the Minutes

3.1 Matters arising not appearing elsewhere on the agenda were discussed.

3.1.1 Further to Minute 3.1.1 regarding revised regulations for resit examinations for all undergraduate degree programmes, it was noted that the changes had been communicated and text sent to departments for use in Student Handbooks in 2013-4.

3.1.2 Further to Minute 4.1.2 regarding methods of dealing with borderline candidates at Master's level, it was noted that Mr Calum MacLeod, Management Trainee, Registry, would be taking this forward.

3.1.3 Further to Minute 6.4.3 regarding a comparison of the National Student Survey 2013 and SOLE results, it was reported that the Registry Surveys Team were investigating whether any direct comparisons could be made.

3.1.4 Further to Minute 9.1 regarding guidance on items for inclusion in Research Student Handbooks. It was noted that the guidance was produced in time for the start of term and an enhanced version would be created for 2014-5.

3.1.5 Further to Minute 10.1, it was noted that additional revisions to the procedures for providing External Examiners with Examination scripts had now been completed and communicated to departments.

3.1.6 Further to Minute 11.1.2, it was reported that where possible harmonisation of routine, periodic and accreditation review paperwork was in progress in line with the Education and Student Strategy commitment to streamline quality assurance processes.

3.1.7 Further to Minute 16 it was noted that in response to the Research Council's (RCUK) Statement of Expectations for Doctoral Training, the Graduate School were considering whether any changes should be made to the research degree precepts.

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

4. Quality Assurance & Enhancement Committee (QAEC) Terms of Reference & Membership **QAEC.2013.02**

The Committee approved the following amendments to the QAEC terms of reference and membership for the 2013-4 academic session.

- The inclusion of the following item to the terms of reference, *to give initial consideration to all proposals for joint degrees with other higher education institutions.*
- Addition of the Director of Learning and Teaching to the membership.
- A correction to the spelling of Dr Lickiss.

5. Chair's Action Taken on Behalf of the Committee

The Committee noted that Chair's Action had been taken to appoint an External Examiner for the Business School Summer School Pilot which had run during July and August 2013.

6. Education and Student Strategy **QAEC.2013.03**

The Chair advised the Committee that the Education and Student Strategy 2013-8 would be made publicly available on the Education Office webpages shortly. The Committee also heard that Ms Emma Caseley, Head of Strategic Projects, would be focusing on turning the actions of the four main objective areas within the strategy in to work areas. The Education Office webpages would contain details of the actions and Working Groups focusing on those objectives which could be found at http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/education-and-student-strategy/actionplan

7. Requirements for English language for Overseas Students **QAEC.2013.04**

The Committee consider a paper outlining the issues faced by the College regarding English language requirements.

7.1 Dr Julie King, Director of English Language Support Unit (ELSU) informed the Committee that the current International English Language Testing System (IELTS) and Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) entry requirements for overseas students were not currently comparable. Dr King explained that for postgraduate students, a higher attainable score was required for TEOFL than IELTS. Dr King proposed that a review of the current minimum IELTS and TOEFL scores be carried out to harmonise scores and set a College agreed minimum standard.

7.2 The Committee discussed the issue with Dr King in some detail and it was suggested that the Postgraduate IELTS score be raised to 7 which would be more comparable with the current TOEFL requirement. Dr King advised the Committee that there was a significant difference in the difficulty level between the current score of 6.5 to the proposed score of 7.

7.3 In light of Dr King's advice the Committee agreed that a Working Group, led by the ELSU, would be set up to consult widely with the faculties and departments regarding the alignment of current TOEFL and IELTS requirements and to propose the minimum English language entry requirement for undergraduate and postgraduate students. The Working Group would consider relevant data such as TOEFL/IELTS entry requirements of other HE Institutions with comparable courses (STEM subjects) and Imperial's current student TOEFL/IELTS scores on admission.

7.4 The Committee also agreed that ELSU should provide guidance of equivalent IELTS and TOEFL scores for those departments who wish to set higher entry requirements than the College agreed minimum.

7.5 The Committee noted that prior to the meeting the paper had been considered via e-mail by the following Committee's members, Postgraduate Research Quality Committee (PRQC), Masters Quality Committee's (BEPS & MLSPD) and Undergraduate Admissions Committee (UAC). The overall responses had been supportive of the proposal for harmonisation of IELTS and TOEFL scores and may be supportive of a raise to the current postgraduate IELTS requirement from 6.5 to 7. Any change to the entry requirements would be for the 2015-6 entry.

Action: Julie King

8. Business School Summer School Pilot **QAEC.2013.05**

The Committee considered a report summarising the Summer School Pilot which had been run by the Business School during July and August 2013.

8.1 Mr Colin Love, Director of Undergraduate Studies, Imperial College Business School, informed the Committee that the pilot was run during July using Business School facilities as a four week programme. Mr Love explained that despite a late start to recruitment student targets had been exceeded with 79 students registering and 78 of those going on to complete and pass the course. Students were assessed by an individual multiple choice question examination (70% weighting) and a group report/presentation (30% weighting). Students received a certificate of attendance and record of assessment.

8.2 Mr Love also informed the Committee that the External Examiner has submitted a positive report of the 2013 Summer School. The Committee would consider the report at the next meeting on the 26th November 2013.

8.3 The Committee heard that ten students who attended the Summer School Pilot had expressed firm interest in Business School taught Master's programmes with three students having registered on an MSc course for 2013-4. Mr Love further explained that the Business School considered the pilot successful and now wished to expand the offer for 2014. A key objective for 2014 Summer School would be to provide both the Business School and Imperial College with exposure to a global student audience with a credible feeder to the Business School suite of postgraduate programmes, with social media and web promotion playing a vital role. The Committee also heard that the Business School had received 'block booking' interest from Chinese and Singapore universities for summer 2014 courses.

8.4 The proposal for summer 2014 would increase the number of courses to four reflecting a wider range of Business School specialisations,

- Strategic Marketing
- Innovation & Entrepreneurship
- Strategy & Consulting
- Global Finance

8.5 The courses would be run consecutively, each for a for three week period with cohorts of approximately 100 students per course. The courses had been reduced from four weeks with the elimination of some social elements whilst maintaining academic contact and course hours. Student recruitment would be web based with a cohort target of 400 to 425 students. The academic content would match accreditation level equivalent to 3 USA credits / 7 ECTS. Mr Love confirmed that the 7 ECTS credits gained from a summer school course could not be used as part of a Master's course within the Business School although marks achieved on the Summer School may help inform decisions on an application at the admissions stage.

8.6 Mr Love confirmed that the admission criteria would include an English requirement as per current Master's requirements, a minimum IELTS score of 7 or minimum TOEFL score of 100. Consideration would be given to undergraduate students from 'recognized 'institutions and young graduates with limited business experience.

8.7 The Committee questioned the financial aspects of running the summer school courses. Mr Love confirmed that the 2013 course financial contribution had been positive, exceeding the initial forecast.

8.8 The Committee raised concerns regarding the planned growth of the Summer School and the impact of staffing levels and accommodation. Mr Love informed the Committee that Student Ambassadors had made a significant contribution to the 2013 courses, particularly to the welfare aspects of the students and they would be asked to assist again during the 2014 Summer Schools. Mr Love also confirmed that accommodation for over 400 Summer School students could be block booked within College halls. A full time administrator would be required for future courses and all teaching assistants would be provided with adequate training and support.

8.9 The Committee supported the proposal for the Summer School 2014 and agreed to recommend it for Senate approval.

8.10 The Committee asked Mr Love to give a presentation at a HoDs lunch to encourage other departments to consider adopting the concept and to share good practice and learning outcomes from the Summer School Pilot 2013. The Committee also requested that the Business School report outcomes of the 2014 Summer School, particularly relating to increased student numbers, to QAEC October 2014.

Action: Colin Love

9. MRes in Mathematics of Planet Earth **QAEC.2013.06**

The Committee received a request for strategic approval of a new joint programme, MRes in Mathematics of Planet Earth, between Imperial College London, Department of Mathematics and the University of Reading, Department of Mathematics.

9.1 The proposal was presented by Dr John Gibbons and Dr Collin Cotter. The Committee heard that the Department of Mathematics were in the process of bidding for a joint Centre for Doctoral Training (CDT) with the University of Reading. Part of the CDT proposal was to establish a joint MRes in the Mathematics of Planet Earth with the University of Reading. The proposed MRes would form part of a 1 + 3 programme, and if the CDT bid was successful, the programme would start in October 2014. The outcome of the bid would be known in November/December 2013. If the bid was unsuccessful the programme would not go ahead.

9.2 The Committee noted that Imperial would be the lead Institution in the CDT programme and therefore would assume the primary role in handling the course administration and quality assurance. The Academic lead would be Professor Dan Crisan, Director of the Mathematics of Planet Earth CDT.

9.3 Dr Gibbons stated that the only MRes attendees would be the EPSRC CDT cohort of students and predicted the initial year being a cohort of 12 students. Dr Gibbons confirmed that there may be potential growth to offer the MRes to students outside of the CDT in future years.

9.4 The Committee approved the initial strategic approval for the MRes in Mathematics of Planet Earth and agreed that the full programme proposal should be presented to the Master's Quality Committee (Business, Engineering and Physical Sciences) in November.

10. Departmental Teaching Champions **QAEC.2013.07**

The Committee considered a proposal outlining the concept to introduce Departmental Teaching Champions. Professor Richard Thompson presented the proposal which had been produced in liaison with Dr Martyn Kingsbury, Head of the Education Development Unit (EDU).

10.1 The Committee heard that Teaching Champions (TCs) would be 'teaching enthusiasts' with a range of teaching experience in their discipline. They would be actively involved in teaching their subject, be aware of the whole range of teaching in their department and be able to recognise and promote good practice and innovation in disciplinary teaching.

10.2 The aim of appointing a TC in a department would be to recognise their interest in teaching and to use their enthusiasm for teaching their subject as a way of encouraging and promoting good practice.

10.3 The Committee acknowledged that the TC would need a role description to ensure consistency across departments. The Committee also discussed how the role would be recognised and if a reward of some form should be offered for staff taking on the role.

10.4 The Committee heard that TCs would also act as advisors to the EDU by discussing departmental and disciplinary context and ideas about teaching. They would represent an important avenue for exchanging information and they would help the EDU maintain good working connections with departments.

10.5 The Committee was supportive of the proposal in principle and agreed that the role could be a positive way in which to keep the EDU informed and could act as a potential supportive role for DUGS. It was agreed that the concept and potential implementation of departmental Teaching Champions and recognition and reward of the role would be discussed further with Professor Humphris, Professor Thompson and Dr Kingsbury outside of the meeting.

Action: Debra Humphris, Richard Thompson & Martyn Kingsbury

11. E-Learning Strategy Committee Recommendations for Online Courses **QAEC.2013.08**

The Committee considered recommendations from the E-Learning Strategy Committee (ELSC) for the setting of guidelines for e-learning/blended learning which was presented by Mr David Lefevre, Director of Educational Technology Unit.

11.1 The Committee heard that courses which were delivered wholly or partly online created quality assurance issues not present in courses delivered wholly by face-to-face teaching, for example:

- Measures needed to be in place to ensure that students enrolled in online courses were those completing the work.
- Staff teaching online courses required knowledge and skills relating to teaching online.

11.2 The Committee noted that the ELSC envisaged that the majority of degree programmes would contain online elements within the next 3 to 5 years. The ELSC recommended a review of existing College Guidelines such as ensuring clauses related to e-learning and blended learning in the College's Programme Approval and Review were comprehensive and aligned with the QAA Quality Code.

11.3 The Committee also noted that the ELSC recommended separate guidelines be developed in conjunction with a member of the QAEC for degree programmes which were solely online, ensuring that they would be compatible with the wider quality assurance framework.

11.4 The Committee agreed that current College guidelines would need to be reviewed to include e-learning/blended learning. The Committee also agreed that in the longer term separate College guidelines would need to be produced should an entirely online programme be introduced.

Action: Sophie White & David Lefevre

12. Level 7 Pass Mark of Degrees in Faculty of Natural Sciences **QAEC.2013.09**

The Committee considered a proposal from the Faculty of Natural Sciences concerning the MSci final year pass mark vs. stand-alone MSc pass mark.

12.1 In order to ensure consistency in the management of academic standards within and across its degree structures, the Committee had asked the Faculty of Natural Sciences to work towards splitting the FHEQ defined Bachelor's Level 6 and Master's Level 7 material between Years 3 and 4 on the Faculty's MSci courses. This would align Year 4 of the Faculty's MSci programmes with their stand-alone Master's programs (e.g. MRes and MSc) and ultimately, the Faculty would have a standard pass mark of 50% for all Level 7 material.

12.2 Professor Alan Spivey informed the Committee that in order to achieve this, the departments within the Faculty of Natural Sciences would take the following actions for students starting the course from the 2014-5 session onwards.

12.3 Chemistry: Years 1 to 3 of the MSci program would comprise of only B Level courses and each element would have pass mark of 40%. Year 4 would comprise only M Level courses with each element having a pass mark of 50%. For re-sit purposes individual B Level courses would have a pass mark of 40% and individual M Level courses would have a pass mark of 50%.

Physics: Courses would be designated as B and M level. In Year 3, all elements, including those containing M Level courses, would have a 40% pass mark, however, for re-sit purposes, any individual M Level course must be passed at 50%. In Year 4, all elements, including those containing B Level courses, would have a 50% pass mark (and for re-sit purposes, any individual B Level courses would also have a pass mark of 50%).

Mathematics: Courses would not be designated as B or M Level during 2013-4. In Year 3 elements will have a 40% pass mark, for re-sit purposes all individual courses would also have a pass mark of 40%. In Year 4, each element (including the element containing the Mastery paper which covers some Year 3 material) would have a 50% pass mark. For re-sit purposes all individual courses, including the Mastery paper, would have a 50% pass mark.

Life Sciences: There are no MSci programmes in Life Sciences

The Committee also heard that the Faculty would take the coming academic year (2013-4), to progress towards splitting the B-Level and M-level between Years 3 and 4

further with a view to standardising the pass mark for all Level 7 material at 50%.

The Committee asked that progress be reported to QAEC during 2013-4 and that the faculty considered whether the prospectus entry for MSci Programmes needed amendment for forthcoming years.

Action: Alan Spivey

13. Examination Feedback to Students in Faculty of Natural Sciences **QAEC.2013.10**

The Committee considered a paper outlining the minimum provision in terms of feedback to undergraduate students with respect to their performance in written examinations in all four departments of the Faculty of Natural Sciences.

13.1 Professor Alan Spivey informed the Committee that the following minimum standards would be implemented from October 2013:

- Procedures for exam feedback would be clearly communicated to students at a program level at the start of the year and at a course level by lecturers at the start of lecture courses so as to manage student expectations.
- General feedback for all year 1 and year 2 examinations would include:
    - Interim marks per examination paper would be provided for January examinations
    - Examination papers
    - Selected/sample outline answers
    - Summaries by the first markers of cohort performance e.g. typical mistakes per examination question
    - Histograms and/or scatter plots of cohort performance per examination paper (unless <10 students took the paper, in which case no histogram/scatter plot is provided to prevent potential individual student identification) which would be posted onto Black Board as soon as marks were finalised within the Department
- Individual Feedback for the January exams/tests of year 1 would include:
    - Opportunity would be provided for students to discuss their examination scripts on a 1-to-1 basis with at least one staff member
    - The student's examinations scripts would be available at meetings for the discussion; these may be handed back (Maths, Physics) or retained (Chemistry, Life Science)

13.2 Ms Kempston informed the Committee that the minimum feedback would be welcomed by students in the Faculty of Natural Sciences. Ms Kempston further informed the Committee that students within the Department of Aeronautics had complained that they did not receive their marks from January examinations until the following Summer, therefore, a standardisation of student feedback across all faculties would be well received.

13.3 Mr Harris informed the Committee that individual student feedback within the Faculty of Medicine was varied however this would be addressed over the coming year with the introduction of a new tutor system.

13.4 The Committee agreed that the minimum feedback would be shared as good practice with the Faculty of Engineering, Faculty of Medicine and the Business School to ensure consistency across the College.

Action: Clare Scheibner

14. Supervisor Training **QAEC.2013.11**

The Committee considered a report from the Graduate School outlining existing arrangements for supervisor training and an action plan to improve supervision across the College. The action plan aimed to address objectives 3, 3.1 and 3.2 of the Education and Student Strategy.

14.2 It was noted that item 9 should be amended to: "*the Registry Surveys Team would provide survey results as appropriate to enable the EDU and Graduate School to consider whether there was any correlation between the number of supervisors undertaking College training courses and survey results".* This could be used as leverage to encourage staff to undertake training. It was further noted that the Postgraduate Research Evaluation Survey (PRES) was a biennial survey and therefore the results could not be provided annually.

14.3 The Committee was supportive of the proposed action plan.

14.4 Following further discussion it was queried whether Supervisor training and development could be captured effectively within the PRDP process to ensure all supervisors regardless of seniority were partaking in training. It was noted that this would need support from HoDs to implement effectively. It was agreed that QAEC would support development of courses specifically aimed at senior members of academic staff.

15. Student Surveys

15.1 National Student Survey (NSS) 2013 results **QAEC.2013.12**

The Committee considered an overview of the results from the National Student Survey 2013 and noted that the Strategic Planning Division were compiling the departmental NSS 2013 Action Plans for the Provost Board on 1st November 2013.

15.2 Summer UG Sole and TOLE 2013 **QAEC. 2013.13**

The Committee received the survey results of the UG SOLE Lecturer/Module and TOLE Personal Tutor Summer Term 2013.

15.2.1 Mr Harris confirmed that the Faculty of Medicine had struggled to engage students to participate in the survey resulting in the low participation rate. Mr Harris felt this was as a result of an inadequate user friendly survey platform as well as survey fatigue.

15.3 Surveys Working Party

The Committee received an update from the Surveys Working Party. The first meeting was held on 26th September 2013 to consider changes to the College run surveys from 2014-15 onwards. The Committee heard that the Working Party would develop a new survey strategy which would accord with stakeholder views, and that focused on key areas where feedback was needed and measurable meaningful actions could result (such that the actions rather than the surveys would drive the questions asked). The Committee also heard that interviews were currently being conducted with stakeholders. The next meeting of the Surveys Working Party would be held in December/January. [Ref. Education and Student Strategy, objective 3, 3.5].

16. Good Practice Highlighted by Periodic Reviews **QAEC. 2013.14**

The Committee considered a report of good practice which was highlighted during Periodic Reviews by External Examiners which were reported to Senate during 2012-3. The Committee heard that the areas of good practice would be added to the Quality Assurance webpages. Departments were invited to forward any further examples of good practice to Clare Scheibner, Assistant Registrar (Quality Assurance and Enhancement), c.scheibner@imperial.ac.uk

17. Representations Procedure **QAEC. 2013.15**

The Committee considered an amendment to the 'Procedure for Consideration of Representations Concerning Decisions of Boards of Examiners.' It was proposed that a timeframe for the consideration of representations by departments be added to the procedure as follows:

Departments should aim to make a formal written response to the Registry to any representation from a student within 15 working days. Where a Department needs more time to consider a particular appeal by for example convening a meeting of the full or a sub Board of Examiners an indicative timeframe for the decision must be communicated promptly to the Registry for transmission to the student.

17.2 The Committee agreed to recommend the proposed amendment for Senate approval.

18. Cheating Offences Policy and Procedures **QAEC.2013.16**

The Committee considered an amendment to the 'Cheating Offences Policy and Procedures.' It was proposed that a new clause be added to the policy to address fabrication of data. The Committee agreed that the following clause should be added to the policy.

Fabrication of data [All such cases must be referred initially to the chair of the Research Misconduct Response Group in accordance with the Procedures for Investigations into Allegations of Scientific Misconduct].

18.2 The Committee agreed to recommend the proposed amendment for Senate approval.

19. Chapter B9 of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education: Academic appeals and student complaints **QAEC.2013.17**

The Committee considered a report which mapped the indicators and expectations of Chapter B9, academic appeals and student complaints, against current College policies and procedures. The Committee agreed that the recommendations within the document be actioned by the Registry Quality Assurance Team.

Action: Sophie White

20. Chapter B4 of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education: Enabling student development and achievement **QAEC.2013.18**

The Committee considered a report which mapped the indicators and expectations of Chapter B4, enabling student development and achievement, against current College policies and procedures.

20.1 It was noted that the chapter superseded the previous 'Code of practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education' and it would therefore no longer be necessary for institutions to publish Careers Education Information and Guidance (CEIGs) in the current format. Sophie White would

approach the Careers Service regarding current published CEIGs. The Committee agreed that the Careers Service should be asked to update their website and material relating to CEIGs.

Post Meeting Note
The Careers Service stated that although it would not be possible to remove the CEIGs from the website as they formed part of the Service Level Agreement with the departments, they would remove reference to the now defunct QAA requirement from the documents.

20.2 The Committee agreed that the recommendations within the document be actioned by the Registry Quality Assurance Team.

Action: Sophie White

ITEMS TO NOTE

21. Imperial Planner- Development Framework for PGR Students **QAEC. 2013.19**

The Committee noted a proposal from the Graduate School to develop a framework and PhD Timeline for students. The PhD timeline would enable PGR students to see what training and milestones they would need to complete at each stage of their programme. Training would include, amongst other things, plagiarism awareness, professional skills development courses and other areas such as English language support.

21.1 The Committee also noted that the Graduate School had initiated a project to explore software which could be developed to incorporate the PhD timeline and facilitate communication between supervisors and students.

21.2 Ms Richardson raised the concern that the Graduate School may be investing financially in software that would be incorporated within the new student system. Dr McPhail informed the Committee that the software would be used in the interim stage whilst the new student system was implemented. It was agreed that Dr McPhail, Ms Richardson and Laura McConnell would meet to discuss this further.

Action: David McPhail, Lorna Richardson & Laura McConnell

22. College Surveys 2013-14 **QAEC.2013.20**

The Committee noted that while the Student Surveys and Feedback Working Group would be focusing on implementing changes for 2014-5, interim changes had been made to the College surveys to address the more pressing needs and concerns for the 2013-4 period.

22.1 The Committee noted that the following surveys would be run for 2013-4.

Survey	Participants	Period	Platform	External benchmarking
NSS	**Final year UG**	**Spring Term**		**Yes**

UG & PG SOLE: Lecturer/Module Evaluation (including Lab, BEST and Co-Curricular surveys)	**All UG and Master's level students**	**Termly (summer term is optional)**	**Student Viewpoint** (*if available, Qualtrics may be used for spring/summer terms)*	**No**
PTES	**Master's level (including MRes) students (except first year part-time students)**	**Spring – Summer Term** *(between 3rd Feb and 19th June 2014 – timing TBC)*	**BOS**	**Yes**
Student Experience Survey *(will include some TOLE and Student Barometer questions)*	**UG (except final year), Master's level and PGR**	**Autumn Term**	**Qualtrics**	**No**

22.2 It was clarified that the following surveys would not run for 2013-4:

- UG SOLE overall course evaluation (this would be partially replaced by an enhanced lecturer/module evaluation. The Faculty of Medicine may run their own survey based on NSS)
- PG SOLE overall course evaluation (this would be replaced by PTES which provided external benchmarking)
- Student Barometer (more questions on recruitment and induction would be added to SES and PTES. The Surveys & Feedback Working Party would decide whether to take part in future years)
- TOLE (more questions would be added to SES and where departments identified a problem with the personal tutor system from SES, the Registry Surveys Team would assist with running a bespoke survey for that department if needed)
- UG Placement Survey (partially replaced by inclusion of B3: Work Placements & Year Abroad question set in NSS and under consideration by the B10 Working Party)
- UG Project Survey
- Master's Project Survey (partially covered by PTES)
- Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES) is a biennial survey and is next due to run in 2014-5. The Surveys & Feedback Working Party would decide whether to take part.

23. QAA - UK Quality Code for Higher Education **QAEC.2013.21**

UK Quality Code, Part A, Chapter B1: Programme design and approval, **Chapter B6: Assessment of students and recognition of prior learning** and **Chapter B8: Programme monitoring and review**.

The Committee noted the final response to the QAA consultation and that the Chapters were due to be published on 31st October 2013.

http://www.qaa.ac.uk/Newsroom/Consultations/Pages/qc-consultations.aspx

24. **UK Quality Code, Chapter B2: Recruitment and Admission to Higher Education** **QAEC.2013.22**

The Committee noted the final response to the QAA consultation and that the Chapter was due to be published on 31st October 2013.
www.qaa.ac.uk/Newsroom/Consultations/Pages/recruitment-admission.aspx

25. **Review of subject benchmark statements**

The Committee noted that the QAA's next review of subject benchmark statements was due and that they were welcoming feedback about any aspect which needed updating in individual statements. The feedback received would be taken into account in deciding the level of revision required for individual statements. As the review gets underway, the QAA would be inviting professional, statutory and regulatory bodies and subject associations and networks to be involved in the review of the relevant statement. The Committee further noted that a request for volunteers had been circulated with one volunteer coming forward, Dr Lorraine Craig, whose interest has been registered with the QAA.
www.qaa.ac.uk/AssuringStandardsAndQuality/subject-guidance/Pages/Honours-degree-benchmark-statements.aspx

26. **Higher Education Review themes announced**

The Committee noted that in preparation for the launch of its new review method, Higher Education Review, QAA had published further information and guidance about the thematic elements for 2013-15. The thematic element would focus on an area which is regarded as particularly worthy of further analysis or enhancement. It would be selected by the Higher Education Review Group - which would include representatives of the Higher Education Funding Council for England, Universities UK, GuildHE and Association of Colleges - and would change periodically. The themes for 2013-15 are Student Involvement in Quality Assurance and Enhancement, and Student Employability. For more information see
www.qaa.ac.uk/InstitutionReports/types-of-review/higher-education-review/Pages/default.aspx

27. **Higher Education Empirical Research (HEER) database**

The Committee noted that the HEER database could provide a quick and easy way to keep up to date with the latest research in higher education. The database would provide summaries of the latest published research on a range of higher education topics, and had been redeveloped by QAA to provide a user-friendly service and would be free to register.

27.1 The Committee also noted that only relevant, robust and reliable articles would included, and research summaries were catalogued by theme to enable access to information quickly and effectively, with clear signposting to full original sources. Email alerts could be sent straight to an inbox when any new research was added matching chosen themes.
http://heer.qaa.ac.uk/pages/default.aspx

28. **Good practice case studies**

The Committee noted that in addition to the examples of good practice identified in the QAA review reports, the QAA had published several case studies supplied by higher education providers, giving full details of the initiatives regarded as good practice, why these were developed, and how they were evaluated. The QAA hoped

that these would stimulate discussion among practitioners and students in higher education, and promote enhancement of the learning experience.

28.1 The Committee further noted some examples of case studies which had been published so far, these included:

- Bangor University, Dyslexia Support The work of the Miles Dyslexia Centre, where research had enhanced support provision across the University and more widely.
- Bangor University, Peer Guide Scheme: The Peer Guide Scheme, which provided an excellent introduction to student life at Bangor University.
- Ravensbourne, Industry Links: Ravensbourne fosters close relations with industry, which both influence its culture and support its preparation of students for obtaining and succeeding in graduate employment.
- Royal Agricultural University, Supporting Students with Disabilities: The College's active and inclusive consideration of issues to support learning opportunities for students with disabilities.
- University of Leeds, Widening Participation: The extensive development and success of initiatives which contributed to the University's widening participation strategy.

www.qaa.ac.uk/ImprovingHigherEducation/GoodPractice/Pages/Good-Practice-Case-Studies-.aspx

29. Guidance for higher education providers and current and prospective students

The Committee noted the QAA, working with partners across the higher education sector, had published new guidance on four of the areas that students had identified as key concerns: workload, class size, staff teaching qualifications and how institutions respond to student feedback. The guidance was intended to support providers in making information available to current and prospective students, and advise students on the questions to ask and the aspects of the learning experience to consider when applying for a higher education course.
www.qaa.ac.uk/ImprovingHigherEducation/Pages/guidance-documents.aspx

30. Any Other Business

There were no other items of business.

31. Dates of next meetings 2013-4

Tuesday 26th November 2013, 10am-1pm, Ballroom, 58 Prince's Gate
Thursday 16th January 2014, 10am-1pm Ballroom, 58 Prince's Gate
Tuesday 4th March 2014, 10am - 1pm, Ballroom, 58 Prince's Gate
Tuesday 1st April 2014, 10am - 1pm, Ballroom, 58 Prince's Gate
Thursday 5th June 2014, 10am -1pm, Ballroom, 58 Prince's Gate
Tuesday 1st July 2014, 10am -1pm, Ballroom, 58 Prince's Gate

32. Reserved Areas of Business

None received.