

STUDENT EXPERIENCE COMMITTEE

NOTES of the FIRST meeting of the STUDENT EXPERIENCE COMMITTEE

in the 2017-2018 academic session held on THURSDAY 5 OCTOBER in QA075
Greenwich Maritime Campus

Present:

Anne Poulson, COO (Chair)
Paul Butler, DILS
Corinne Delage DSE, FACH
Meike Imberg, Pres SUUG
David Morris, VC Policy Officer
Chris Shelley, DSAS

Marianne Boyle, HSS
Christine Couper, DSP, PAS
Michael Flanagan, DEF
Simon Leggatt, DSE FEH
John Schless, CEO SUUG

In Attendance:

Nick Ellwood, PRO

Sarah Hills, MAR, SAS

Lynne Savage, (Secretary)SAS

Jon Sibson, PVC BUS

Apologies:

Colin Allen DSE, BUS
Mike McGibbon, DSE FES

Christopher Bustin, HIO
Iain Morrison, HMC

SEC17.01 MINUTES AND ACTIONS ARISING

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 30th May 2017 were **approved**.

Actions Arising

DSEs confirmed that a meeting had taken place to discuss “Proposal for an integrated online system to support disabled students”. An interim solution was in place.
This **closed** the agenda item.

Processes had been updated to ensure that the Aspire Funds could be used for items other than books.
This **closed** the agenda item.

Updated *Student Disciplinary Procedure, and Fitness to Practise Procedure*, had been submitted to Academic Council.

This **closed** the agenda item.

Alliance summit had not taken place, so Chair was unable to report back to SEC.

This **closed** the agenda item.

Student Experience Committee – Terms of Reference and Membership.

Revised ToR and Membership had been submitted to Academic Council.

This **closed** the agenda item.

DSE

s had worked together to standardise FAC SEC agendas.

This **closed** the agenda item.

SEC17.02 Graduate Outcomes Strategy

PVC BUS presented a paper *SEC17.P04 Strategy paper for consideration by Student Experience Committee*

PVC BUS outlined the main points of the document and the detail of why it had been written, by who and when. It was intended to support DELHI data, TEF data and LEO data.

Page 3 of the document detailed the strategy and the main themes of the roll out.

Pages 4 & 5 gave an inventory of the implementation plans – things would change considerably. The paper detailed more targeted interventions, for specific minority groups, rather than generic plans as at present. They would be asked what they wanted. Already a focus group had been set up in Business for Asian female Muslims. Early next year the PVC BUS would report back to SEC on their progress.

The strategy was aspirational in terms of resources, and it was hoped that ideas would be embedded in all areas – career paths, appraisals, job descriptions etc.

In terms of Governance they would report to SEC, and then to Academic Council.

Pres SU asked how the Faculties and ECS would work together to deliver the outcomes.

PVC BUS explained that the Faculty employability teams would work with the central ECS team, who work with other colleagues in SAS, and the Communications team. In response to further questions he felt there was a good liaison, and that they had good contact by being placed in the physical locations of Faculties.

The paper was **ratified** by SEC.

ACTION: Paper to be presented to Academic Council.

SEC17.03 Update from joint LQSC/SEC meeting

Chair reported that the joint meeting, in terms of SEC input, had related to survey information presented by PAS.

CEO SU advised that he had asked a query about SU promoting the NSS but had not heard back – he would chase.

SEC17.04 Student Complaints Procedure – amendment

Manager of AR presented a paper *SEC17.P005 Revision to Student Complaints Procedure* together with a summary of the changes. She explained that the main changes related to wording clarifying the rights of apprenticeship students and updates for students studying at partner/collab colleges in light of OIA guidance. The remaining amendments were wording changes to reflect current practice.

SEC **approved** the amendments.

ACTION: Revised Student Complaints Procedure to be presented to Academic Council.

SEC17.05 Plans and preparations for elections/training of student reps

CEO SU presented two papers *SEC17.P006 Academic Presentation* and *SEC17.P007 SU Programme Representatives and Elections*

He outlined how the new staff were working with academic reps to ensure they were elected and trained. There would be a 3 year plan, with regular training. At Faculty level, where changes were required, they would feedback directly to DSE's. A copy of a handbook *Programme Representative Handbook* was handed out to the meeting for information. A video for academic staff had also been developed. Contacts for academic reps were Heather Doon and Cat ?

The Chair reiterated the point that Faculties needed to use the reps, and if necessary "name and shame" staff where there had been issues.

To back this up CEO SU said that if Faculties were not getting what they wanted from the reps, they should speak to him or Pres SU.

CEO SU said that this year it had been a very successful Welcome week, which they intended to build on.

DSE FEH said they had good communications with their own academic reps, and he hoped they felt empowered to contact him with any issues.

The Chair congratulated them on their work, and advised that the new Director of Student & Academic Services would be attending the Student Council in December.

SEC noted the papers.

SEC17.06 Start of year processes including residences, registration, international, welcome fair

The Chair said that it had been a great Welcome week, and asked the DSAS to talk about the start of year processes.

DSAS explained that the annual process of registration was important, and although he had only just started he had been around the campuses to see what was happening. He had spoken to the teams, and felt that registration was not being done as efficiently as it could be. There would be a review meeting, and SEC were asked to feedback their views, either during the meeting, or via email after.

At the meeting the teams would step back and look at what they needed to achieve, and how it was best achieved.

The Chair explained there had previously been a Transitions group, looking at the first week, which had made headway, but a working group was needed to review it. Chris Bustin was also looking at the International Experience.

CEO SU felt the review was welcome and wondered if the SU could play a bigger role – it would be good to involve Kate Dawson on the working group. He also felt the International Welcome needed further investment.

DSE FACH said a review was welcome, and she was particularly concerned about non-standard starters – some of whom did not have a good experience.

DoF said that somebody from accommodation should also be involved in the review as they had lots of opportunities to interact with students.

PRES.SU felt there was scope to link registration with activities and fun events.

DILS said the proposed Banner upgrade would be a good opportunity for technology to assist the process. Dave Mutti was already on the working group.

DSE FEH outlined detail of a less than helpful communication he had been made aware of, and agreed to inform DSAS of this outside the meeting.

DoF emphasised that not only did we need to look at the spaces that were used, but also at how they were presented, and the issues of temporary wayfinding.

The Chair felt that although always room for improvement, the signage had been better this year. There were issues with how students found their accommodation, as some summer school attendees had only just vacated their rooms.

PRES.SU agreed that further work was needed on the signage. She also felt most students needed to be spoon-fed and relied on communications by social media.

HSS said that students were interacting with staff on site, and these staff needed to be trained.

DSAS said that communications were the key.

Chair agreed that most student see Facilities staff first, and those staff would therefore need to be briefed.

SEC **noted** the verbal report.

SEC17.07 NSS

Papers were circulated *SEC17.P003 NSS Analysis of Results*, and further papers were tabled *NSS Survey outcomes*, *NSS “the teaching on my course”*, *NSS Organisation and Management*, *NSS Assessment and Feedback*, *NSS Student Life Workstream*, *NSS process* from the various working groups.

The Chair explained that most of the meeting had seen these papers before, at other meetings, and the aim today was to go through the proposals, with David Morris, the VC’s Policy Officer, and prioritise them. He would then go away and prepare an implementation plan.

- Student Life Workstream

DSAS explained they had looked at the things they could do this year, and carried out an audit of the gaps – with contributions from the SU and Faculties. CEO SU emphasised that they needed to get to the programme teams, but only one had contacted them.

Discussions took place around budgets which Faculties were given for social events and the Chair stressed that if Faculties were not spending it, they must.

ACTION: VP Policy Officer to investigate to ensure a consistent approach by programme teams.

DSAS said the University needed to build a Community – ensuring students felt more attached to it. They needed social activities, societies, reasons to stay after lectures, and opportunities. They needed to look at where we could strengthen the student voice – easier in some areas than others. To look at who would pay, and ideas that wouldn’t cost anything.

The Chair agreed that students preferred things where they didn’t have to pay!

CEO SU said they had a new co-ordinator, in a new role, who would be attempting to get communications into the Faculty. One idea was to get the events calendar onto the mobile app.

DE&F said they needed to look at available spaces, and whether they could be “social” spaces.

DSE FACH said that many employability events had a social aspect to them, too.

The Chair emphasised that the big issue was definitely communication, and preferably via the Personal tutor.

- Organisation and Management

The Chair summarised the work undertaken so far, and advised that the priorities had been identified as timetabling, private study space, course handbooks, class cancellations and response times. Task and Finish groups had been set up, and would report to VCG.

Discussions took place around programme/course handbooks and it was thought that they needed to be possibly simplified.

Pres SU said that the course reps could help to do this – from a student’s perspective.

It was reported that the lecture/class cancellation system had been implemented from April – the Chair asked if it was being used? Text messages were an idea, but obviously had cost implications.

There were many recommendations surrounding response times, which the Faculties and Directorates needed to address.

ACTION: DILS to check if reports being used within lecture/class cancellation system.

- Teaching on my Course

Acting PVC FEH had reported for the working group, and made many recommendations, mostly long term. VC’s PO asked if there were any “quick fixes”.

The Chair said the new PVC started in a few weeks and would have a view.

- Assessment and Feedback

DPAS highlighted the “quick wins” – a sheet giving assessment terminology, already used by EDU, would be more widely available; publish clear assignment briefs as soon as possible; continually explain assessment criteria throughout the course; and disseminate good practise which already exists.

DPAS and CEO SU discussed various issues around terminology and correct language, and ensuring students were aware they were being asked for feedback, and how it was being used.

The meeting liked the idea of email updates – but agreed this was a medium to long term objective.

Again, the SU offered to attend staff inductions to advise how they could assist.

The Chair agreed it would be good to take SU up on their offer, although it would have resource implications.

The meeting also agreed that if there were genuine issues around teaching and assessment, they also needed to be addressed.

- Academic Support

DSE FEH explained this group aimed to quantify the relationship the student has with the University, and their Primary contacts.

DILS felt it was essential to ensure staff knew, or knew how to signpost students to, the correct place for information. It begged the question “how are

staff inducted”. There was an HR induction, but this did not necessarily show them how to navigate systems and processes. DSE FEH said they appointed mentors for new staff, and these issues should be covered when discussing career paths, and during appraisal.

The Chair commented that there were also communication issues around things like printing and parking- and why charges had to be made etc.

The meeting asked if the Aspire card could be used for printing purposes? DILS wasn't sure, and even if it was technically possible.

DSAS asked if even printing required for a student's course had to be paid for by the student, and was advised that it did.

The Chair said that the University needed to think creatively about these things, and the service provided after 5.00 pm, to ensure we were addressing the needs of the students.

DFM said that although we had to meet the needs of the customer, there is a limit, in terms of security, resources etc.

PAS felt it may be easier, once Dreadnought was being used.

The Chair said that we needed to come up with new terminology to replace “You said, We did”.

ACTION: DILS to check if Aspire card can be used by students for print costs.

ACTION: SU to discuss replacement term for “You said, We did”.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

- a) Flow of minutes from Faculty Student Experience Committees
 - No meetings had taken place this academic year
- b) SEC Meeting Dates 2017-2018

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Tuesday 28th November 2017 in QA075