

**STUDENT EXPERIENCE COMMITTEE**

**NOTES of the THIRD meeting of the STUDENT EXPERIENCE COMMITTEE**

**in the 2015-2016 academic session held on Thursday 28th January 2016 at 2.00 pm in Blake 028 Medway Campus**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Present:** |  |
| Judith Burnett (Chair), PVC, ACH | Colin Allen, DSE, BUS |
| Will Calver, PD | Christine Couper, DSP, PAS |
| Corinne Delage, DSE, FACH | Harry Hodges , Pres SUUG |
| Virginia Malone, ILS | Mike McGibbon, DSE FES |
| Christopher Philpott DSE, FEH | Anne Poulson, COO |
|  |  |
| **In Attendance:** |  |
| Fiona Bradley, M&C | Richard Cottam, FM |
| David Mutti, PMO | Elaine Rafferty, M&C |
| Lynne Savage (Secretary), SA |  |
|  |  |
| **Apologies:** |  |
| Sally Alsford, EDU | Jenny Greenfield, SUUG |
| Michael Flanagan, FM | Pauline McFarlane, SA |
| Katarina Thomson ,PAS |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SEC15.20**  **Actions Arising** | **MINUTES AND ACTIONS ARISING**  The minutes of SEC held on 1st December were **agreed** as a true record, and **approved.**  The Chair welcomed Fiona Bradley and Elaine Rafferty from Marketing and Communications to the meeting, and carried out introductions.  *SEC15.03 Young Adult Carers*  The group had met to discuss the situation re Young Adult Carers. Actions had been identified – to flag carers and put a support package in place. An event had been arranged – it had taken place last week – and another event would be held in June. The aim was to raise awareness. Over 250 people had been spoken to – over 20% had been identified as carers. Although not reliable data, it was interesting. The Chair said that it had definitely been worth bringing the subject to the SEC meeting, and more work needed to be undertaken.  *SEC15.04 Medway Campus – re Prayer Provision*  COO and Richard Cottam updated the meeting. The work had been carried out as part of the Student Hub project. A room had been identified on the ground floor of Pilkington, having taken into account UofG and Univ of Kent requirements. Between now and the summer, a plan would be drawn up and costed. Hopefully it would be in place by the beginning of term, or Christmas at the latest. Management of the room would then be required, ensuring it was not dominated by one faith. DSE FES confirmed it had been a joint initiative. There would be a single point of management via the Chaplains, but it would be multifaith. The COO explained that overall responsibility would lie with Lynne Spencer (acting Deputy Director of Student Affairs).  The Chair thanked everyone and commented that it was a job well done!  This **closed** the item. |
| **SEC15.21** | **Wednesday Afternoon Policy** *(item taken out of sequence)*  Chair explained the history behind the policy to the meeting – releasing students from teaching on a Wednesday afternoon.  Head of SMU, Catherine Churchill circulated papers *SEC15.P033a Wednesday Afternoon Monitoring Report and SEC15 P033b Wednesday Afternoon Activities,* and explained the contents. The colour coded spreadsheet showed 871 instances, most were Postgraduate or one-off activities, and therefore exempt.  The Chair acknowledged that a significant step change had taken place, and explained that a timetable review was taking place to further address the issue. Various queries were raised by members.  The Chair asked members to have one more look at reducing Wednesday afternoon activity and thanked Catherine for her work.  **ACTION:**  Head of SMU to bring updated data to March SEC meeting.  SEC **noted** the report. |
| **SEC15.22** | **Student Engagement Framework**  The Chair explained that the Student Engagement Framework was designed by SEC to look at the Student Journey, with 5 different themes, and different groups meeting to discuss those themes. Final outcomes from those groups should be available by March, giving time to implement their recommendations.   1. Personal Tutor Management System   Head of PMO, David Mutti, presented paper *SEC15.P024 Personal Tutor Management System – Usage Statistics.* He explained that it was standard procedure to review usage of a new system. Current usage was looking much better than previously, nearing 100% in 3 Faculties, with only FEH still having problems with 45%. However, data regarding the 2nd element of the system – creation of meetings/comments etc. had very low usage. It would appear the system was only being used as an informative tool but David asked the meeting if they agreed with this view, or had any views as to why this was the case? Was it a timing issue, or a technical one? He also explained there would be a “phase 2”, with additional developments.  DSE FEH explained that considerable work had been put in to get people to engage, so he was disappointed with the results. He felt that his Faculty had been expected to use several other new products too, which was one of the issues. Also, as it was not an integrated system, this might be a factor.  DSE FACH agreed – she felt that more functionality might improve the usage, but also felt that the first year of any new system could be difficult. Teams already had various legacy systems they were using, which would eventually be reduced.  DM explained that although the system was not integrated, all the data was obtained from the SR system, and therefore it was just another way of presenting the data.  The Chair felt the data was really useful and thanked Head of PMO. She asked if he could go around the Faculties to obtain some more qualitative data, and asked SEC members to continue to encourage usage.  SEC **noted** the report.   1. Personal Tutor Policy   Chair presented paper *SEC15.P025 Personal Tutor Policy – draft amendments* and explained the changes.  The policy had previously been front loaded for year 1’s, and this had been evened out. Other changes related to positioning the Student body as partners, shifting the focus of PT, acknowledging the contribution to progression, achievement and employability, and resource issues.  DSE FES commented he was pleased to see reference made to employability, and felt this backed up what employers were saying.  DSE FEH was pleased to see references to the curriculum, but felt that sometimes the use of the word “personal” was controversial, and confusing. He felt that the role of the PT required a particular set of skills, which would then raise the standard, and the outcomes. Training was required.  Other members emphasised these points, and commented that flexibility was required, with individual departmental needs being considered.  Pres SUUG felt that point 2.4 relating to the SU was quite vague? The Chair explained that she hoped the SU would assist the push to encourage students to attend PT sessions. Pres SUUG also queried point 3.3, and when the first PT session should take place? Chair confirmed that this related to the students first week, and needed to cover early arrivals and late starters. She asked SEC if they could commit to that – members felt this was essential.  Will Calver asked how the quality of sessions would be measured? The Chair responded that this would be via student representation system, and questions within student surveys. Various other comments were made, relating to monitoring and best practise. The Chair agreed to take all views away and include them in the policy. In response to a query from Will Calver, the COO explained that academic skills were the subject of a separate review, being undertaken by the DVC.  SEC **noted** the report.   1. Transitions (STJ) group   DSA had submitted two papers to the meeting *SEC15.P026a and SEC15.P026b* *Transitions:start and throughout journey* updates. In response to a query, it was agreed that some of the items should now be RAG rated as amber, rather than red. The Chair thanked DSA for the reports.  SEC **noted** the reports.   1. Transitions (Graduand to Alumni) group – interim report   The COO presented papers *SEC15.P027a and SEC15.P027b Transitions (Graduand to Alumni)* minutes of meetings. COO explained there would be one more meeting, and then the group would be wrapped up, as the work would sit within the Alumni office. The Chair queried if they would be writing up their findings, which was confirmed. The COO said that costs relating to the membership package, and data and resources would be brought to the January meeting. In response to queries she explained that there was an alumni club in place, and it included international students. Consideration was being given to graduation dates, and visa requirements. Virginia Malone also said there was an online club, and a “LinkedIn” page.  SEC **noted** the reports.   1. Student Voice   President SUUG tabled a paper *SEC15.P028a and SEC15.P028b Student Voice Terms of reference, and Student consultation Matrix.*  He explained these had been drawn from another University, and more work needed to be done to ensure relevance for UoG.  Chair asked for any comments?  DSE FACH felt it was an interesting way of approaching the subject.  The Chair asked members to look at the matrix and feedback as to its feasibility.  **ACTION**: President SUUG to finalise for March SEC. |
| **SEC15.23** | **Student Communications – key stages**  Elaine Rafferty presented two papers *SEC15.P029a and SEC15.P029b Student Engagement key stages and Student Life-cycle*  She explained that Marketing and Communication were looking at the whole communications programme including customer value, audiences and brand awareness. They needed to understand how to package the University, with a focus on undergraduates. She outlined the areas they were looking at and asked the SEC members to feedback if everything had been captured, and make any comments. Elaine said the next steps were to write a Campaign brief, bringing in CRM elements. Pres SUUG said he would provide detail to her regarding all SU communications to students.  The COO emphasised that she was meeting with Marketing, SU and others to take a lead on the branding of the University and would be reporting back.  Elaine said that nothing would change before August, then a campaign agency would be commissioned and work would begin in September. It was important to turn students into our best advocates. Pres SUUG urged caution – some aspects of the student experience needed to be improved.  The Chair thanked her for coming, and commented that it was good to see the communications mapped. It was a big project and she was sure SEC would be updated at some point. She asked members to feedback as requested.  SEC **noted** the report. |
| **SEC15.24** | **COO update**  COO presented a paper *SEC15.P030 COO Update for Student Experience Committee* and outlined the main details. The COO had included an overview, plus detail regarding individual projects, focussing on things most relevant to SEC.  The Chair commented that it was a good summary, and would be useful to send round Faculties for information.  The COO confirmed this would happen, the report had already gone to Court, and she would be happy to visit Faculties if required.  DSE FEH commented that she had undersold the excellent work done at Mansion site, and congratulated them. Pres SUUG felt that the work on the Dome should also be celebrated.  SEC **noted** the report. |
| **SEC15.25** | **OFFA agreement – SASS report**  DSE FEH gave a verbal update on the work of the SASS sub-committee, and commented that minutes should be presented to SEC. It was their job to draft the new access agreement to OFFA.  He explained that the main aims were for more ownership of the agreement, that the aims actually happened and that impact was monitored. An audit had been done, retrospectively, and indications were that a good start had been made.  Groups would be targeted, with SEF data driven priorities, for example come up with new ideas e.g. money in the pocket as opposed to fee remission; tablets; maths support and targeting BME students. They would be meeting with DVC to discuss how these plans could be implemented, how best recommendations could be made etc. The OFFA was clearly crucial to retention, success and employability, and there was a requirement to say how the money had been spent.  The other DSE’s felt this was an excellent summing up.  The Chair commented that it sounded interesting and worthwhile, and reminded members that the agreement had to be signed off by the VC and by Finance.  The COO said that she and the DVC could help to get if written, and it could be brought back to the next meeting.  **ACTION**: DSE FEH to bring draft OFFA agreement to March SEC. |
| **SEC15.26** | **DSE FEH Annual Report**  DSE FEH presented a paper *SEC15.P031 FEH Annual Report* and outlined the main points. He felt that the SEF agenda was a big one, challenging all DSE’s, requiring more integration between DSE’s and DTL’s.  Other DSE’s agreed that many initiatives came out of SEC, and they tried to drive them through but unfortunately messages got diluted, which was very frustrating.  DSE FEH explained they had constructed their Faculty SEC around 4 main themes – Student support, Student Voice, Student Journey and Data & Resources. Much work had been done on student support, and personal tutoring. There had been local “You said, we did” campaigns. EVASYS had been tailored to maximise engagement, with some success. The PTES data had been startling - they needed to identify the source of this.  The Chair agreed that SEF was a big agenda, which interlocked with many other agendas. The DSE’s all had a lot of work on their hands, working out where to focus their energies. She was happy to help if required. Chair said she would also talk to Heads of Department.  SEC **noted** the report. |
| **SEC15.27** | **Third Term**  Pres SUUG presented a paper for discussion *SEC15.P032 Reference Sheet; Third Term.* He explained that the paper was designed to facilitate debate following informal discussions. It was intended to highlight the issue, and was not informed research, but he asked SEC to endorse the project.  The COO explained that she had held discussions with DVC, and this was indeed a sector wide issue, and included problems with activities and accommodation. She encouraged Pres SUUG to do some research into what other Universities had found. In response to queries Pres SUUG stressed the issue was not one of timetabling, and that the Employability agenda was already being investigated by ECS, and was being picked up separately. Further views around the third term were voiced, and it was agreed that it was indeed an issue.  The Chair thanked Pres SUUG for the paper, and agreed there was some negative feedback regarding the third term.  SEC **endorsed** the project.  **ACTION**: Pres SUUG to update March SEC on current status of project. |
| **SEC15.28** | **Student Course Evaluation Survey (SCESS)**   1. Progress of the Project.   Chair presented a paper *SEC15.P034a Student Course Evaluation surveys* for information. There was increased uptake, with further work required.   1. Overview of results   PAS tabled a paper *SEC15.P034b SCES minutes* and gave a PowerPoint presentation with an overview of the results. Overall the message was a positive one, with an improved response, giving meaningful results. Response rates were shown by department, and although some were under 20%, the move was in the right direction. DSE’s had been provided with the data, to review for their Faculty. Three strategies for improving the response rates had been devised: engaging course leaders – giving flexibility when the survey was run, clear communications etc. Engaging students – SU support, conducted in lectures, seeing results via “You said, we did” etc. and Branding and Promotion.  In response to a query, PAS confirmed the data was already there on <http://www.gre.ac.uk/offices/pas/student-surveys>  PAS then demonstrated the types of report available.  Various ideas were put forward for improving engagement with the survey, including tailoring the timing of delivery. PAS welcomed the feedback from SEC.  The Chair thanked PAS for the report and presentation.  SEC **noted** the report. |
| **SEC15.29** | **PTES Survey**  The Chair gave an update on the PTES survey, and confirmed that each Faculty had reported back to her. DSE FBUS presented paper *SEC15.P035* *Faculty PTES Summaries and Actions* for information. She felt that this survey needed its profile raised, and suggested a “Task and Finish” group be set up to look at this, and to understand why the results were poor.  **ACTION:** Chair to convene a “task and finish” group, including DSE’s, and report back to March SEC. |
|  | **ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**   1. Flow of minutes from Faculty Student Experience Committees   Minutes were received from FES, FEH, FBUS and FACH.   1. Workflow of items for future meetings 2015/2016 |
|  | **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**  Thursday 24th March at 2.00 pm in S309/S310, Avery Hill Campus |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Key to work streams:** | student voice | supporting student experience |
|  | student journey | data and resources |