

**STUDENT EXPERIENCE COMMITTEE**

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

**in the 2016-2017 academic session held on Thursday 26th January 2017 in Blake 028, Medway Campus**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Present:** |  |
| Colin Allen DSE, BUS | Christine Couper, DSP, PAS |
| Corinne Delage DSE, FACH | Virginia Malone, HLS |
| Mike McGibbon DSE FES | Richard Mendez, ECS |
| Christopher Philpott DSE,FEH | John Schless, CEO SUUG |
|  |  |
| **In Attendance:** |  |
| Heather Doon HMS SUUG | Lynne Martin, Chaplaincy |
| Lynne Savage (Secretary), SAS | Lynne Spencer, SAS |
| Kirsten Wynn, Chaplaincy |  |
|  |  |
| **Apologies:** |  |
| Sally Alsford, EDU | Judith Burnett (Chair), PVC, ACH |
| Will Calver, PD | Catherine Churchill HTT |
| Scarlett Dempsey, SUUG | Michael Flanagan, DEF |
| Nikki Makinwa, QM | Anne Poulson, COO |
| Sara Ragab, AD,SAS | Katarina Thomson, PAS |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SEC16.18**  **Actions Arising** | **MINUTES AND ACTIONS ARISING**  The minutes of the meeting held on 13th October 2016 were **approved.**  *SEC16.P018 New Arrivals and transitions report to SEC – November 2016*  CEO SUUG had circulated SU Freshers report to SEC.  This **closed** the agenda item.  *CEO SUUG presented a short film about the SUUG.*  CEO shared link to film with SEC.  This **closed** the agenda item.  *Pres SUUG presented a paper SEC15.P047 SUUG KPI’s and Performance Indicators 2015/2016.*  SEC to encourage personal tutors, at nomination time, to make a push for students to become programme reps  DSE’s confirmed that student reps were being promoted in various ways. DSE FES explained that sometimes this push came best from other student rep’s which is something their Faculty were encouraging. CEO SUUG advised that training for student reps had been improved. HMS SUUG said that if Faculties contacted them regarding the gaps, they would take steps to address them. Next year the SU would get feedback on the process, with a view to strengthening it further.  The Chair felt that they had difficulty finding reps from the Extended degree programmes, and further work needed to be done there.  HLS asked that academic skills and the library be included in any initiatives.  This **closed** the agenda item.  *National Mixed Methodology Learning Gain Project Briefing*  *Simon Walker, for EDU, briefed the meeting about a new HEFCE funded project, which the University was participating in.*  SEC members confirmed they had received a copy of the emails being sent to students. The meeting were generally concerned about the process, the emails and the tests, however felt they had done what they could to support it given the difficulties. |
| **SEC16.19** | **SU “Big Plan”**  CEO SUUG delivered a presentation *SEC16.P025 SU “Big Plan” 2017-2020*  This detailed the SU plans for the next 3 years, showing their officers, structures and processes. He explained there were 4 sabbatical officers, currently changed every year, 32-35 permanent staff and 200 student staff. The current model was not, he felt, ideal. He introduced Heather Doon, who was the new Head of Membership Services. Elections were underway at the moment, with nominations closing on Monday 30th Jan. He gave an overview of what facilities were available on each campus, and explained that at Medway they worked closely with GK Unions. The Big Plan had been developed following various consultations and feedback. The presentation also showed research undertaken by NUS around its membership, what they did with their spare time, their priorities and aims, which made for interesting reading. It showed how students viewed the role of the SUUG, and its importance, or otherwise, over a range of criteria. The plan highlighted the SU strengths and weaknesses.  The key values of SUUG were named as *Approachable, Courageous, Dedicated, Trusted and Empowering.* Their aim was *For all students to make the most of their journey at Greenwich.* This would be realised by having clear objectives and outcomes under the headings Enterprise; People; Communication: Spaces and Partnerships.  CEO SUUG then explained the next steps to be taken, to achieve the plan.  The Chair thanked him for the presentation, and asked what the problems were with the current model?  CEO SUUG explained that at present it was only the people who were already engaged with the SU who ran for the positions, the same people were engaging over and over again, and tended to be FT UG, whereas UoG was so much more. HMS commented that the model was under review and they needed to create a system where all different methods of engagement were considered, to encourage extended participation. The meetings were not always accessible to everybody. The officers tended to be white, middle class. In response to a query he confirmed that the SU needed to go to the students, rather than the students come to them.  HMS explained that the plan needed to consider the TEF requirements, particularly in relation to part time students, for whom there were very few opportunities to engage. Further consultations were necessary.  In response to a query from DSE FES, they agreed that there were sometimes identity issues around their relationship with GK Unions, which they would like to address if possible.  The meeting generally agreed the plans were exciting and thanked CEO SUUG.  SEC **noted** the presentation.  **ACTION:** CEO SUUG to circulated updated version of presentation to SEC. |
| **SEC16.20** | **Wednesday Afternoon Policy**  HTT presented 3 papers *SEC16.P026a Wednesday Afternoon Derogations, SEC16.P026b Wednesday Afternoon – teaching taking place* and *SEC16.P026c copy of Wednesday pm teaching (19/1/17)*  She explained that the papers were self-explanatory, and although it looked as if a lot of teaching took place on a Wednesday afternoon, there were very few that didn’t have exceptions, or adhered to the rules. There were inevitably a lot of PG courses, which would be difficult to schedule if they weren’t on a Wednesday. The DSE’s agreed this would be almost impossible, especially at Greenwich and Medway. Of those without exceptions, there were mostly either a “one off” or a drop in session, not regular sessions. She summarised that there were only 13 with no exceptions – which out of 20000 was not bad!  SEC **noted** the reports. |
| **SEC16.21** | **NSS Update**  The Chair asked the DSE’s for a verbal update on progress with NSS.  DSE FES said they held a series of workshops, where they demonstrated the new questions, and gave an opportunity to provide examples of how they might be answered. A reminder had gone out across the Faculty. Useful PR slides had also been circulated. Partner colleges were also being chased to ensure they participated. In response to a query, he said they had a “few hundred” partner college students. He commented that on the results side, good engagement with Programme leaders and programme teams could make all the difference.  The Chair commented that they seemed to be doing a lot, and thanked him for his feedback.  DSE FACH said they had borrowed the same presentation, and had run 2 workshops. These had been fruitful, and empowering, with some useful debate. They had compiled some positive “You Said, we Did” material for each department, and ensured the communications all dovetailed with the communications plan. They too had chased Partner colleges, and had encouraged “Shout outs” from the SU.  DSE FES said he was also keen to have the SU in, and HMS SUUG asked him to let her have a mailing list or list of key courses.  DSE FES echoed the work of the other Faculties – they had done 3 workshops, and linked them to Evasys and dashboards. They were preparing staff for the new questions, and developed materials for staff to use. He felt they were doing as much as they could.  The Chair, for FBUS, said they had also borrowed FES materials, for their 2.5 workshops. There was a useful section on feedback. They had selected one member of staff from each programme to work with the students, had presented “You said, we Did” and explained the new questions. He felt they did the NSS in a slightly more structured way than other Faculties, bringing it into the timetable, in a computer lab.  SEC members agreed that all Faculties probably had at least one programme of concern, and that it was challenging to get good scores when changes had been made. They also felt that personal relationships could come into the results, especially where small teams were involved.  PAS said that already there was good news, in that the first week’s response rate was up to 20%. This was because the survey had gone live earlier than published, but it didn’t seem to have had a negative effect, even though it would have been nice to be informed.  HMS SUUG tabled a paper *SU Representation & NSS Support 2017* detailing the support available from SU, and the actions they had taken. Funding had been made available for them to promote NSS. After the elections they would put measures in place.  PAS said it was good to have some focus events – and that SU could give a final push after faculties had done their bit.  The Chair and SEC members agreed it was an excellent idea, and that it was good to see a concerted plan.  HLS felt that results around the learning environment would be quite positive, and that changes made over the summer had taken away many of the complaints.  There were some discussions about the NUS boycott, some staff supporting it, and the effect that was having. PAS re-iterated that good NSS results could have a significant impact on TEF.  SEC **noted** the verbal reports. |
| **SEC16.22** | **Employability and placements**  RM for ECS presented a paper *SEC16.P027 Taxonomy of placement quality standards*  ECS explained that following consultation with the placements Task & Finish Group, which looked at standardising placements, the taxonomy had been developed. They had looked at what was worthwhile, how they were recorded, how they supported the curriculum. The group had worked with Faculties and come up with 2 separate outcomes – Sandwich placements starting in 2017/2018 and Internships starting in 2017. Targets had been set for Faculties – he handed these out and would circulate them to SEC.  DSE FEH asked if the figures for his Faculty referred to programmes where they were not usually required to have a placement, and it was confirmed they did.  PAS asked if the DSE’s had been included in setting the targets, and was advised they hadn’t been. PAS were concerned that the targets were not tied to the over-arching targets already set by the University, but ECS said that the PVC Business had been overseeing them, and felt sure they were.  DSE FEH said the Taxonomy may need to be revisited in the light of Graduate apprenticeships, which PAS agreed would be required. PAS also felt they needed to be tied to existing KPI’s. DSE FACH asked if the internships were over 1 calendar year, and ECS responded they could be over 2.  PAS expressed concerns – there needed to be an “end point” where they could be counted. DSE FES said they had done work to minimise students finding their own placements, as they didn’t tend to make a good job of it. Further discussions took place around the difficulties of finding good placements, and recording the outcomes.  In response to a written question from the QM around checking health and safety at placements, ECS said this had not been part of the initial remit, but that he would reply directly to QM.  The Chair mentioned that FBUS had 2 new 0 credit courses going before APC next week, designed as a way of recording placements. There was also a 30 credit L6 courses which could be attached to programmes as a way of recording internships. DSE FES advised they were doing similar with a 15 credit course for Science students. PAS voiced further concerns about the recording of these, and asked the DSE’s to speak with her – Banner was not flexible in recording cross-sessional courses, and the data could have detrimental effects on University statistics if not managed correctly.  **ACTION:** Paper containing targets for placements to be circulated to SEC  **ACTION:** DSE’s to liaise with PAS over set up of new programmes. |
| **SEC16.23** | **Chaplaincy Report**  LM for the Chaplaincy tabled a document *Chaplaincy contact details* which contained details of the staff changes in the last year. She outlined their role, working alongside Student Centres, Wellbeing and academic staff or indeed anyone who had pastoral concerns. Most of their team were voluntary, and part time, and worked both 9-5, and out of hours. They were growing increasingly concerned about mental health issues. Some of the team had undertaken a mental health course, and another was doing suicide training, but none were professional counsellors. Although the University had excellent counsellors there were some concerns about communications and the level of support – they were not always readily contactable at Medway. DSE FES endorsed that view. There were also difficulties getting the website updated quickly.  There was a “Missing in Action” scheme, which flagged up possible vulnerable students where they had stopped attending, and the Chaplains wanted to raise the profile of this. PAS said that Faculties now had Retention officers, and these might prove to be a useful first point of contact. The scheme had proved successful in the past.  She said that at all campuses the Chaplains were available, and were involved with various University events – International Welcome, Carol Services etc and held functions on each campus.  TTM advised that updating the web was now very much a self-service operation, and if they attended the training they would be able to update it themselves – the information was appreciated.  HMS SU asked if their service was linked to the SU advice service, and was advised it wasn’t, but once an issue had been raised students were often referred there, and to other services – the SU had been really helpful in the past. DSE FES commended the work of the Chaplains, saying it was very valuable.  The Chaplains said that a multi faith room was soon to open at Medway, and she was meeting with representatives of all faiths, to ensure it worked well.  **ACTION:** Chaplains to circulated updated contact list to SEC.. |
| **SEC16.24** | **FEH Annual Report**  DSE FEH presented a paper *SEC16.P028 Faculty of Education and Health Student Experience Annual Report January 2017* which he felt was self-explanatory. He added that the recent Ofsted inspection had been very complimentary about the quality of Student experience within the Faculty, and the quality of their students. There were issues for development, mainly around University systems.  The Chair thanked him, and said it was an outstanding outcome – well done!  SEC **noted** the report. |
| **SEC16.25** | **Campus Reports**  DEF had tabled a written report *SEC16.P029 Estates and Facilities Management Department Campus Report January 2017*.  SEC **noted** the report. |
| **SEC16.26** | **SASS report**  DSE FEH gave a verbal update on the work of the Strategy and Access for Student Success group, a sub-committee of SEC.  It was the role of this sub-committee to write the OFFA access agreement, accounting for £10/12 million of funding. They needed to account for how the money was spent, and where, and ensure that it covered all stages of the programmes. The University had previously no trouble spending the funding, but had less success in tagging it to particular group’s i.e. BME/Disabled students etc., and had therefore been criticized in the past. OFFA wanted to see how it impacted on these groups. The SASS group were trying to change the culture of the agreement, tagging particular interventions, and ensuring they were monitored. It wasn’t extra money, it was already there, and being spent. It was very important, too, in relation to the TEF. The group were trying to take TEF areas for development, and the action plan would more explicitly link TEF and the access agreement.  PAS confirmed this was the case, and that this and NSS issues would come through to the TEF. DSE FES felt it was up to FOO’s and Faculties to ensure projects were monitorable.  PAS explained they had been involved with the Kingston project, which is a bid to implement at UoG the Kingston devised Added Value Metric, and also their inclusive curriculum methodology.  DSE FES said that the introduction of the TEF had in some way done the University a favour, as it had escalated the importance of showing the impact of the access agreement on all students, and particular groups.  PAS felt the appointment of the Retention and Success officers would also have an effect on this.  The Chair said it was indeed a big challenge to show how the money was spent, and in particular the outcomes, but this had now been acknowledged as a priority.  SEC **noted** the update. |
|  | **ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**   1. Flow of minutes from Faculty Student Experience Committees  * FES 14 Sept, FES 16 Nov, FACH 28 Sept  1. Workflow of items for future meetings 2016/2017 |
|  | **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**  Thursday 23rd March 2017, at 2.00 pm, in QA075 Greenwich Maritime Campus |

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