Minutes of Meeting

Meeting: FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES LEARNING, TEACHING AND QUALITY COMMITTEE

Date and Time: Wednesday 12th June 2013 at 1.45pm

Venue: 3 East 3.11

Present: Dr P Lambert, Associate Dean (Learning and Teaching) (Chair)
Dr D Clarke, Department of Politics, Languages and International Studies
Ms H Fouquet, Learning Partnerships Office
Dr F Gillison, Department for Health
Dr R Joiner, Department of Psychology
Prof A Lewis, Psychology
Dr S Martin, Department of Education
Mrs S Ibbitson, Learning and Teaching Enhancement Office
Dr P McGuigan, Department for Health
Dr R Maconachie, Department of Social and Policy Sciences
Dr T Skinner, Department of Social and Policy Sciences
Dr C Winnett, Economics
Miss A Rees, Student
Miss H Wade, Students’ Union
Miss S Williamson, Students’ Union

In Attendance: Miss S E Jacobs, Faculty Assistant Registrar (Secretary)
Miss A Hill, Deputy Graduate School Manager

Apologies: Ms E Barratt Hacking, Department of Education
Dr H Diamond, Politics, Languages and International Studies
Prof S Gough, Associate Dean (Graduate Studies)
Ms H Harrison, Student
Prof J Sessions, Economics
Mrs A Spencer, Undergraduate Manager

1171. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING
The minutes of the meeting held on the 8th May 2013 (paper 195) were agreed to be an accurate record of the meeting.

1172. MATTERS ARISING
(1) Minute 1162. (1): AMR: MA Interpreting and Translating and MA Translation and Professional Language Skills
The Committee noted that a revised report has been approved by Chair’s action.
Minute 1163 (1): Turnitin Plagiarism Detection

Further to the discussion at the previous meeting, Chairs of the Departmental LTQCs reported on discussions held in their departments with regard to the suggestion that students are given access to Turnitin for the submission of draft coursework as a developmental tool.

The Committee noted the following points:

- Psychology: concerns were expressed that the ambiguity of Turnitin Similarity reports might lead to additional anxiety among students without detailed guidance on how to interpret the reports. The formalised language of some of the research-related work would, for example, be likely to present a high similarity score but this would not be evidence of plagiarism.
- Education: as the majority of potential plagiarism cases are not intentional, with students needing further guidance on how to properly refer to sources and use quotations, there is a feeling that giving students access to Turnitin would help eliminate these unintentional cases.
- Social and Policy Sciences: a successful pilot for a compulsory Year 2 unit was conducted this year. The students had to submit their coursework earlier than the submission deadline in order to be able to run the Turnitin Similarity report. The students used the software effectively. With on-line tutorials to guide students through the interpretation of the Turnitin Similarity report, the Department believes that this is a useful educational tool.
- Politics, Languages and International Studies: some concerns were expressed that the very small number of students who wish to intentionally cheat may be able to use submission in draft to Turnitin as a tool to eliminate the evidence that they had plagiarised.
- Health: all part-time postgraduate students are able to submit their draft work to Turnitin and this is seen as a useful tool to help students returning to academic study. It would be preferable if students were unable to see the Similarity score but it appears not to be possible to arrange this. At undergraduate level, the Department has been considering given students access to Turnitin for one Year 1 unit.

Miss Wade indicated to the Committee that it would be useful to consult with students via the Academic Assembly.

The Committee agreed that Departments should be encouraged to use Turnitin as a teaching tool as part of a Year 1 (compulsory) unit. It was agreed that it would not be appropriate to use in any unit which contributes to the final award (so Year 2 and upwards for undergraduate degrees and all postgraduate degrees). It was noted, however, that part-time PGT/CPD students could, however, benefit. The Chair agreed to submit a paper to Academic Assembly for discussion in October 2014.

Chair

Minute 1163 (3): Electronic and Hardcopy Coursework Submission

Chairs of Department LTQCs were invited to report on discussions which had taken place so far in each Department with regard to the desire to agree on a Faculty-wide policy in relation to the submission of coursework.
It was noted that this was in response to confusion for students taking units outside of their home department where practices currently differ.

- Psychology: hardcopies of undergraduate coursework are currently submitted anonymously. This is not possible via electronic submission on Moodle. Some staff prefer to hand annotate hardcopy work.
- Education: at undergraduate level with effect from the current academic year all coursework is submitted in electronic form only via Moodle. New students are perfectly happy with this. Some Year 2 and Year 3 students have not been so happy because they have in the past been used to receiving hand annotated hardcopies of work back from staff.
- Social and Policy Sciences: currently all work is submitted on-line and in hardcopy and most staff prefer to mark the hardcopy. Concerns with regard to the health issues related to reading too much on screen have been raised. Also, members of staff indicate that it takes longer to type feedback on-line in comparison with hand annotating hardcopy work.
- Health: at postgraduate level all work is submitted on-line, and all feedback given on-line. At undergraduate level students submit both in hardcopy (anonymously) and electronic copy. Some members of staff are unhappy with marking on-line.
- PoLIS: students must submit both in hardcopy and on-line, and they must submit in one form by the submission deadline. Students value hand annotations on their work, especially for language work so moving to electronic only would not be popular.

The Committee noted that students need to be clearly informed of the rules for the submission of work. The Committee agreed that at this stage it would be difficult to enforce a Faculty-wide policy. It was agreed, however, that the policy for submission should be stated for each unit clearly in the unit handbook and on Moodle so that it is clear to all students, whichever department they are from, whether they must submit hardcopy only, electronic copy only, or both, and which is the definitive submission if submission is in both forms.

(4) Minute 1166. (3): Changes to MRes units
To note that the final revisions to XX50134 and XX50138 were approved by Chair’s action.

1173. CHAIR’S BUSINESS
(1) Student Partnership Agreement
The Chair reported that a Student Partnership Agreement is being developed to replace the Guidance Principles for the Student Experience which was approved in 2007.

(2) NFAAR:UG Review
The Chair reported that Senate is being asked to consider a change to the NFAAR:UG in relation to students who fail to pass deferred assessment in September. If approved, the change will be applicable with effect from 1.8.13.

(3) HEA Accreditation
The Chair reported that the University of Bath will in the future have an HEA-accredited scheme which will replace the HEA Fellowship scheme for academic staff.

(4) Feedback to Students
The Chair invited comments in relation to a paper from the Department of Social and Policy Sciences which discusses the requirement to provide students with feedback on assessment within 3 weeks.

Dr Skinner explained that the more detailed and burdensome processes which are now expected in relation to the assessment of student work (Turnitin checks, providing external examiners with comments on moderation, the administration of anonymously submitted work and the entry of marks onto SAMIS) puts staff under considerable pressure.

In discussion the following points were made:

- Students welcome formative feedback during the semester and it is good practice to provide this as quickly as possible. Often feedback to students on oral presentations is provided within a few days. Feedback on summative work at the end of a year is less crucial in terms of timing because the feedback cannot influence any further assessments during that academic year.
- Feedback on some summative coursework submitted at the end of a unit is not being received by students within the 3 week period, but after confirmation of the mark by the Unit Board of Examiners.
- Examination feedback is not generally provided within 3 weeks.
- Departments would like to be able to employ more Teaching Fellows and Student Teaching Assistants to assist with marking but are restrained by the rule that students cannot be involved in the assessment of work which contributes to an award.

The Chair agreed to gather more information from each Department in the Faculty in relation to how they are managing marking and feedback at both undergraduate and postgraduate level with a view to presenting a paper to help share best practice at the October meeting of the Committee.
individual feedback is provided within 4 weeks. The Chair indicated that in view of the requirement in QA16 that students receive feedback on individual summative assessments within 3 semester weeks that the Feedback Policy and Student Handbook must be amended to reflect this.

(2) **Education (paper 198)**
The Committee noted that changes had been made to the policy in response to views expressed by students in the review.

(3) **Health (paper 199)**
The Committee noted that undergraduate students are satisfied with the new procedure for the collection of marked work from the administrative office to be followed up by a meeting with their personal tutor to discuss all coursework and examination results. It was suggested that the Feedback Policy might benefit from an additional statement that students will receive their results via SAMIS. The Committee also commented positively on the practice of offering postgraduate students the opportunity to submit ‘milestones’ (non-compulsory assignments for formative feedback).

(4) **Politics, Languages and International Studies (paper 200)**
The Committee commented that the statement that giving feedback to students occurs only after a Board of Examiners for Units has approved marks and therefore can be outside of the expected 3 week timeframe is misleading. The Committee noted that it is expected that students will be provided with feedback, which might include a provisional mark, 3 weeks after the submission of a piece of work.

The Committee noted that the document made no reference to the review of the feedback policy for postgraduate programmes and therefore that this should be added. It was also noted that currently the policy makes no reference to students receiving their results via SAMIS.

(5) **Psychology (paper 201)**
The Committee noted that the review had not included a review of the feedback policy for postgraduate students and therefore that this should be added. It was suggested that the reference to ‘15 working days’ should be amended to ‘15 semester days’.

(6) **Social and Policy Sciences (paper 202)**
The Committee noted that there had been wide consultation and staff and students at both undergraduate and postgraduate level.

(7) **Learning Partnerships Office**
The Committee approved the proposed Policy for Feedback on Assessed work for Foundation Degrees and Honours Years delivered at Partner organisations (paper 203).

1176. **SAMPLING POLICY**
Learning Partnerships Office
The Committee approved a sampling policy for the reduction, control and detection of plagiarism for use by all partner colleges (paper 204).

1177. **UNITS AND PROGRAMMES**
(1) **Department for Health**
The Committee approved proposed changes to HL50076 Sport and
ii  The Committee approved the proposal that all units on the MSc Sports Physiotherapy programme are re-designated as Designated Essential Units (213), noting that the changes will be applicable to all students covered by the NFAAR:PGT with effect from 2013/14.

iii  The Committee approved the proposal that all units on the MSc Sport and Exercise Medicine programme are re-designated as Designated Essential Units (214), noting that the changes will be applicable to all students covered by the NFAAR:PGT with effect from 2013/14.

iii  The Committee approved a proposed new unit HL3XXXX Research Project (Biomedical Sciences) (paper 215). The Committee also noted details of a proposed new BSc Biomedical Sciences, which will be based in the Department of Biology and Biochemistry but for which the Department for Health will provide units to form a Health stream (paper 215b). The Chair indicated that this was a positive development for the Department of Biology and Biochemistry in the Faculty of Science and the Department for Health. It was noted that communication between the two departments will be key in ensuring the success of the programme. It was noted that the programme will not be jointly managed and therefore that there is no requirement to establish a Joint Committee. It was suggested, however, that consideration should be given to the establishment of a committee/group with members from both departments which would meet periodically.

(3)  Department of Social and Policy Sciences

i  The Committee approved the proposal for the withdrawal of the following programmes, noting that the proposals would now be considered by the University Academic Programmes Committee:

•  BSc Sociology with Human Resource Management (paper 217)
•  MSc Business and Community (paper 218)

ii  The Committee approved the proposal for minor changes to undergraduate units and programmes for implementation in 2013/14 (paper 219).

(4)  The Committee noted details of unit and programme changes which have been approved by Chair’s action (paper 230).

1178.  FACULTY COMMITTEES

The Committee noted the minutes of the following committee:

•  Department of Social and Policy Sciences Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee, 17th April 2013 (paper 231)

1179.  ANY OTHER BUSINESS

(1)  The Chair reminded members that there is a Faculty Teaching Development fund to which bids could still be submitted. He also reported that it is likely that the fund will be repeated next year also.

(2)  The Chair thanked the student members of the Committee for their important contribution over the past year. He also thanked those members who will not be continuing with the role in 2013/14.