

Meeting: SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT
LEARNING, TEACHING AND QUALITY COMMITTEE

Date and Time: Wednesday 29 April 2026, 14.15pm

Venue: Remote using MS Office TEAMS

Present:

Dr T WAKELEY (Chair)
Mr D BARKER
Prof I CRAWFORD, from item 332-341
Mr D DALY
Dr B DUNCOMBE
Prof G ERDOGAN
Mrs D MAHIL
Mrs C MARTIN
Prof R JACKSON
Dr I PYRKO
Mr M WILLIS, from items 327-332 and from items 335b-341

In Attendance:

Mrs L BARNES, secretary to the meeting
Mrs A BEVAN, from item 332-341
Ms K ELLIOTT
Prof R KAMM
Ms G SPARDING, for item 334
Dr L STUBBS

Apologies were received from:

Dr J ELLIS-BRUSH

NB No Sabbatical Officers had been allocated to the School at the time of this meeting.

ACTION

Part I Business

327 Declarations of Interest

There were no declared conflicts of interests.

328 Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 25 March (Paper SLTQC25/26-067) were approved as a correct record subject to the removal of two sentences within item 322.

Sec

329 Matters Arising

317: The Committee noted that the Course Evaluation Document (CED) had been added to the Degree Scheme Review SharePoint site. Members

were invited to provide feedback and were reminded that the deadline for submission was 5 May 2026.

320: The Committee noted that amendments had been made to the BSc Business course proposal. Business analytics would now remain in Year 1 as a core unit and Managing people in organisations would be a core Year 2 unit. The Chair confirmed that the Business analytics unit would be delivered by the School of Management rather than the Department of Mathematical Sciences.

321: During the last meeting, a query was raised regarding the School's capacity to deliver a new unit should the proposer leave the University. It was noted that the Head of Division for Marketing had confirmed that there are several colleagues within the School with the appropriate expertise to teach the unit.

330 Chair's Business

The Chair informed the Committee that the UKVI Steering Group had recently decided that, as a result of the Office for Students regulations the University would be introducing attendance monitoring for all students. It was noted that attendance monitoring would likely be implemented electronically and could be accessed via a range of devices, ensuring that students without a mobile phone would still be able to register their attendance. However, it was acknowledged that exact procedures have yet to be confirmed.

The Chair confirmed that there were a number of vacant Director of Studies positions available and that these roles would be advertised shortly.

331 Education Action Plan (EAP)

The Committee received the updated copy of the Education Action Plan (Paper SLTQC 25/26-068).

The Committee was directed to lines 47-53 of the Education Action Plan (EAP) spreadsheet, which outline the latest additions.

The Committee noted that Mrs BEVAN had investigated student engagement with generic exam feedback and that findings showed students were more likely to access the feedback when explicitly directed to do so. Approximately 50% of students accessed the feedback, indicating that further work was required to improve engagement.

It was noted that Mrs BEVAN and Mr WILLIS were reviewing the actions on the EAP.

Prof KAMM confirmed that the Assurance of Learning (AoL) framework had been established some time ago and the School was developing an AoL stakeholder group to support the process.

Dr STUBBS noted that she would be meeting with Ms HODGSON to discuss whether there was a more user-friendly way of presenting the EAP and would provide an update on the outcome.

332 Inclusive Education

The Committee received information on the level 1 adjustments for Inclusive Education (Paper SLTQC 25/26-069).

The Committee noted that some Level 1 adjustments would be moved to Level 2, but that there were no major changes overall regarding the wording of the adjustments.

Prof KAMM queried the guidance for group work and felt that the wording used was still unclear. The Chair agreed that the guidance continued to place responsibility with lecturers for determining the impact of Level 1 adjustments on group work. The Chair noted that group work is most appropriate where it is integral to achieving the intended learning outcomes. Where group work is not essential to the outcomes it was suggested that individual assessments might be more appropriate. The School has a group work policy which can help students to understand expectations and avoid unequal contribution claims.

The Committee noted the requirement to provide Library Lists.

Mr WILLIS queried the use of Panopto to record lectures and if this was now a requirement. The Committee noted that lecture recording follows an opt-out, rather than an opt-in, approach. Dr DUNCOMBE confirmed that, in accordance with the Recorded Teaching Policy, where lectures are not recorded, alternative arrangements must be put in place to support students. It was noted that the policy also refers to relevant legal considerations, including intellectual property.

Mrs MARTIN questioned if there was any guidance on recording seminars. It was noted that recording seminars might create barriers for student participation, but this could be solved by recording only the start or pausing the recording when students speak. The Chair noted that not all rooms had the technology to record seminars.

[Mrs BEVAN and Prof CRAWFORD joined the meeting]

Mr BARKER noted that the policy continues to give academic staff discretion over whether teaching sessions are recorded. It was highlighted that recording sessions via Panopto or room recording is generally the most efficient approach in terms of time and effort when considering reasonable adjustments.

It was further noted that the policy is due to be slightly revised, with minor additions rather than significant changes. These revisions will clarify that recording is not required where it is not pedagogically appropriate, including in seminars involving sensitive discussions or where there is no educational value in capturing the session.

MR BARKER suggested alternative approaches such as a recorded short summary of the session, or, where appropriate, making detailed written materials available to enable students to review the content.

The Chair noted that recording seminars may discourage student participation and expressed a preference for anonymous participation tools, such as Mentimeter, to support engagement.

Mrs MARTIN confirmed that offer holders had raised questions regarding the recording of teaching sessions but noted that the reasons behind these queries were largely limited to establishing how many sessions would be recorded.

Mrs BEVAN confirmed that the issue of recording seminars had arisen during an Inclusive Education presentation for colleagues. It was suggested that these challenges could be addressed by pausing recordings during sensitive elements or releasing recordings that exclude student contributions.

Prof CRAWFORD, Director of Inclusive Education, agreed and suggested that providing a list of key points covered in the seminar, or a recorded summary, could also be a useful alternative.

[Mr WILLIS left the meeting]

333 Senior Academic Advisor Report

The Committee received an update on the Academic Advising system for Undergraduates from April 2025 to March 2026 (Paper SLTQC 25/26-071).

The Committee noted that the Student Experience Officers within the School provide support for students and help to reduce the number of requests of pastoral support meetings to academic staff.

Prof KAMM suggested that the Academic Advising role plays a useful part in helping students to understand and act on feedback from units, although this means that feedback is visible to colleagues beyond the original marker.

It was noted that greater emphasis could be placed on the academic dimension of the Academic Advising relationship, particularly at first meetings with students. While strong pastoral support is already provided through Student Experience Officers, it was noted that Academic Advisors have an important role in helping students to interpret and make sense of academic feedback. It was further noted that evidence suggests students tend to find individual feedback on assessed work more valuable than generic feedback.

The Chair noted that the report was encouraging, with scope for further improvement.

[Ms SPARDING joined the meeting]

The following agenda item was discussed out of order with item 335a discussed before 334.

334 Consultation on proposed QA3 changes

The Committee received the proposed QA3 changes (Paper SLTQC 25/26-071).

The Chair welcomed Ms SPARDING, Deputy Head of Academic Quality and Standards, to the meeting.

Ms SPARDING summarised the paper and reiterated to colleagues that this element of the QA3 proposal related specifically to Stage 2 of the course

approval process, which concerns academic approval. It was noted that a review of Stage 1 of the process would be incorporated into the QA3 documentation once finalised.

[Mr WILLIS joined the meeting]

The Committee noted that the QA3 proposal follows recommendations from the Education, Quality and Standards Committee (EQSC) and is intended to ensure compliance with the Office for Students B1 Conditions of Registration. While EQSC was confident that compliance is currently being met, the proposed amendments to QA3 will address identified gaps in the processes for approving new courses and ensure that a clear audit evidence trail is in place.

One of the actions agreed by EQSC was to strengthen the course approval process by providing greater clarity about where specific aspects are considered and assured. The focus of the proposed changes is therefore to ensure that academic decisions are clearly evidenced through effective minute-taking and documentation.

The Committee noted that the QA3 proposal includes the formal inclusion of Learning, Teaching and Quality Committees within the course approval process. This raises questions regarding the absence of a Department Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee (DLTQC) within the School. Further proposed changes include clarifying the questions asked during the course approval process, being explicit about who is responsible for providing assurance against those questions, and improving clarity around teaching methods and contact hours.

Contact hours has been defined by the University as scheduled delivery. The proposal also includes the adoption of a common teaching taxonomy to ensure a shared understanding of teaching and delivery methods across the University.

Ms SPARDING invited feedback on the proposal from committee members in particular to comment on how responsibility for reviewing different levels of detail should be allocated within the School's governance structures.

Ms SPARDING confirmed that the feedback deadline is 29 April 2026 for EQSC.

The Chair reported that a meeting had taken place with the Dean and Deputy Dean, at which it was concluded that the School is not structured in a way that would support the establishment of a Department Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee. It was noted that the preferred approach would be to place responsibility for DLTQC level approval activity with the Directors of Teaching, reflecting their overall portfolio responsibilities. Under this model, the Directors of Teaching would undertake the due diligence that would ordinarily be considered by DLTQC and would then bring the outcomes to the School Learning Teaching and Quality Committee for oversight and approval.

Ms ELLIOTT noted that the Dean and Deputy Dean had expressed concern about creating artificial sub-structures within the School's governance arrangements. It was emphasised that the School covers a broad and integrated pedagogic area, consistent with the way a business school typically operates, and that this is the reason departmental structures do not

exist. However, it was noted that clear responsibility would be maintained through the process, whereby Directors of Teaching hold defined responsibility for their respective teaching portfolios.

Ms SPARDING noted that, given the tight timeline associated with EQSC, it may be appropriate to reflect in the paper that the proposed approach is being put forward at this stage, while recognising that the detailed implementation may require further consultation. It was noted that there would still be value in setting out a clear expectation within the Quality Code of Practice. In particular, it was proposed that the Code should state how the process would be evidenced, for example through a report from the Directors of Teaching to the School Learning and Teaching Quality Committee, outlining the evidence considered and the assurances provided as part of the approval process.

The Chair asked whether any guidance would be provided in relation to contact hours. Ms SPARDING confirmed that the University defines contact hours as scheduled delivery. It was noted, however, that there is interest in developing further guidance in this area. Ms SPARDING confirmed that the course specification published on the website includes details of contact hours. It was noted that the Office for Students (OfS) is currently consulting on a proposed new Condition of Registration (C6), which, if implemented, may require the University to publish more detailed information on contact hours. It was emphasised that this would not necessarily result in an increase in contact hours, but rather a requirement for greater transparency and clarity in how they are defined and communicated, including in promotional materials. It was noted that the question of contact hours, including who is best placed to determine what constitutes an appropriate level, would require further guidance. It was emphasised that this should be informed through consultation with academic colleagues, recognising that appropriate contact time varies significantly across disciplines.

Ms ELLIOTT raised questions regarding the implementation of the OfS B1 Conditions of Registration, particularly in relation to expectations that courses should include optional units and should not be delivered predominantly through large lectures. Concern was expressed about how these expectations would apply in practice, particularly for specialist one-year MSc programmes that are entirely core, and in the context of timetabling constraints at the University. Ms ELLIOTT questioned whether the School would continue to exercise academic judgement within the approach. Ms SPARDING emphasised that, under the new process, it would be important to consider and clearly justify why a new course may not include optional units. It was noted that in accredited programmes this may be acceptable. It was stressed that a clear and robust audit trail is essential, with documented evidence setting out the rationale for such decisions. It was noted that the Committee would need to consider and determine whether the absence of optional units was appropriate in specific cases. A similar approach would apply to decisions regarding the use of large lectures and the overall balance of teaching delivery methods, with the Committee exercising judgement on what is appropriate in each case. It was noted that these decisions may be more appropriate to be considered at Stage 1 of the approval process. It was reiterated that decisions would need a clear rationale and an audit trail.

Prof KAMM raised a concern that the rationale for particular teaching formats or levels of optionality may not be inherent to an individual new course, but instead reflect established departmental approaches applied

across existing provision. He noted that, in this context, there is a risk that the burden of demonstrating compliance with Conditions of Registration could fall disproportionately on proposals for new courses. It was suggested that such requirements should be considered more holistically and applied across all courses, rather than being limited solely to new course approvals. Ms SPARDING confirmed that aspects of B1 compliance were being addressed through other mechanisms. In particular, it was noted that existing courses would be considered through the Degree Scheme Review process, providing an opportunity to review and evidence compliance at that stage.

Ms SPARDING noted that she would provide feedback to EQSC regarding how the DLTQC element would be incorporated within the School and recommend to EQSC that follow-up work be undertaken. Subject to EQSC's endorsement of this approach, she confirmed that she would provide a further update in due course.

The Chair thanked Ms SPARDING for attending the meeting.

[Ms SPARDING left the meeting]

335 Online Unit Evaluations

- a** The Committee received the student responses on the Online Unit Evaluations for Semester 1 and the reports from the Director of Teaching Undergraduate and the Director of Teaching Postgraduate (Papers SLTQC 25/26-072 and SLTQC 25/26-073).

The Committee was informed that the scores for the Online Unit Evaluation for undergraduate units remain in line with previous years, but with an increase in robustness. Prof KAMM suggested that the reduced number of units, and therefore fewer evaluations for students to complete, may have had an impact.

The Chair expressed a preference for using Course Level Surveys rather than individual unit surveys, suggesting that a single survey allowing students to comment on all units taken within a given year may help to increase response rates. Mrs BEVAN and Mrs MARTIN confirmed that uptake on the Course Level Surveys was limited and showed disappointing engagement.

It was noted that despite targeted reminders to students, the uptake of the National Student Survey (NSS) had remained lower than in previous years and below expectations.

The Committee noted that, despite some indications from the central team that a review of the surveys issued to students would take place, this had not yet occurred. It was suggested that the impact of requiring students to complete multiple surveys may be impacting the engagement.

Dr DUNCOMBE suggested that peer-to-peer approaches could be more effective in encouraging student engagement with feedback processes. It was noted that students may be more responsive to hearing from peers, particularly more senior students, about how feedback has led to course improvements, rather than hearing this message solely from academic staff.

The Committee noted that student engagement in committee meetings was also low, despite encouragement and support from the Students Union and

Student Experience Officers. Dr DUNCOMBE noted that engagement with Staff Student Liaison Committees is critical, particularly when consulting on course changes. It was highlighted that, once the Office for Students C6 requirements are introduced, it will no longer be sufficient to state that consultation has taken place where no feedback has been received.

Mr DALY noted that both the Student Experience Officer for BSc Business and the Director of Student Voice had used a range of approaches to encourage student engagement with the NSS, but that engagement levels had remained disappointing.

[Mr WILLIS was present for item 335b]

- b** The Committee was informed that the PGT Online Unit Evaluations remain in line with previous years, and that 4 out of 36 robust units were below the acceptable level. The Committee was informed that, of the four units, one was being withdrawn, and another had amended its learning outcomes, which was expected to help reduce dissatisfaction.

Regarding the remaining two units, Mr WILLIS noted that the Unit Convenors had been contacted and that steps had been put in place to improve them.

It was noted that student engagement with the Online Unit Evaluations at postgraduate level was a cause for concern, with the requirement to complete multiple surveys identified as a possible contributing factor. It was noted that, based on feedback from both the January and September intakes, students appeared to be largely satisfied. Postgraduate student representatives were complimentary about the delivery of the units; however, it was acknowledged that there remained scope for further improvement. Work would therefore continue with the Director of Innovation in Pedagogy and Assessment and the Director of Student Voice to enhance postgraduate provision going forward.

336 Matters for Undergraduate units

The Committee considered the change to an undergraduate unit for 2026/27 session (Papers SLTQC 25/26-074).

The proposal is to change the unit title for MN32046 Developing New Products and Services to Cultural Innovation with effect from 2026/27.

The Committee noted comments from colleagues, Staff Student Liaison Committee and the External Examiner who were all in agreement.

AGREED: Proposed unit change agreed, as noted above, for approval by Board of Studies.

Sec

337 Faculty Representatives' Items

Faculty representatives were not present at the meeting.

Part II Business

There were no items under this section of the agenda.

Part III Business

338 Chair's Action

- a** The Committee noted Chair's Action taken to confirm the updates to the formatting of the delivery methods on SAMIS and the University web pages (Paper SLTQC25/26-075).
- b** The Committee noted Chair's Action taken to confirm the addition of a forbidden combination to MN22165 (Paper SLTQC25/26-076).

339 Office for Student Outcomes

The Committee received the Office for Students dashboard indicators displaying data for the School of Management (Paper SLTQC25/26-077).

Prof KAMM confirmed that the School of Management was above benchmark indicators for student outcomes for continuation, completion and progression.

340 Committees

- a** The Committee noted the minutes from the Education Advisory Board meeting of 23 March 2026 (Paper SLTQC25/26-078).

Mr WILLIS enquired if an update was available on the Sustainability Framework Pilot for 2026/27 which was being expanded to include both MSc Finance and MBA. It was noted that some colleagues within the School had been approached regarding the pilot. Mr WILLIS confirmed that he would speak to the Director of Studies for MSc Finance to confirm the current position.

- b** The Committee noted the minutes from the School Experience Advisory Board meeting of 5 March 2026 (Paper SLTQC25/26-079).

Part IV Business

341 Any Other Business

Mrs MARTIN raised with the Chair an issue regarding the increased burden of student immigration processes and their impact on the international student experience. It was noted that there appears to be an increase in compliance checks and related communications which are often perceived by students as threatening. Concern was expressed that highly engaged students are also being affected and raised the effectiveness of the automatic attendance check-in process and whether this is functioning correctly.

It was noted that there had been plans to update the app to provide students with clearer information about their attendance status, however, this enhancement has not yet been implemented.

Mrs MAHIL confirmed that the issue was affecting postgraduate students as well and that Mrs KER-BRIDGES, Student Experience Manager, was in liaison with Student Immigration Services (SIS) to understand the process. Mr DALY noted following a meeting with SIS that there is a misunderstanding among some students regarding the functionality of the attendance app. Students may assume that keeping the app open on their phone automatically records their presence on campus, however, due to

phone settings, the app may close after a period of inactivity. Mr DALY also suggested that Directors of Studies and Student Experience Officers could be copied into relevant emails to students and that such emails should be sent at times when appropriate support is available.

The Chair suggested that the Student Experience Advisory Board was a good forum to raise this concern.

AGREED: The Chair to contact Prof WILSON, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Student Experience) regarding the issue raised above.

TW

There was no other business.

The meeting concluded at 15:44 pm
