A meeting of the Learning and Teaching Committee will be held on **Monday 11th March 2013** in **River Room 3**, Tower Building at 10am.

5th March 2013                   Dr J McGeorge, University Secretary

**AGENDA**

Members of the Committee are invited to indicate, at the start of the meeting, any matters in Section 2 that they wish to discuss

Section 1

1. **Minutes**  Paper A

   To approve the minutes of the meeting of the Learning and Teaching Committee of 13th November 2012.

2. **Matters Arising**

3. **Outcome Agreement Projects – Update from project leads**
   - Articulation Working Group
   - Wider Access working Group
   - TPG Funded Places Working Group

4. **Periodic Review of the Student Support Environment**  Paper B

5. **ELIR Update – Feedback from Workshop 1**

6. **Student Feedback & Assessment Project Update**  Paper C
Section 2

7. Quality Forum Report 12th February Paper D
8. e-Learning Sub-Committee Report 22nd February 2013 Paper E
10. Research Degree Sub-Committee 25th February 2013 Paper G
11. Report from Library & Learning Centre Paper H

12. Any Other Business

13. Dates of Next Meetings

Professor David Coates
Deputy Principal (Learning & Teaching)
Convener
UNIVERSITY OF DUNDEE
SENATUS ACADMICUS
LEARNING AND TEACHING COMMITTEE

A meeting of the Committee was held on Tuesday 13th November 2012.

Present: Professor D Coates (Convener), Professor R Abboud, Mr WI Ball, Mr S Cross, Ms R Doherty (DUSA), Dr M Frame, Dr N Laker, Dr L McLellan, Dr L Monk, Dr W Murray (Vice Dr A Schloerscheidt), Ms G Pallis, Dr R Parsons, Dr K Petrie, Dr Fraser Smith, Dr D Walker, Dr William Whitfield, Dr K Wilkie.

Apologies: Mr J Baldwin, Professor D Bearn, Mr G Hutton, Mrs L Jones, Professor G Mires, Dr A Schloerscheidt, Professor R Soames, Dr Fiona Smith.

In attendance: Dr M Glover.

1. Minutes

Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meeting of 17th September 2012.

2. Matters Arising

Minute (4): Learning & Teaching Strategy

(i) The Convener reported that the introduction to the Strategy document had been rewritten and improved in line with the recommendations of the Committee.

(ii) The Committee noted that a meeting of the Articulation Working Group has been arranged and will report back to the next Committee meeting on progress.

(iii) The Committee was pleased to note that the Dean of the School of Computing had agreed to convene the Wider Access/Retention Working Group and that invitations to participate would now be sent to relevant staff.

Minute (8): Higher Education Achievement Report (HEAR)

The Committee noted that the Convener will make a presentation on HEAR to the next Directors’ Group meeting and would report back.

Minute (9) Policy on Wednesday Afternoon Teaching and Sport

The Committee noted that the issue was referred to the Central Timetabling Team who are currently analyzing various implementation models to enable a clear view of the potential impact on class timetables across the University.

Minute (14) Policy and Guidelines on the Recording of Lectures
Learning & Teaching Committee 11th March 2013

PAPER A

The Director of QA informed the Committee that the policy had been subject to a full consultation exercise. Discussions would now begin with Human Resources and the Campus Unions.

The Committee suggested that further work be done on developing (i) a pedagogical rather than a legal rationale for the new policy and that (ii) the draft policy be extended so that it covers visiting and guest lecturers.

Resolved: for its part, to approve the new policy in principle subject to further development as suggested.

3. SFC Outcome Agreement: College Articulation and Partnerships

The Committee received a verbal report from the Convener on the SFC Outcome Agreement in relation to articulation and partnerships between higher and further education. The Committee was asked to note that the focus on wider access and knowledge exchange in the 2012/13 Agreement continues into 2013/14, along with a new emphasis on articulation and skills for growth. The sector was asked by the Council, at very short notice and to very short timescales, to bid on funding streams amounting across the sector to a total of 850 wider access students, 850 FE articulation places and up to 1000 TPG places - all funded by a 2% cut in the main teaching grant.

The Convener reported that some very creative ideas had been developed within the University - helped by a close alignment of the existing University strategy with the requirements of the SFC - in terms of wider access and sustainable TPG provision in particular.

The Committee heard that although there is, at this stage, a lack of clarity on how academic provision will need to adapt, it is clear that given the short timescales involved and the innovative approach taken by the University, there will be a need for fast-track validation and approval for September 2013 intake.

Resolved: to note the Report

4. Annual Review of External Examiners Reports

The Committee considered the annual review of external examiner reports and recommendations as presented by the Director of Policy, Governance and Legal Affairs.

The Committee was pleased to note that there were no serious problems reported - although it was acknowledged that there needed to be clear evidence that issues were being followed up and action taken when necessary. The Director reported the following as common issues in the Reports for 2011/12:

- Inconsistency in dissertation requirements across programmes
- Use of external examiners as markers rather than moderators
- External examiners need to see and approve every exam paper
- Use of the standard form to report issues in a consistent way.

Resolved: to note the Report

5. National Student Survey 2011-12
The Committee considered the Results and Final Report of the 2011-12 National Student Survey and were to note the generally good results but also acknowledged some areas of concern. It was noted that, as in previous years, each Dean will be asked to provide a public response to the results - with the emphasis on quality enhancement.

The Committee noted that the University rated 2nd top in Scotland for overall satisfaction and that congratulations were due to DUSA who rated top in Scotland and in the top 10 in the UK.

The Committee also noted that scores were at or above the sector average except for the scores in (i) assessment and feedback and (ii) organisation and management. The ongoing assessment and feedback project is currently picking out the qualitative data relating to this score to enable specific problems to be identified and addressed.

It was also noted that the full set of NSS information - including data supplied for internal use only and data at programme level - would be posted as a dedicated Blackboard resource in due course.

Resolved: to note the Report.

6. Feedback & Assessment TESTA Proposal

The Committee considered a proposal from the Project Group to develop and implement TESTA methodology across all taught programmes.

Dr Walker, on behalf of the Project Group, explained how the HEA project and the work of the Group had developed an audit based methodology for enhancement of assessment and feedback activities at programme level.

The Committee heard that programme teams that had engaged with the project during the pilot had welcomed the evidence based approach taken. It was noted that the audit is carried out 1 year prior to programme review so that if 20 programmes participate per academic year then all areas can be covered in a five year period. The Committee were asked to note that although not compulsory under the quality enhancement/assurance framework being developed if the TESTA methodology were not used then programme teams would have to demonstrate some alternative method for enhancing assessment and feedback had been used.

The project Group were now recommending full implementation and asked the Committee for support in taking the plans forward. Implementation would need dedicated central support and the proposals outline a new post to be based in the Library and Learning Centre. A credible support network would also be needed – as a steering group and as a forum to share experience.

The Committee thanked Dr Walker for his presentation and expressed very strong support for the proposal. The Convener noted that the proposal will now go to SMT for discussion and approval and asked the Committee to feed any further comments directly to the Project Team.

Resolved: to strongly support the proposal for full implementation of the TESTA methodology.

The Director of Quality Assurance asked the Committee to consider the report of the Annual Monitoring Review Group. The Committee noted that improvements to the process were underway in order to meet the quality enhancement ambitions of the Schools – each Dean would be asked to produce a report to allow for a much stronger emphasis on enhancement and reflection to meet the coming challenges of ELIR in 2013. The Committee would be given an update on progress in the second Semester.

The Committee were asked to note the exemplar report produced by the School of Psychology as an indication of the level of reflection and analysis needed.

Resolved: to note the Report.

*The Committee received the following items for information and noted each without further observation.

8.* Standing Items:

   (i) Quality Forum (Formerly Learning & Teaching Quality Forum) PAPER F

   Nb. The Committee approved the change of name in response to the Forum's developing remit.

   (ii) e-Learning Sub-committee PAPER G
   (iii) Postgraduate Taught Degrees Sub-committee PAPER H
   (iv) Report from Library and Learning Centre PAPER I

9.* Preparatory Resit Exam Programme PAPER J

10.* Joint Statement on Student Representation PAPER K

11.* ELIR 2013 Summary & Key Points PAPER L

12. Any Other Business

Plagiarism Detection Software

The representatives from the College of Medicine, Dentistry and Nursing reported a serious problem with the University’s current plagiarism detection software (SafeAssign). This has led to loss of data and has been raised as an issue by external examiners. It was argued that urgent action is needed to protect the University’s reputation and finances. The Committee were asked to note that the Dasman project had used Turnitin as an alternative and the College recommended that a move to this system be considered urgently.

The Director of Library and Learning Centre reported that the last option appraisal on the Turnitin system was carried out 5-6 years ago – a new review would need to be carried out. The Committee were asked to note that Turnitin had more functionality than Safe Assign and did perform well in tests during the previous appraisal – but no system is perfect (it was noted that some staff also reported difficulties with using Turnitin where this had been tried locally) and a careful exit strategy would be needed – this is made more difficult by the fact that SafeAssign is integrated into Blackboard (and thus part of the VLE licence).
The Convener of the e-learning Sub-Committee noted that the representatives from the College on the Sub-Committee did not express such a strong view during recent discussions on the current trials.

Resolved: to note the dissatisfaction of the College of Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing and to ask the e-learning Sub-Committee to examine the issue and to report back with recommendations.

Student Hackathon

The Committee were asked to note that a hackathon weekend will be hosted by the School of Computing from Friday the 1st to Sunday 3rd of February, on the theme of health. Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art and Design and the School of Medicine are also involved in organising the event. Members of the Committee were asked to circulate details and to note that any other schools who would like to be involved in this event should email: K.Petrie@dundee.ac.uk

Social Media Policy

The Committee noted that the eLearning Sub-Committee would look at the issue and make policy recommendations in due course.

Library & Learning Centre

The Committee noted that the changing pattern of provision of the Library & Learning Centre was outlined in Paper I and that feedback and comments would be welcomed by the Director of LLC.

13. Dates of Next Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11th March</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>River Room 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th May</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>River Room 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Rationale and overview

Enhancing and assuring the quality of services that support the learning and teaching environment and the out-of-classroom student experience is a critical part of our approach to the development of the *quality culture* at Dundee. The principal aim of periodic review of the student support environment is to promote improvement of services and the overall support environment by providing a framework to:

- evaluate the effectiveness of support provision
- reflect on how provision could be improved for the future
- plan and implement changes.

Additional important aims of the review process are to identify and share good practice, develop areas of collaboration between units and Directorates and, importantly, ensure a holistic approach to the quality of the student support environment at Dundee.

*As for the periodic review process for taught programmes (‘Programme Review’), periodic review of the student support environment should be carried out in a spirit of open, collegial discussion, with the aim of enhancing future provision. It is not an audit of past performance.*

The quinquennial periodic review process will be supplemented with thematic reviews that will be undertaken mid-cycle or on an *ad hoc* basis to ensure agility to respond to strategic initiatives. The process will take account of, and be informed by, existing annual service evaluation processes (where relevant) as well as emerging user needs and internal and external drivers such as changes in legislation and quality assurance requirements.

The periodic review process involves the development of an over-arching, evidence-based *Student Support Environment Reflective Review* (SSERR) of the support of the learning and teaching environment and the out-of-classroom support at the University of Dundee, which is informed by structured self-evaluation reports from each support unit.

The SSERR captures the key messages that have emerged from unit/Directorate self-evaluation reports, and contains an enhancement-focused forward plan. The SSERR is considered by a Review Board, which examines submitted documents and supporting material, and meets with the relevant groups of staff and students to discuss their views and experiences.

The Review Board comprises administrative and academic staff and student sabbatical officers from within the Institution, as well as at least one external representative. The Board develops a formal report (which should include commendations and recommendations, and may include priority recommendations) which informs the development of an implementation plan.

The report and implementation plan are considered by the Quality Forum (QF), Directors’ & College Secretaries’ Group and the Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC), before formal approval by Senate and Court. The outcome of the review is reported as part of the Annual Institutional Statement to the Scottish Funding Council on Internal Subject Review:

(https://www.sfc.ac.uk/news_events_circulars/Circulars/2012/SFC1412.aspx). *Note Section A, paragraph 19. ‘The role of support services (guidance, learning resources, ICT, recruitment, student finance and so on) is of crucial importance in determining the overall quality of the student learning experience. Institutions should satisfy themselves that there are appropriate mechanisms in place to facilitate periodic review of the strategic and operational role of support services in relation to their impact on the student experience…..’.*

2. Outline of the process

The process for review of the quality of student support has been designed to align with expectations of the *Quality Assurance Agency* (QAA, see the UK Quality Code ‘Assuring Standards and Quality’,...
especially Chapter B2: Admissions and Chapter B4: Supporting student achievement) and with the Scottish Funding Council’s Council Guidance to Higher Education Institutions on Quality (2012).

2.1 Applicability and timing

There should be a periodic review of the student support environment every 5 years. Any deviation from the 5-yearly cycle of review must be discussed with and formally approved by the Vice-Principal for Learning and Teaching in consultation with the Director of Quality Assurance.

It is envisaged that at least four Directorates should form part of a collective review of student support:

**Student Services (comprising the units detailed below).**

- Academic Achievement Teaching Unit
- Admissions and Student Recruitment Services
- Advice Team
- Careers Service
- Counselling Services
- Disability Services
- Enquiry Centre
- Enterprise Gym
- Health Service
- International Advice Service
- Nursery
- Peer Connections
- Registry
- Residences
- Student Funding
- Student Support Team
- Widening Participation.

**Information and Communication Services**

**Library and Learning Centre**

**Estates and Buildings.**

Other Directorates and units that support the student experience at Dundee may be asked to contribute as the review process is developed further.

2.2 The process

The review process involves four main stages:

1. evaluation, consultation and planning at the level of each Directorate/unit
2. development of an over-arching Student Support Environment Reflective Review
3. a formal Review Board event that will develop commendations and recommendations
4. development of an implementation plan and review of planned changes.

2.3 Responsibilities within the review process

The relevant Student and Academic Support Services (SASS) Directors (or designated deputies) have collective responsibility for the conduct of the review. Guidance on the conduct of the review will be provided by the Director of Quality Assurance.
Responsibility for ensuring that the Review Board is appropriately supported by a Review Board secretary lies with the University Secretary.

The primary responsibility for organising the review process and developing the SSERR lies with the Directors (or designated deputies) of the relevant SASS Directorates. It is recommended that one of those individuals takes overall responsibility for authoring the final draft of the SSERR. The duty to develop a reflective review for each individual support unit rests with service unit managers and their staff.

Students will have opportunities to engage in the process by:

- informing the evaluation and consultation stage with feedback and suggestions for improvement
- participating in the Review Board event.

Students should be included in the evaluation process in ways that:

- are systematic and rigorous, but are appropriate and sensitive to the nature and diversity of the student body
- positively encourage students to contribute their views on the effectiveness of the service and to make suggestions on how it could be improved.

2.4 Scope of the review

The unit reflective reviews and the SSERR should address the standard and quality of the service, with particular focus on the following aspects:

- the role and effectiveness of the service in providing high-quality support to students and other users
- feedback and enhancement arrangements
- resources and the environment
- partnerships and collaboration
- benchmarking
- external accreditation where applicable
- barriers and challenges.

The reflective reviews should highlight areas of strength and areas where good practice should be shared. They should also summarise needs and opportunities for change, providing an evidence-based case for areas that require development. Opportunities for collaborative working should be identified where appropriate. The reviews should also identify areas where resource constraints exist as well as areas where savings might be made. Reference should be made to previous efficiency measures and their impact, where relevant.

The reflective reviews should draw upon the outcomes of annual service evaluations and existing Directorate operating plans. They should contain proposed development plans, containing short-term targets (for the next planning cycle) and longer-term goals over the 5-year review period as well as taking account of the Transformation Vision for the University. Priorities should be highlighted. Where appropriate, performance indicators should be identified and used to analyse progress during subsequent annual service evaluations.

2.5 Conduct of Review Boards

The Review Board includes University administrative and academic staff members external to the Directorates being reviewed, student sabbatical officers, and at least one external expert. Its discussions are managed by two co-convenors (the President of DUSA and the Vice-Principal/Deputy Principal for Learning and Teaching), supported by a Review Board secretary.

Review Board members should receive relevant documentation at least three weeks prior to the event (including access details for any online materials supporting the submissions). The convenors
should arrange an opportunity to review and discuss the information provided prior to meeting panels of staff and students.

Membership of these panels (see Section 3.2.2) should be agreed by the Review Board convenors and the Director of Quality Assurance in consultation with the relevant SASS Directors.

Following these meetings, the Review Board arrives at a formal conclusion in relation to future operating arrangements and considers any commendations and recommendations they may wish to make.

A formal report is drafted by the convenors, agreed by the Review Board members, checked for factual accuracy by the lead author of the SSERR, and then submitted to the relevant SASS Directors, the Deputy President of DUSA, the University Secretary, The Director of PGLA and the Director of Quality Assurance. The report informs the development of an implementation plan. Formal approval of the report and implementation plan is at the level of Senate and Court, via relevant subcommittee structures.

The SASS Directors should ensure that the report and implementation plan are disseminated to their support teams, and are discussed at a follow-on meeting that should include unit managers, relevant SASS Directors (or their deputies) and members of the DUSA Executive Team.

2.6 External audit

The review and enhancement processes should be organised, referenced and archived in ways that could be easily audited, for example, as a sample within an external review of the University at institutional level.

2.7 Recognition of the importance of quality reviews

The University recognises:

- the importance of the review of the student support environment in assuring and promoting the enhancement of standards and quality
- the administrative expertise and time required to implement the process effectively.

Commitment and effective effort by individual members of staff in review activities should be recognised and valued in staff promotion and advancement as evidence of contribution to continual enhancement and excellence in all aspects of the student experience.

2.8 Costs of the Review Board event

The costs associated with the Review Board event will be met by PGLA.

External members of Review Boards will be:

- reimbursed for all reasonable expenses associated with travel, subsistence and accommodation
- granted an honorarium payment in recognition of their time. In keeping with current practice for reimbursement of external members of Programme Review Boards, the current recommendation is 500 pounds.

2.9 Monitoring and review of this policy

The University QF, reporting to the LTC, will monitor the implementation and effectiveness of the policy, procedures and guidance.
3. Guidenotes and templates

These guidenotes provide advice on the conduct of periodic review of the student support environment and describe the formats for development of self-evaluation reviews from each support unit/Directorate and the over-arching SSERR.

3.1 Evaluation, reflection and planning within the review process

3.1.1 Self-evaluation of each support unit/Directorate

The aim of the self-evaluation process is to analyse and judge the effectiveness of each support service unit/Directorate and develop ideas and plans for future enhancement. The formats of the unit self-evaluation reports and the SSERR are similar, with the latter providing a distillation of the key points from the unit self-evaluation reports. A template for structuring the self-evaluation document is provided in Appendix 1, though with the recognition that units/Directorates may wish to modify the structure of their reports to reflect the focus of their activities.

3.1.2 Development of the Student Support Environment Reflective Review

The SSERR is the top-level over-arching reflective review of the student support environment at Dundee. This review should distil key points from self-evaluation reviews of units and Directorates, taking into account their individual self-evaluations and proposed forward plans. Whilst responsibility for authoring of the review should lie with one individual (in a senior management role with responsibility for student support), it is important that the review comprises a collective and holistic view on the quality, effectiveness and integration of student support at the University of Dundee rather than a summary of the separate inputs from individual units. The review should contain a commentary on how the final review report was developed and how the various support units contributed to the over-arching report. A template for structuring the SSERR is provided in Appendix 2.

3.2 Conduct of the Review Board

3.2.1 Composition of the Review Board

Membership of the Review Board will be agreed by the President of DUSA, the Vice-Principal/Deputy Principal for Learning and Teaching and the Director of Quality Assurance, in consultation with the relevant student support Directors. It will normally comprise:

1. the President of DUSA (co-convenor)
2. the Vice-Principal/Deputy Principal for Learning and Teaching (co-convenor)
3. the University Secretary
4. a DUSA sabbatical officer (normally the Deputy President)
5. the Director of Policy, Governance and Legal Affairs
6. a College Secretary
7. at least two experienced members of academic staff (normally with a quality enhancement/assurance role) from within the Institution
8. a minimum of one external expert with experience in student support and quality enhancement. Additional external reviewers could be an employer representative and/or a member of staff from the secondary education sector.

The Review Board convenors should be supported by a Review Board secretary nominated by the University Secretary. The chief role of the Review Board secretary is to support the convenors in the preparation of the report. The Review Board secretary should have experience in the support of
academic ‘Programme Reviews’. Additional administrative support should be provided by an
organising secretary, who should contact proposed members well in advance to agree availability.

3.2.2 Composition of student support environment review panels

The Review Board examines submitted documents and other information and meets with separate
panels comprising:

a. heads of student support units and relevant Directorates
b. operational staff from within the relevant support units and directorates
c. students (nominated in consultation with DUSA sabbatical officers and the University
   Equality and Diversity Officer, and reflecting the diversity of the student population at
   Dundee)
d. School secretaries and relevant College administrative staff
e. academic staff (including College Heads of Learning and Teaching or nominees, and other
   academic staff with key student support roles identified by College Heads of Learning and
   Teaching).

There should not be merging of the panel meetings. Whilst there is not an expectation that all of the
School Secretaries will attend the meeting of Panel d, all School Secretaries should be invited and
encouraged to contribute and attend.

All of the panel members should be given the opportunity to access and read the supporting
documentation, which should be made available through My Dundee.

3.2.3 Conduct of the Review Board event

A recommended model, which assumes the Review event lasting two days, is as follows:

1. Before the Review Board event. The organising secretary should ensure that members receive
electronic copies of the following documentation a minimum of three weeks prior to the Review
Board event (preferably earlier).

Organisational information:

- membership of the Review Board and panels
- timetable for the event, including location and maps.
- for external members, an expenses claim form.

Reference documentation

- a copy of this policy and guidenote
- guidance for participants
- a copy of the relevant chapters of the QAA Quality Code.

Review documentation

- a copy of the SSERR, with supporting appendices (this may be via hyperlinks to a dedicated
  website) that include the individual unit/Directorate self-evaluation reports.

Members should be invited at the outset to declare any prior interests or connections within the
context of the Review.

If a Review Board member has any questions, or wishes hard copies of any of the supporting
documentation (including copies of any of the references cited), they should contact the organising
secretary in the first instance.
The convenors may request preliminary written comments by Review Board members to be submitted prior to the Review Board event.

2. **Private pre-meeting of the Review Board.** This may be held on the morning before the first meetings with the Student Support Review Panels. Here, members of the Review Board will be introduced, and will be asked to give their initial views of the submitted materials. The convenors should then ask for topics and issues that the Review Board members would like to pursue with the different groups, and agree upon who will lead on these issues during the face-to-face meetings, and the panels at which each topic should be addressed. The convenors should discuss and finalise a plan of action, which should be agreed by the Board.

3. **Meetings with the Student Support Review Panels.** The meetings will normally take place during the afternoon of the first day and morning of the second day. It is suggested that the Board meets with the unit/Directorate heads panel first to clarify and address the points that emerge from the SSERR. At the discretion of the convenors, this meeting may include a short presentation from the designated Director to highlight key points. The presentation should not dominate the meeting, and should be used as an opportunity to highlight areas of good practice and areas where there are challenges. The meeting with unit/Director heads should be followed with a meeting with the operational staff, then students, then School secretaries (and College administrative staff where appropriate), then academic staff. It is recognised that the order of the meetings may need to be adjusted to accommodate availability of students and staff. The order does not reflect the importance of the input from each of the panels.

4. **Second private meeting of the Review Board.** The Review Board discusses the Review and agrees conclusions. This should cover:
   - recommendations to Senate and Court regarding the effectiveness of the student support environment and proposals for future operations
   - aspects of good practice that the Review Board wishes to highlight
   - suggestions regarding the future conduct of periodic (and thematic) review of the student support environment
   - any additional comments.

   A synopsis of the conclusions of the Review Board may be given orally to the lead Director and the designated heads of student support units and relevant Directorates. Before doing this, the convenors should confirm the wording of the Board’s decision (including any good practice to be commended and areas that require development).

5. **Meeting with the lead Director for the student support environment (SSERR author) and designated heads of student support units and Directorates.** One of the convenors conveys the synopsis of the collective view of the Review Board to the lead Director and designated heads of student support units and relevant Directorates (including recommendations and points of good practice to be highlighted). This is an initial reporting meeting rather than a discussion meeting. The convenor should describe the key points of the conclusions and recommendations to the group, then close the event, indicating approximately when the formal report will be available.

6. **Drafting of the report.** The convenors and Review Board secretary are responsible for preparing the report. They may invite individual Review Board members to prepare drafts of specific sections. Having drafted the report, the Review Board secretary should circulate this to Board members for comment and suggestions for revision. A final draft report should be circulated to the lead author of the SSERR for comments on its accuracy. Any comments on the accuracy of the report should be addressed by the Review Board convenors and secretary (ensuring consultation and agreement with the Review Board members), before submission of the final report.

7. **Submission of the final report and development of an implementation plan.** The convenors submit the agreed, final report to:
• the University Secretary
• the Director of PGLA
• the Director of Quality Assurance
• the relevant SASS Directors
• the Deputy President of DUSA.

The University Secretary, in consultation with the relevant SASS Directors and the DUSA President, develops an implementation plan with proposed timescales.

The SASS Directors should ensure that the report and implementation plan are disseminated to their support teams, and are discussed at a follow-on meeting that should include unit heads, relevant SASS directors and DUSA sabbatical officers.

The Director of Quality Assurance ensures that the report and implementation plan are conveyed to the appropriate University committees, and that key points are highlighted for the attention of the University Senior Management Team.

3.2.4 Suggested areas of focus for Review Board Members

Suggestions on areas of particular focus for individual members are outlined below. It should be noted, however, that all members, including the convenors, have both the authority and responsibility to comment on any aspect or issue.

The DUSA sabbatical officer

The student representative should, in general, read and comment on the documentation and plans from a student perspective and specifically:

• consider how the elements of the student experience for which SASS is responsible are being supported and whether the needs of all students (on- and off-campus) are being addressed appropriately (comments on areas that fall outwith the scope of the review should also be explored, to aid the development of the review process in the future)
• comment on the approach to enhancement. In particular, scrutinise the ways in which student (and other user) feedback is taken into account and acted upon, and fed back to users of the services
• examine the approach to equality and diversity
• comment on the management of communications and public information for students where relevant.

The University Secretary

The University Secretary should focus on the effectiveness of the student support environment in the context of the University vision and strategy, and specifically:

• consider how the development plan supports the University vision, strategy and relevant Directorate operating plans
• comment on the proposed forward plan for managing the environment for student support
• examine the evaluation and proposed forward plan for resourcing future operation of the student support environment.

The Director of PGLA

The Director of PGLA should consider the documentation and review in the context of policy development to support the ambitions of the student support environment. It is suggested that the PGLA Director should concentrate on:
• the alignment of University policies and regulations with practice in the arena of the student support environment
• how student support operations map to external guidelines and expectations (e.g. the QAA Quality Code).

College Secretary
The College Secretary should focus on how the central student support services align with support at College and School level. Specifically, the College Secretary should:
• consider how communication works between College, School and central support services
• explore and comment on areas where there might be overlapping provision in student support
• explore and comment on issues that cut across one or more units or Directorates and how well these are integrated from a user perspective
• consider the resourcing of student support across the Institution.

The academic staff members
The academic members of staff should focus on:
• the effectiveness of the central support environment on enhancing the overall student experience
• the contribution of the central support environment to the development of graduate skills and attributes
• the effectiveness of central student support units/Directorates in supporting the needs of academic staff in terms of their delivery of learning and teaching
• challenges faced by student support units/Directorates in accommodating the varying needs and approaches of different Schools and Colleges.

The external expert(s)
The external member(s) of the Board should focus on:
• the effectiveness of the student support environment in the context of national, European and international developments and best practice
• the reflection, evaluation and development plan in the context of national government agendas
• opportunities for internal and external collaborations
• the benefits from existing or potential accreditation by external bodies where relevant.

3.2.4 Structure of the Review Board report
The Review Board Report should be structured as shown in Appendix 3.

3.2.5 Status of the Review Board report
The status of the Review Board Report is that of a recommendation to the University Senate, Court and the Senior Management Team. An implementation plan developed by the University Secretary, SASS Directors and the DUSA President (see Section 3.2.3, sub-section 7) will be considered alongside the Review Board Report by relevant Senate and Court Committees. The implementation plan should inform the future development of Directorate operational plans. Subsequent annual service evaluations should identify progress against the implementation plan.

Dr Lesley McLellan, Director of Quality Assurance, February 2013
**Template for structuring the unit/Directorate self-evaluation report**

**PART 1: INTRODUCTION**

1.1 Name of unit or group of units  
(e.g. Careers Service)

1.2 Key features of the service provision
   
   1.2.1 Purpose and role  
   Provide a brief statement of purpose and role of the support unit(s).

   1.2.2 Distinctiveness and relevance  
   Describe the distinctiveness of the provision and relevance to the student population (and staff client population where relevant).

1.3 The evaluation process
   
   Give a brief explanation of how the evaluation was undertaken - e.g. how it was structured, who did what, how the views of students (and other users or stakeholders) were taken into account.

**PART 2: REFLECTION AND EVALUATION**

2.1 The role and effectiveness of the service in providing high quality support to students and other users

   2.1.1 Profile of the service provision
      
      • alignment of activities with the University Strategy and Transformational Vision  
      Describe (where relevant) how the role and purpose of the unit/Directorate aligns with the University Strategy and Vision.

      • scope and operating statistics  
      Give a detailed description of the scope and operating statistics of the unit/Directorate.

      • key activities and responsibilities  
      Describe the activities that the unit/Directorate has responsibility for (breadth and depth).  
      How many staff support the unit/Directorate?  
      What is the user profile?  
      What are the trends in use of the service?

      • notable characteristics of the student/user profile and analysis of future needs  
      Include any notable characteristics of the student/user profile, implications for management of enhancement of the student experience and any future discernible trends. Give an assessment of the ability of the service to meet current and likely future demands for its provision.

   2.1.2 Approach to quality enhancement
      
      • approach to obtaining feedback and evaluating quality  
      Describe the unit’s/Directorate’s approach to routinely obtaining, evaluating and responding to feedback from students and other users, and how feedback influences
practice. Provide an evaluation of the unit’s effectiveness of obtaining and responding to feedback. Describe the unit’s/Directorate’s approach to equality and diversity, and ensuring appropriate staff/student training.

- key messages from feedback

Where possible, provide a collation of quantitative feedback on satisfaction with the support unit from the preceding year(s), and indicate the response rate where appropriate. Give an evaluation of the themes arising from qualitative feedback (i.e. comments and recommendations from students/users). Where appropriate, this can be drawn from annual service evaluation activities, which should be referenced through web-links or added as appendices.

- approach to acting on feedback

Give an overview of the key themes arising from feedback, highlighting areas of high satisfaction as well as areas where there are challenges, and describe how the unit/Directorate has acted (or plans to act) on feedback. Use examples as appropriate.

- Evaluation of approach to quality enhancement

Provide an evaluation of the unit’s/Directorate’s effectiveness in responding to feedback. Use examples (e.g. you said, we did) as appropriate, highlighting areas where the unit/Directorate could or could not respond to feedback in a satisfactory way. Give an evaluation of other approaches to quality enhancement as appropriate.

2.1.3 Approach to communicating with students and other users

Describe how the unit/Directorate communicates with students and other users and, where possible, provide an evaluation of the effectiveness of the approach to communication.

2.2 Resources and the environment

Describe and comment on the resources and the environment under the suggested headings given below, and provide an evaluation of effectiveness. This commentary and evaluation of effectiveness should be supported by evidence (referred to in appendices or web-links to on-line supporting materials as appropriate). Cross-referencing to feedback reports and annual service evaluations may be useful.

- the location
- accessibility for students and staff
- facilities
- staffing levels
- the operating budget where relevant.

2.3 Partnerships and collaborations

2.3.1 Approach to working with internal operative units

- collaborations with internal units/Directorates

Give details of the unit’s/Directorate’s approach to working with and partnering with other support units, Schools, Colleges, Directorates and DUSA. Highlight successful collaborative initiatives as well as any barriers to collaborations.

- evaluation of the effectiveness of collaborative working

Provide an evidence-based evaluation of the effectiveness the unit’s/Directorate’s approach to collaborative working within the Institution.

2.3.2 Approach to working with external organisations and stakeholders
Describe the unit’s approach to working with external organisations and stakeholders where relevant, and provide an evaluation of the unit’s/Directorate’s effectiveness in this area.

2.4 Benchmarking

2.4.1 Approach to benchmarking with external reference points
Describe the mechanisms that the unit has in place for benchmarking with external reference points (e.g. the QAA Quality Code and/or external Professional Bodies).

2.4.2 Mapping to external reference points
Provide a mapping of practice to external benchmarks (where appropriate) and an evaluation of whether practice fits with external norms.

2.5 External accreditation (where applicable)
Give details of accreditation by external bodies where relevant. Describe the benefits and costs.

2.6 Barriers and challenges
Describe any difficulties that the Directorate/unit face which result from issues outside its control. Examples of these may be external factors like legislation and statutory responsibilities, or internal factors such as varying practice and differing demands across Schools and Colleges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART 3: CONCLUSIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Summary of strengths and good practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify points of strength and areas where good practice can be shared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Summary of needs and opportunities for change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide an evidence-based case for areas that require development. Consider the appropriateness of existing structures and options for enhancement. Consider areas where collaborative working and sharing of resources could be strengthened. Using appropriate evidence from evaluations described in Section 2 above, identify areas that are under-resourced and identify areas where there are opportunities for efficiencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART 4: DEVELOPMENT PLAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This should indicate how the unit proposes to manage and enhance the service for the future. The plan should contain ideas for short-term targets (for the next planning cycle) and longer-term goals over the 5-year review period and beyond towards the University Transformational Vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priorities should be highlighted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans should be evidenced-based, building on the evaluation and reflection of the effectiveness of the service, as well as drawing upon the national (and international) quality context and the developing quality agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where appropriate, performance indicators should be identified and used to analyse progress during subsequent annual service evaluations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| PART 5: REFERENCES AND APPENDICES. Refer to on-line materials through web-links where possible. |
Template for structuring the SSERR

PART 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Scope of the Review

1.2 The evaluation process

Give an overview of how the SSERR was developed and how units and Directorates contributed to the SSERR.

PART 2: REFLECTION AND EVALUATION

2.1 The role and effectiveness of the services in providing high quality support to students and other users

2.1.1 Over-arching profile of the student support environment at Dundee

• overview
  Provide an overview of the student support environment, drawing upon the data provided within the self-evaluation reports.

• scope and operating statistics
  Describe the scope and operating statistics e.g. staffing, user ‘foot-fall’, annual budget.

• analysis of current and future effectiveness
  Provide an evaluation of the effectiveness of the current provision, and an assessment of the ability of the service to meet likely future demands for its provision.

2.1.2 Approach to quality enhancement

• overview
  Give an overview of the practices of units/Directorates in routinely obtaining and responding to feedback from students and other users, and how feedback is used for quality enhancement.

• assessment of effectiveness of approach to quality enhancement
  Provide an assessment of the effectiveness of approaches to quality enhancement. Describe how the units/Directorates approach equality and diversity, and ensure appropriate staff/student training, and give an evaluation of the effectiveness of the approaches.

2.1.3 Approach to communicating with students and other users

• overview
  Give an overview of the practices of units/Directorates in communicating with students and other users.

• assessment of effectiveness of approach to communication
  Provide an assessment of the effectiveness of approaches to communication.

2.2 Resources and the environment

Provide an overview of the resources and the environment under the suggested headings given below, and provide an evaluation of effectiveness. This commentary and evaluation of effectiveness should be supported by the evidence provided by the self-evaluation reports from units/Directorates (referred to in appendices or web-links to on-line supporting materials as appropriate).
• locations of units/Directorates
• accessibility for students and staff
• facilities
• staffing levels
• operating budget.

2.3 Partnerships and collaborations
Give an overview of the approach to collaboration between units/Directorates within the Institution. Highlight successful collaborative initiatives as well as any barriers to collaborations. Provide an evidence-based evaluation of the effectiveness of the approach to collaborative working within the Institution.

Describe the approach to working with external organisations and stakeholders, and provide an evaluation of effectiveness in this area.

2.4 Benchmarking
Provide an overview of the mechanisms in place for benchmarking with external reference points (e.g. the QAA Quality Code and/or external Professional Bodies), and an evaluation of whether practice maps to expectations of relevant external bodies.

2.5 External accreditation
Give a summary of services that are accredited by external bodies. Provide a view on the benefits (or otherwise) of current accreditation of activities and opportunities for further development.

2.6 Barriers and challenges
Give an overview of the external and internal challenges that the units/Directorates face. In particular, highlight areas where solutions could be found by changes in practice at School, College or other Directorate level.

PART 3: CONCLUSIONS

3.1 Summary of strengths and good practice
Identify points of strength and areas where good practice can be shared.

3.2 Summary of needs and opportunities for change
Provide an evidence-based case for areas that require development. Consider the appropriateness of existing structures and options for enhancement. Consider areas where collaborative working and sharing of resources could be strengthened. Using appropriate evidence from evaluations described in Section 2 above, identify areas that are under-resourced and identify areas where there are opportunities for efficiencies.

PART 4: DEVELOPMENT PLAN

This should give a broad, over-arching description of proposed plans for management and enhancement of the student support environment for the future. The plan should contain priorities for short-term targets (for the next planning cycle) and longer-term goals over the 5-year review period and beyond towards the University Transformational Vision.

The over-arching development plan should be evidenced-based, referring to unit/Directorate proposals with the provision of hyperlinks as appropriate, as well as drawing upon the national (and international) quality context and the developing quality agenda.

Where appropriate, performance indicators should be identified and used to analyse progress during subsequent service evaluation activities.
PART 5: REFERENCES AND APPENDICES

Individual self-evaluation reports should be included as appendices (preferably via hyperlinks to online material).
# Template for structuring the Review Board report

## Introduction

Provide an introduction to the context and scope of the review. Give the names and roles of the members of the Review Board as well as the Student Support Review Panel members that were interviewed as part of the event. Provide a précis of how the review event was structured.

## Observations and questions to Student Support Review Panels

The detailed report should be presented under the focus headings of the SSERR, with outcomes of the discussions with each Panel being highlighted within each section:

1. the role and effectiveness of the services in providing high quality support to students and other users
2. resources and the environment
3. partnerships and collaborations
4. benchmarking and external accreditation
5. barriers and challenges.

## Summary of the Review Board’s views

Identify areas of strength and where good practice can be shared.

Provide an assessment of the approach to enhancement and student engagement.

Identify areas where there are needs and/or opportunities for change, including structural change.

Give a commentary on the approach to equality and diversity.

Provide a view on effectiveness, sustainability, the appropriateness of the resource (staff and estate) and agility to respond to local, national and international agendas.

Comment on the effectiveness of communications, and how the student support environment aligns with the University vision and strategy, and the focus on quality enhancement of the student experience.


## Conclusions

Provide recommendations on the future operation of the student support environment. It may be appropriate to develop priority recommendations.

Commend areas of good practice.

Give any suggestions regarding the University policy and process for periodic review of the student support environment.

Provide any other constructive comments.
Abbreviations

DUSA: Dundee University Students’ Association
LTC: Learning and Teaching Committee
QAA: Quality Assurance Agency
QF: (University of Dundee) Quality Forum
PGLA: Policy, Governance and Legal Affairs
SASS: Student and Academic Support Services
SSERR: Student Support Environment Reflective Review
Assessment and Feedback: Report and Recommendations to the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee

A Dundee University Students’ Association (DUSA)-Led Collaborative Project on Analysis of the Student View of Current Practice at the University of Dundee

Executive Summary

Our National Student Survey (NSS) scores for 2012 indicate a level of student dissatisfaction in the area of assessment and feedback that is not acceptable. It is therefore important to understand further the student view of assessment and feedback at Dundee in order to develop changes in practice to enhance student learning opportunities.

A DUSA-led project to address this issue was undertaken during late 2012 in collaboration with the Library & Learning Centre (LLC) and the Directorate of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs (PGLA). A triangulated approach was taken, where NSS scores, open comments from the NSS and the outcomes of focus group interviews with students were examined together to identify common themes where improvements could be made. The over-arching themes that were identified are detailed below:

Clarity of expectations for assignments: One of the main messages that emerged from this project was the need to ensure that the requirements and expectations for assignments/tasks are clearly explained to students, along with robust communication about marking criteria. Students need comprehensive guidance on how to approach assignments as well as being given a clear understanding on how assignments will be marked.

Consistency in marking: A major theme that came out of the analysis of the qualitative material was that of variability in the ‘harshness’ of marking. The data suggest that students do not always perceive marking to be fair and equitable. There were views that standards for assessment can be dependent on the individual assessor. Whilst it is interesting to note that analysis of the NSS scores did not flag-up fairness in assessment as an area for concern, there is a strong indication from the qualitative data that consistency and fairness in marking is an area that needs to be addressed through taking a transparent and criteria-focused approach (see also above).

Feedback as an important component of learning: The critical role that feedback plays in student learning, as well as in helping students with their approach to future assignments and exams, was identified as a key area for development. This theme emerged from all of the approaches taken in the present study. There was a strong message that students recognise the importance of assessment in their learning, and that they want to learn from their performance in assignments and exams in order to be successful in the future. Whilst it is apparent that there are examples of very good practice across the University, performance in this area is clearly patchy.

Timing of assessments and distribution of effort: An area that was highlighted as an area for improvement is the approach to the setting of deadlines for assignments. Students expressed concerns about conflicting deadlines, unreasonable workloads at certain times during the semester and the need for time to be able to assimilate taught material before learning is assessed.

Timeliness in giving feedback: There is a clear indication from the quantitative data that this is an area of concern for our students. Although the number of open comments that relate to timeliness was relatively few, it is notable that some students commented that they had to wait weeks or months to receive feedback.

Assessment methods: Whilst the NSS data do not highlight this as an area that students have concerns with, the message from the focus group work suggests that students would prefer a better
balance between coursework and exams in terms of contribution towards their grades. In addition, there is an indication that students find approaches to group assessments unsatisfactory.

The Learning and Teaching Committee is asked to support and respond to the recommendations outlined below, consider and agree necessary actions and responsibilities for implementation of the recommendations as appropriate (specifically with regard to the development of future policies, guidelines and processes) and monitor progress through receiving regular reports. The recommendations arising from this project are as follows:

- learning outcomes and the way that these are assessed need to be clearly explained to students. Consideration also has to be given to approaches to alignment of assessments with learning outcomes and the Scottish Credit & Qualifications Framework and how this is properly understood by students and staff

- annual (taught provision) monitoring templates should be modified to give a higher profile to assessment and feedback practices. For the programme monitoring template, this should include a request for reflection, where possible, of how modules link together in terms of assessment practices, to ensure that there are not unreasonable workload expectations for students at specific times during the semester

- the programme/module approval templates should be modified to encourage greater consideration of distribution of student effort across a programme/module of study. Programme teams should map the sequence of assessment deadlines across levels of study to try and minimise coincidental submission dates where possible

- programme/module approval templates should be modified to encourage greater consideration of alignment of proposed assessment practices with learning outcomes

- emphasis on assessment and feedback should be increased as part of academic staff development initiatives and CPD opportunities

- good examples of feedback templates should be available as a central resource through the Quality Enhancement Framework website

- a specific question on the quality of feedback to students should be included in the external examiners report form under Section 4: Areas of good practice and opportunities and opportunities for quality enhancement

- consideration should be given to the reintroduction of the over-arching University Student Handbook, or the development of a ‘Frequently Asked Questions’ page for students within the Quality Enhancement Framework website, so that key points that relate to assessment and feedback are clearly communicated to students

- the wording in the University guidelines for the mandatory elements of student handbooks should be reviewed and modified to ensure that there is an expectation that detailed, descriptive marking criteria allied to the marking scale should be included

- the University Assessment Policy should be reviewed in light of the findings of the present study, and should be up-dated to become an over-arching Assessment and Feedback Policy that includes elements of good practice on feedback

- a copy of the final version of this report (endorsed by the Learning & Teaching committee) should be circulated to Schools for information, and made available on the web for University staff and students.

Iain Kennedy, Rachael Doherty, Stuart Fitzpatrick, David Walker and Lesley McLellan, 5 March 2013
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Introduction and background

The results from the National Student Survey (NSS) 2012 showed that our scores in the area of assessment and feedback continue to fall below the sector average (http://www.dundee.ac.uk/qaf/qafnss.htm). In order to address this area of student dissatisfaction and to continue to develop our quality enhancement culture at Dundee, two strands of work were undertaken during 2012.

The first work strand was a pilot of the TESTA (Transforming the Experience of Students Through Assessment, see http://www.testa.ac.uk/) methodology to determine whether this approach should be taken-up across the Institution to further develop good practice in assessment and feedback. This project was led by the Deputy Principal (Learning and Teaching) and the Library and Learning Centre (LLC) and the outcome of the pilot is the subject of a separate report (http://www.dundee.ac.uk/academic/learning/agenda/, paper D) and will not be considered here.

The second work strand focused primarily on an analysis of the student view of assessment and feedback at Dundee and was led by the Dundee University Students’ Association (DUSA) in collaboration with the Directorate of Policy, Governance and Legal Affairs (PGLA) and the LLC. A part-time graduate intern (0.5 FTE) was jointly appointed for three months by DUSA, the LLC and PGLA to take the project forward.

The outcome of the latter work strand on analysis of the student view of assessment and feedback is the subject of this report and recommendations. Whilst this is an independent (and collaborative) DUSA-led project, its outcomes and recommendations are intended to be complementary to the TESTA pilot project.

Approach to examining the student view on assessment and feedback

Following meetings of a task group (Iain Kennedy (DUSA President), Rachael Doherty (DUSA Deputy President), Stuart Fitzpatrick (temporary graduate intern - Academic Policy Development Officer and previous DUSA Deputy President), David Walker (LLC) and Lesley McLellan (PGLA)) it was decided that the best way to examine the student view of assessment and feedback (within the resource constraints) was to carry out detailed analyses of the semi-quantitative (described as ‘quantitative’ hereafter) and qualitative data that are provided from the NSS results as well as asking students for their views through representative focus group interviews.

1. The quantitative NSS data (i.e. the % scores from students who agree or strongly agree with the statements relating to assessment and feedback in the NSS) from 2012 were analysed with respect to a cut-off value of 75% agree/strongly agree. Within this framework, areas of general student satisfaction and areas for development were identified.

2. The open comments that were provided by students through the 2012 NSS (qualitative data) were examined and the views that related to assessment and feedback were extracted and categorised. The comments were quantified within themes and analysed for common areas where University policy development could make a positive impact.

3. Structured student focus group meetings from representative Schools were carried out to attempt to gain an ‘on the ground’ understanding of the feelings of the student body on issues relating to assessment and feedback. Whilst valuable feedback was obtained from the focus group approach, it is recognised that the sample was small and that that the results from this part of the study can only be considered as indicative.

The outcomes from these three data sources form the basis of this report and recommendations for development of policy and guidelines for good practice.
Identification of areas of good practice and areas for development through analysis of National Student Survey (NSS) scores

The annual University report on the NSS (see http://www.dundee.ac.uk/qaf/qafnss.htm) summarises scores by subject using the following categories: high satisfaction (≥ 90%), satisfaction (75-89%), some concerns (50-74%) and major concerns (≤ 49%). During the present study it was decided to examine the scores for assessment and feedback using two categories only. Areas where ≥75% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statements were considered to represent satisfaction. Areas where ≤74% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statements (i.e. where at least a quarter of the student population was not satisfied) were considered to be areas of concern that DUSA and the University should be giving attention to. The scores for Assessment and Feedback at the subject level are shown in Appendix 1, Table 1 and summarised in Appendix 1, Table 2.

Of the five questions that relate to assessment and feedback, only Question 6 (Assessment arrangements and marking have been fair) had a higher proportion of subject areas where satisfaction was expressed compared with subject areas where there were concerns. For all of the other questions, 56-78% of the subject areas had scores that fall in to the ‘concern’ area.

The NSS question where the highest number of subjects was categorised within the ‘concern’ area is Question 7 (Feedback on my work has been prompt). Here, 25 out of the 32 subject areas (78%) had scores that fall within the area of concern. The other question where there were an alarming number (69%) of subjects areas that have scores within the ‘concern’ category is Question 9 (Feedback on my work has helped me clarify things I did not understand). A close follower to this is Question 5 (The criteria used in marking have been made clear in advance), where 62% of the subject areas have scores that suggest concerns.

To summarise, the top three questions (out of five) where concerns were expressed at subject level are as follows:

1. Question 7. Feedback on my work has been prompt.
2. Question 9. Feedback on my work has helped me clarify thing I did not understand.
3. Question 5. The criteria used in marking have been made clear in advance.

During this study, subject areas that demonstrate overall student satisfaction scores for assessment and feedback were identified in order to highlight areas where there are opportunities for sharing good practice. These are as follows:

- Academic Studies in Education
- English Studies
- Philosophy.

Analysis of the student view of assessment and feedback from the open comments given in the NSS

The open comments from students (qualitative data) were analysed and each of the views that related to assessment and feedback were extracted and categorised within designated areas (Appendix 2, Table 1):

- consistency and fairness
- guidance, support, clarity and feed-forward
- quality and quantity
- timeliness
- type/makeup of assessment
- workload and distribution of effort.

The comments were quantified (Appendix 2, Table 2) within the above categories and examined for recurring themes.

Bearing in mind that there is the potential for variable interpretations of comments as well as overlap of our definitions within the area that was considered to be Assessment and Feedback, there were approximately 238 open comments of which 44 were positive and 194 were negative. The area that attracted the greatest number of comments was that of Quality and Quantity, where there were around 61 comments. Interestingly, within this category, the number of positive comments constituted about 40% of the number of comments. In all of the other categories, the proportion of positive comments was much less.

The area that attracted the fewest number of comments is in the Type and Make-up of Assessment category, where there were only 12 comments.

An analysis of the key messages arising from the open comments is given below.

Consistency and fairness.

Under this category, nearly half of the comments relate to consistency of marking. The views suggest that students were unhappy that some lecturers seemed to mark more harshly than others, and that marking criteria were not adhered to or inconsistently interpreted and applied. Other negative comments describe variability in feedback, unfair marking and group work. There were relatively few positive comments in this category.

Guidance, support, clarity and feed-forward.

As above, comments in this area were largely negative. More than half of the negative comments relate to clarity of expectations. The comments suggest that students would like to have clearer guidance on how to approach their assignments/exams and how to conceptualise standards in relation to criteria. The other major theme that emerged from this area is clarity of feedback, with several of the students describing feedback as ‘vague’, ‘unclear’ or ‘confusing’. A couple of comments highlight dissatisfaction with receiving marks only for exams, with no feedback. There were several positive comments that relate to clear constructive feedback, and highlight good practice in feedback.

Quality and quantity

This category attracted a fairly similar number of positive (40%) and negative (60%) comments. The majority of the comments relate to feedback. Within the positive comments, most relate to high quality, useful feedback. Within the negative comments, perhaps understandably, the quality and quantity aspects were not really separable as lack of feedback is obviously an issue of both quality and quantity. Comments indicate that students would value receiving more than just a grade. Some students complained about lack of feedback for exams. Other comments focused on feedback being overly negative and not constructive.

Timeliness

Surprisingly, this category contains a relatively low number of comments (26). Of these, only one comment was positive. The negative comments were fairly bland and not particularly informative for the purpose of developing this report. It is worth noting that there are a few instances where students commented that they had to wait several weeks or months for feedback.

Type/makeup of assessment
The very small number of comments (12) that fell within this category means that it is hard to extract anything meaningful from them. Four comments indicate that students felt that there is too much examining as a method of assessment, although one student complained about a lack of exams.

**Workload and distribution of effort**

A common theme within this category is general workload, where several students expressed dissatisfaction with high workloads. This seemed to be problematic for some students with work placements or with family/work commitments. Erratic timing of deadlines for coursework and coincident deadlines were highlighted as being challenging. There were four positive comments, where students expressed general satisfaction with the amount and spread of assignments.

**Student focus groups to gather student opinion of practice and effectiveness in the area of assessment and feedback: outcomes of a pilot study**

Students from each year of study were invited by School Presidents to take part in structured interviews with the DUSA Deputy President (Rachael Doherty) and the graduate intern (Stuart Fitzpatrick). The discussions were structured as follows:

1. Tell us about how you are assessed. What types of assessments are used within your course?
   - Prompt for specific examples
2. What is one thing you would change about your assessments?
   - Ask if it is a general feeling. Do they all feel like that?
3. Have you been made aware/do you know what your lecturers or tutors are looking for in a specific assessed piece of work? Are you clear about the marking criteria?
   - Is the guidance given by your lecturers or tutors consistent?
4. What are the best and worst things about your current assessment structure?
5. How does the feedback you receive help you in your next assessment or module?
6. How is feedback given to you?
7. Is there anything you would change about the structure of the feedback given to you?
8. Are there any GOOD things you would like to highlight that your school does in feedback practices?
9. Are there any BAD things you would like to highlight that your school does in feedback practices?
10. Tell us how quickly do you expect to get marks and feedback on your work and how quickly do you actually receive them?
11. What do you expect from University level feedback on your work?
12. Overall, are you satisfied with areas relating to assessment and feedback on your course?

The interviews were recorded and statements were transcribed and analysed. Meetings with students from four Schools (Business, Computing, Engineering, Physics and Maths and Life Sciences School of Learning and Teaching) were included in this pilot. Between four and eight students participated in each focus group.

Analysis of the transcripts of statements from the focus groups showed that there were recurring themes across the University of positive and negative practices.

Within all of the Schools that participated in the focus groups there were a number of students who praised lecturers on the feedback practices where extensive feedback was given by lecturers. This
included clear explanations relating to assessment task requirements, what lecturers expected and the marking criteria. An example of good practice that was highlighted is the provision of pre-feedback, where common errors that students had made in previous years were explained to current students in advance of completion of the assessed task.

Students stated that they are aware that academics are busy. Within each School there are cases where they felt they could approach lecturers for explanation, more feedback on their work and in some cases guidance on how to improve on their academic standards. However this varied from lecturer to lecturer. The School of Computing received many positive comments where their assessment practices were described as being challenging and enjoyable and supported by detailed feedback. Within other Schools the students indicated that they perceived that their learning was not a priority. The students from one School stated that they continually feel as though the research side takes priority over the teaching aspect. There was an awareness, however, that the research side is highly important to the reputation of the School and the University, and there was divided opinion on the issue of which is more important.

Assessments

Across the board, students did not favour group-based assessments. Several reasons were given for this: 1) The size of groups (any more than 5 people within a group seems to be extremely unfavourable); 2) Not enough for everyone to do; 3) Scheduling meetings; 4) Weaker students being carried by the strong students making the overall grade biased. Students stated that if there must be group assignments the preference would be to have small groups of about four students per group. The overall preference seemed to be for individual assignments where possible.

Some students indicated a preference for constant learning/continual assessment, and there was enthusiasm about weekly assignments worth a low percentage of their overall grade\(^1\).

Timings of assignments were noted to be a problem within certain schools, with multiple assignments having deadlines with 24 hours of each other and then no coursework for a number of weeks. In addition, within some Schools, it was noted that lecturers will assign work with deadlines prior to the subject being taught.

A common theme that emerged from all of the Schools was an issue of lack of clarity of expectations for assignments. Generally it was felt that, in many instances, expectations and criteria are not explained thoroughly and students are left feeling confused. When asking for further guidance, they received little other direction than what had previously been stated. Clear and concise directions on assignments, including clarity about the marking criteria and how they relate to intended learning outcomes, are needed for every piece of assessed work set to the students. This was felt to be particularly important for first year students during their transition period from secondary school to University standard studying.

The focus group students recognised the importance of assessments in their learning. They are motivated to learn throughout the year with assessments. A large proportion of the students stated that they prefer course work to the pressure of examinations, and concern was expressed about modules with examinations worth 80% - 100% of the module mark. The students felt that the pressure to do well in order to gain a good degree is higher than it has been for years due to the fact that jobs are few and far between. Where examinations for modules have a disproportionately high

---

\(^1\) The authors note that this is not usually a pedagogically sound approach. Fragmentation can lead to surface learning and mark-motivated learners. It can work well in some areas (e.g. language learning and some science disciplines) but not across the board. With large numbers it is impossible to provide meaningful feedback.
influence on the module grade, students expressed frustration. The ability to achieve good marks under exam conditions was felt to be an unbalanced reflection of achievement of the learning outcomes of a module/programme.

Feedback

Across the focus groups, all students indicated that they would be grateful for clear and constructively critical feedback, especially within their first two years in order to allow them to progress quickly to University-standard writing and research skills as each student comes from a different background. It was noted that throughout the University there is a lack of standardised feedback. Within each focus group, students highlighted that there are some lecturers who provide excellent feedback, be it verbal, extensive written or within the class as a whole if it is a class test/short answer questions. Across the board many students stated that many lecturers only provide one word feedback such as “good”, “could improve” etc. Such bland/careless comments are not helpful in informing the student approach to learning. Students felt that feedback should help them develop an understanding of how they should tackle subsequent assignments, and that the purpose of feedback should be to improve learning and their standard of work. Detailed, constructive feedback is vital for students in order for them to identify the actions they need to take in relation to their learning in order to progress. One word feedback or no feedback at all is useless and a waste of time for both the marker and the student.

Student perceptions and expectations

A common message was that students do not expect to be important within the University. There was a view that emerged from the focus group sessions that lecturers have their own research and that the focus is on that rather than student priorities. In consideration of expectations of the University experience, some students expected harsh/blunt and critical feedback, and others assumed that they would not receive any feedback at all. All of the students in the focus groups stated a wish for critical, constructive feedback especially within the first two years in order to be able to produce a higher standard of work during the years that contribute to their degree classification.

Overall, there was an underlying message of dissatisfaction about approaches to assessment and feedback procedures, though with the recognition that there are also areas of good practice in certain School/Programmes. The views of the focus groups ranged from partially satisfied/dissatisfied to completely dissatisfied with assessment and feedback procedures within their Schools. The students understand that lecturers are busy people with competing priorities, and several focus group participants stated (approx. 40% of those asked) that they are aware that they are not the lecturer’s priority.

Distillation of key points from analysis of the NSS results and outcomes from the student focus groups

Preamble

Several common themes emerged from the triangulated approach to looking at the student view of assessment and feedback at Dundee. The open comments from the NSS seem to reflect many of the statements made by students in the focus groups. Perhaps unsurprisingly, a couple of apparent anomalies arise when attempting to align the outcomes of the analysis of the quantitative data with the two sources of qualitative data. This is likely to be, at least in part, a consequence of the way the NSS questions are asked, as well as the fact that the freestyle comments within the NSS are completely open. In the NSS, students are asked to comment on any positive or negative aspect of their time at University, and there is no mechanism to link individual students’ scoring to their comments.
It is recognised that the points outlined below seem to focus on areas of dissatisfaction. As this project was undertaken to address an area for improvement at the University, this is almost inevitable. It should be stressed, however, that the project also identified areas of good and innovative practice in assessment and feedback. A desirable outcome of this project would be that these pockets of good practice would become the norm across the University.

**Themes identified from the project**

1. **Clarity of expectations for assignments**: One of the main messages that emerged from this project was the need to ensure that the requirements and expectations for assignments/tasks are clearly explained to students, along with robust communication about marking criteria. Students need comprehensive guidance on how to approach assignments as well as being given a clear understanding on how assignments will be marked.

2. **Consistency in marking**: A major theme that came out of the analysis of the qualitative material was that of variability in the ‘harshness’ of marking. The data suggest that students do not always perceive marking to be fair and equitable. There were views that standards for assessment can be dependent on the individual assessor. Whilst it is interesting to note that analysis of the NSS scores did not flag-up fairness in assessment as an area for concern, there is a strong indication from the qualitative data that consistency and fairness in marking is an area that needs to be addressed through taking a transparent and criteria-focused approach (see also above).

3. **Feedback as an important component of learning**: The critical role that feedback plays in student learning, as well as in helping students with their approach to future assignments and exams, was identified as a key area for development. This theme emerged from all of the approaches taken in the present study. There was a strong message that students recognise the importance of assessment in their learning, and that they want to learn from their performance in assignments and exams in order to be successful in the future. Whilst it is apparent that there are examples of very good practice across the University, performance in this area is clearly patchy.

4. **Timing of assessments and distribution of effort**: An area that was highlighted as an area for improvement is the approach to the setting of deadlines for assignments. Students expressed concerns about conflicting deadlines, unreasonable workloads at certain times during the semester and the need for time to be able to assimilate taught material before learning is assessed.

5. **Timeliness in giving feedback**: There is a clear indication from the quantitative data that this is an area of concern for our students. Although the number of open comments that relate to timeliness was relatively few, it is notable that some students commented that they had to wait weeks or months to receive feedback.

6. **Assessment methods**: Whilst the NSS data do not highlight this as an area that students have concerns with, the message from the focus group work suggests that students would prefer a better balance between coursework and exams in terms of contribution towards their grades. In addition, there is an indication that students find approaches to group assessments unsatisfactory.

**Recommendations**

In developing future policies, guidelines and processes that relate to assessment and feedback the Learning and Teaching Committee is asked to consider the following:

- learning outcomes and the way that these are assessed need to be clearly explained to students. Consideration also has to be given to approaches to alignment of assessments
with learning outcomes and the Scottish Credit & Qualifications Framework and how this is properly understood by students and staff

- annual (taught provision) monitoring templates should be modified to give a higher profile to assessment and feedback practices. For the programme monitoring template, this should include a request for reflection, where possible, of how modules link together in terms of assessment practices, to ensure that there are not unreasonable workload expectations for students at specific times during the semester

- the programme/module approval templates should be modified to encourage greater consideration of distribution of student effort across a programme/module of study. Programme teams should map the sequence of assessment deadlines across levels of study to try and minimise coincidental submission dates where possible

- programme/module approval templates should be modified to encourage greater consideration of alignment of proposed assessment practices with learning outcomes

- emphasis on assessment and feedback should be increased as part of academic staff development initiatives and CPD opportunities

- good examples of feedback templates should be available as a central resource though the Quality Enhancement Framework website

- a specific question on the quality of feedback to students should be included in the external examiners report form under Section 4: Areas of good practice and opportunities and opportunities for quality enhancement

- consideration should be given to the reintroduction of the over-arching University Student Handbook, or the development of a ‘Frequently Asked Questions’ page for students within the Quality Enhancement Framework website, so that key points that relate to assessment and feedback are clearly communicated to students

- the wording in the University guidelines for the mandatory elements of student handbooks should be reviewed and modified to ensure that there is an expectation that detailed, descriptive marking criteria allied to the marking scale should be included

- the University Assessment Policy should be reviewed in light of the findings of the present study, and should be up-dated to become an over-arching Assessment and Feedback Policy that includes elements of good practice on feedback

- a copy of the final version of this report (endorsed by the Learning & Teaching committee) should be circulated to Schools for information, and made available on the web for University staff and students.
## Table 1: Summary Data (% agree) relating to assessment and feedback by subject area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject area</th>
<th>Q5: The criteria used in marking have been clear in advance</th>
<th>Q6: Assessment arrangements and marking have been fair</th>
<th>Q7: Feedback on my work has been prompt</th>
<th>Q8: I have received detailed comments on my work</th>
<th>Q9: Feedback on my work has helped me clarify things I did not understand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dundee 2012 (1284)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Studies in Education (26)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting (26)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American &amp; Aust. Studies (14)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture (40)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology (22)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinematics &amp; Photography (17)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering (28)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science (27)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry (51)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Studies (92)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics (26)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English studies (55)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Art (23)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic &amp; Archaeol. Sci. (14)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography (Hum &amp; Soc) (26)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History (55)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Teach. Training (54)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law (58)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing (13)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths &amp; Statistics (24)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mech. Prod. Manufact. Eng. (13)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine (113)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (249)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Area</td>
<td>Number of Subject Areas where there is satisfaction (%)</td>
<td>Number of Subject Areas where there is concern (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others in Biol. Sci. (49)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others in Creat. Arts &amp; Des. (33)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy (21)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys. Geography &amp; Env. Sci. (13)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning (10)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics (46)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology (56)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work (30)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoology (15)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of subject areas where there is satisfaction.</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of subject areas where there is concern.</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers of respondents are indicated in parentheses after the subject heading. Data is only given where there are 10 or more respondents. Green shading represents areas where there is reasonable satisfaction (≥75% agree with the statements). Red shading represents areas where there are concerns (≤74% agree with the statements).

**Table 2: Number of subject areas (%) where there is satisfaction or concern**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSS Question</th>
<th>Number of subject areas where there is satisfaction (%)</th>
<th>Number of subject areas where there is concern (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q5. The criteria used in marking have been clear in advance.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6. Assessment arrangements and marking have been fair.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7. Feedback on my work has been prompt.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8. I have received detailed comments on my work.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9. Feedback on my work has helped me clarify things I did not understand.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Student Survey 2012: Student Comments on Assessment and Feedback

As part of the NSS, Students are asked to respond to the statement: *Looking back on the experience, are there any particularly positive or negative aspects you would like to highlight?* The free style comments that students gave as part of their participation in the 2012 NSS (see [http://www.dundee.ac.uk/qaf/qafnss.htm](http://www.dundee.ac.uk/qaf/qafnss.htm), report for 2012) were analysed and areas that clearly related to *Assessment and Feedback* were extracted. Comments generally fell into the broad categories detailed below (with the recognition that there is the potential for variance in the interpretation of the comments and that there are areas that overlap).

**Consistency and fairness**

**Guidance, support, clarity and feed-forward**

**Quality and quantity**

**Timeliness**

**Type/makeup of assessments**

**Workload and distribution of effort**

The comments were analysed by School (a breakdown of the comments by School can be provided on request to the Director of Quality Assurance, l.i.mclellan@dundee.ac.uk) and by category (Table 1). A quantitative analysis of the categories is shown in Table 2.

**Table 1: Student comments on assessment and feedback by category**

Where comments include reference to different aspects of assessment and feedback they appear more than once in the table under the different categories. The relevant parts are underlined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment &amp; Feedback – Consistency and Fairness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams are very fair. They are tough but not unreasonable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very well laid out learning aims and outcomes for most areas!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff are very helpful and easy to approached. Exams are generally fair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differing advice and marking between clinicians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair marking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of consistency with tutor contact. Students are not allocated equal tutor contact. Seems to be lack of communication between tutors. Differing opinions/ideas of what projects are about/what is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments were done on a sympathetic basis and not consistent throughout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't like the baseness about art and the way tutors mark you, if it's good it's because they really like you and if it's bad it's because they don't like you. I think that's because it's art whereas maths it's 1 plus 1/the bias is unfair and I don't like that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring of dissertation was unfair and for some nonexistent, tutors who were not getting paid over summer did not help students where other tutors were helping them throughout the year. Some tutors read over dissertations while other students didn't even get proposals fully read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes I feel that some students can be favoured over others in the class with regards to the marking of their work. With regards to the dissertation, some students were being refused their proposals read as the staff were not getting paid to read them. Other students had their 7000 words read over and corrected. This is extremely unfair as obviously the students who have had that help will do better in the dissertation than those who did not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount or lack of effort is not always reflected in the grades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair marking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finished work is not always graded as high as someone who has only researched. Passing students as they have not noticed they had reshow previous years work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The marking was unfair on one piece, the rest was OK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments of tutors are varied, and personal styles and feedback rely on the teachers person view of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
what they believe is right of the built environment, which not necessarily what the students need.

I do not agree with group grading for group work tasks, especially when the grades are part of your final degree classification. I feel that it is unfair to have the effort (or lack thereof) of other people dictating a grade, which contributes to your overall degree classification.

A few problems. A module I tried to drop in favour of another module stayed on my record, and since I did not attend the exam, it is being counted as a fail. Another time I missed an exam due to migraine. I attempted to receive medical exemption. Since I have a bit of history with migraine at the uni before this year, this has served to count against me rather than back me up, as I am deemed ‘incapable’ of fulfilling the requirements of a student.

I believe that not all members of staff are consistent in their teaching, assessment and examinations.

Some lecturers repeatedly set exams which are too difficult for that level.

The first negative is the consistency with the marking. For example, all markers mark differently and I feel this is unfair and disadvantages students. The second negative is that I feel our degree programme has been disadvantaged sometimes in comparison with the years below us, such as with the literature review, we only had input around 5 weeks prior to the submission date. The year below us have had a whole module on how to write a literature review. I have never written a literature review and feel nervous at submitting this.

Assignments are never marked in the same way. What worked for one tutor is really good, but marked down by another tutor lacks consistency.

For school experiences, some students have CRIT visits very early and others very late. After the visit, no student’s folder is looked at again. I feel this puts pressure on those with later CRIT date as they have to maintain their folder whereas others may not. I feel to ensure all students have the same experience, folders should be checked again at the final tutorial after the placement.
Changing the marking of essays from graded to pass/fail back to graded.

Too much power given to Practice Educators whilst on placement. They can state whatever they like within your report and the university take this opinion as gospel. There should be the opportunity to appeal this part of the process.

Marking of assignments have been inconsistent, e.g. something that I was picked up or was not picked up or someone else's.

Assessment unclear, marking unfair and feedback not always helpful just critical in a negative manner.

I feel that assignment marking can be unfair. There had been a lot of evidence to suggest that tutors look for different things in essays and grades given depend on the marker, not on quality of work. This is extremely frustrating.

Feedback is not consistent.

The structure of assessments could be better. It's not the type of assessments i.e. assignments or practicals, it is the grading and how it does not count for two years.

The dissertation aspect of it - the communication from tutors and supervisors has been poor. Although there is a generic marking scheme, some of them are harsher in marking than others.

Inconsistency of some marking/differing standards or expectations.

The marking criteria do not seem to be adhered to by everyone to the same level. Depending on what module you choose, and who is teaching, varies the level of grades you receive. There needs to be a blanket marking system that is regularly checked in order to ensure that everyone is being graded to the same level, as at the moment it seems to be a bit here and there.

Marking was occasionally an issue, as some lecturers seem to mark much more harshly than others. This even put me off choosing a module that sounded interesting because I felt I would be able to get a better mark choosing another module with a
different lecturer. Even though second marking is already in place I still see students struggling to understand why they are getting disappointing marks for certain modules.

I do not think the resit system works properly. During the exam timetable in second year my dad died and I had to do the resits like I had failed and none of my coursework was taken into account. This hardly seems fair.

Difference in marking. Views of lecturers aren't consistent.

Different marking styles depending on teacher.

Some marking did not feel consistent or fair [i.e. in seen exam criteria for allowed notes was changed after exam].

The dissertation forming 25% of your final degree title with 5% of that simply being your supervisor's view of you.

I do not agree with their system of classification for the degree system, the fact that the third year does not matter in the overall classification. So in a four-year course, only the fourth year really counts, and not the other three years which is unfair.

Make the assessment system more consistent.

With the marking, some lecturers will praise work, spelling etc. while others will say it's ?? so there is no even keel.

Feedback from work is poor, completely dependent on marker and down to luck.

There can be variations in marks depending on who's marking it.

Marking of assignments is not consistent between markers.

Sometimes the grades awarded would seem to depend on the markers own criteria. Perhaps this is a misconception but this is how it would appear.

The marking for the course is not continuous. During the course the tutors are enthusiastic and
encouraging, however when it comes to marking the marks do not always reflect the comments made previously.

Quite a large difference in the way some lecturer’s enticed in assessments.

Sometimes inconsistent feedback.

Feedback varies, sometimes it'll be lots and very informative, sometimes it'll be like one line.

Gap between what is taught and what we are expected to produce in written work.

No common ground between markers... what one is looking for another may be looking for something different.

Having my English marked by foreign graduate students, not accurate marking as English isn't their first language.

Inconsistencies in lecturers marking - it's not clear what they look for from essays/assessments, some are fairer and more lenient than others.

Sometimes there have been differences in marking across papers.

### Assessment & Feedback - Guidance, Support, Clarity & Feed-forward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The feedback can be confusing. Sometimes the feedback can be unclear.</td>
<td>Department tutors are vague and don't inspire me at all. The feedback is usually vague and uncomplimentary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes unclear guidelines to work to.</td>
<td>Clear feedback is missing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarly, the language used to describe aspects of the course is overly complicated and I have felt at times that this is not necessary and nor does it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
benefit my student work or myself. It seems to be a trend, and has confused my understanding at times, due to the terms not being explained or having any meaning in the context in which they were placed

| Things are rarely explained in full and feedback on our work is always vague and not constructive. |

Using techniques of presentations for feedback and brilliant face-to-face 'chats' to allow students to receive feedback, whether positive or negative... always constructive.

| Speaking with a range of staff members can provide different insights into your work and lead to development in different areas, but this can be confusing and lead to contradictions at times. |

Assessments have been well timed and the feedback is always prompt and constructive, pointing out strengths and encouraging areas that need more work.

| Grading not explained. |

...unclear/inaccessible wording of marking criteria leaves you to have to try to interpret what is said rather than understand what it is you are supposed to achieve, this is based in the sentence structure, and vocabulary.

| Students unsure about assessment. |

Lack of quality feedback from reviews. Tutorials are not constructive. Little to no positive feedback about work submitted, over critical.

| The feedback given about my work has been direct, straightforward and has helped in improving my studies. Very open minded, constructive and supportive. |

The feedback given about my work has been direct, straightforward and has helped in improving my studies. Very open minded, constructive and supportive.

| The assessment antenna of coursework is not communicated/specified appropriately to successfully approach coursework. |

Some of the assignments could have been better explained so students knew what was actually required.

| The dissertation advice that was offered was first |
class. Tutors replied to queries within 24 hours and the open office hours were a fundamental part of the whole course. They were very positive and helpful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Some lecturers do not allow access to past paper solutions which makes it hard to study when you can't what you are doing wrong, has been mentioned on several occasions at student/staff meetings but nothing is done or an answer is not given.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some tutors do not give detailed feedback on essays. This should be the chance for students to recognise what their developmental needs are. For those who do not do this, it makes it difficult for the student to do this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The only negative aspect is the way assessments are handled some staff were not clear in explaining what was expected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clear goals for each year. Expectations known.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assessment unclear, marking unfair and feedback not always helpful just critical in a negative manner.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The first 2 years of my course are pass/fair with grading occurring in 3rd/4th. I felt this was unfair/unrealistic as with a pass, IT gave no indication of where you actually were. Therefore, I feel my grades have been lower in 3rd/4th as I have had less time to increase grades. I.e. with a pass you think you have an 'A' but actually it's only a 'D'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>… never once was a tutor unable to help with any problems and I always left the meetings with them knowing what was required for my essays and with confidence that I could complete the essays well…. the coursework was well explained, feedback from assignments were clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessments not graded until 3rd year which makes it difficult to know where you are at in terms of the standard of your writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Good support with dissertation

Feedback on assessed work was particularly advantageous to me as the advice was clear and concise and completely allowed me to get the best
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>out of my grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some of the feedback on coursework has been a bit vague and there have been some delays in getting coursework back within the required two week time period as set out by the university but tutors are always helpful and if you approach them to ask them to clarify feedback, they are more than happy to do so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and help from the staff especially in fourth year with dissertation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The politics course, American Foreign Policy since 1945 was the only disappointing course in my 4 years at uni. I was unaware of what was expected of me, and found that my grades dropped significantly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The assessment feedback is not always clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The assessment criteria are pretty vague and the marking is pretty vague too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback on assessments was not readily available. Marking criteria was not always available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are unclear as to the information which is examinable and where to find relevant information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough coursework experience and guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have an issue with the feedback we have had on essays. You might get a grade say a C3 and there will be ticks throughout your work, but no comments so you don’t know where you’ve gone wrong or what you’ve done right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General feedback about any exams or modules. You just get a grade rather than any specific feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

... and we do not receive any feedback from exams apart from a grade, which means that we don’t know in which area we have gone wrong.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More feedback would be good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough critical and constructive feedback for students, who need this in order to learn and improve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no past papers since everything has gone electronic and it is hard to understand the criteria. They need to have more availability of past papers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examinations do not reflect the learning obtained during the year. Many exercises are preformed which are not marked effectively. Communication of what we need to do is poor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes it is easier to hand-in essays without guidance and hope you don't fail than attempting to contact my personal tutor and being ignored several times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback on coursework is not clear and is too brief. And guidelines for essays isn't clear. In 2nd year we did coursework, 3 different essays, and only had 1 brief feedback from one, and none at all for the other two.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes guidance on your work isn't there when you need it. Could be better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel more guidance is needed as a lot of the time myself and my classmates felt abandoned and somewhat alone regarding a lot of the coursework. Guidelines could be clearer for essays....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of information regarding assessments has been a hinder also.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of how essays where to be structured were not highlighted effectively leading to confusion amongst students &amp; failed first attempts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor support at times when advice is required for coursework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel at times that feedback from coursework could be more specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines for essays aren't always clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt I didn't get enough feedback early on to help...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
me with my next assignment.

Not much information about dissertation process very confusing.

There isn't enough communication regarding what and when you are meant to be doing things, such as with the dissertation proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment &amp; Feedback – Quality &amp; Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only started to get feedback on coursework this year that is unless we went individually to ask for it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting coursework and assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Really good support and access to help with dissertations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough help and support with dissertation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design tutors badly disorganised around the time of dissertations and left students to their own devices with no help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of help.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tutorials have provided me with confidence when speaking about my work, and have provided valuable and constructive feedback which is usually delivered in a positive way

The level of tutoring has been of a high standard. This has allowed for me to gain constructive feedback when I needed it and given me more confidence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not get feedback sheets after reviews anymore.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good feedback on coursework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good provisions were made on the occasions a tutor was absent in the shape of a replacement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There could be more feedback given with course assessment, including continuous assessment (weekly homework exercises). At times staff are too busy to answer questions in enough detail or go over material that is not understood in class, although they do try their best</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like all my lecturers. They congratulate you when you do very well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough feedback on coursework/assignments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good feedback from the lecturers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The majority of staff provide in-depth comments when marking assignments. They also are very willing to meet with students to discuss next steps etc... I think this is so beneficial and I commend the tutors that do this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment unclear, marking unfair and feedback not always helpful just critical in a negative manner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most (but not all) of my placement and assignment feedback have been helpful and let me see what I next to work on next time round. The availability of some staff contacting me back with advice (even during the holidays), to me this showed their commitment to helping the students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School placements. Support that you get and the feedback you get</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most staff are more than approachable. Feedback and positive criticism have been very effective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably the feedback from tutors helpful with experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainly the enthusiasms of those teaching are along with the continued and consistent feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...The advice on research methodologies and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting papers marks this course out as one that seeks to create a generation of scholars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback has been brilliant, really helpful.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intense but interesting coursework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback could be a lot better.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback on work not getting any, just ticks and good work that was it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My advisor of studies has been more than helpful, meeting with me to go over work before it is to be assessed, giving me advice and generally being someone that I can talk things over with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At some points, it was difficult to get enough feedback and it would have been extremely beneficial to have more practical experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of feedback on the work and the time it takes to get the feedback.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers are always ready to help and give relevant feedback.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some lecturers don't give enough feedback.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback on coursework could be improved; especially in the school of Life Sciences (Pharmacology/Neuroscience is pretty good however).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback wasn't that great until we got to fourth year you would just get a grade. In fourth year, they would give you detailed feedback but it took months to get it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lack of detail on what I could improve on.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The feedback, they could have given more than they have. More feedback would be helpful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework in general was ok, suitable tasks were set</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from the course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback Issue</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of feedback, lots of pointless modules, which could be cut from course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No feedback.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor feedback from exams - no detail given. Went through 2 years without any feedback on performance apart from end-of-year exam results.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally good feedback.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes the feedback wasn't really sufficient from assignments. The feedback could be more detailed as it is quite brief.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some lecturers will not meet with students to discuss feedback. This at times made me feel unsupported.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too long in giving exam results, no feedback really on areas you went wrong in.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The coursework is challenging &amp; complex at times but most tutors encourage everyone to participate in the sessions &amp; to ask if they don't understand - they make sure you do understand when answer your question.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All have their marking criteria and some are unwilling to meet with you.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have found the feedback to be poor and doesn't always correspond with the grade given.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments are well laid out and explained.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not always great feedback on the marks for an essay.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel it would be beneficial to receive feedback for examinations as well as essays.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not feel supported with studies or assignments...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor and negative feedback on assignments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is quite enjoyable and they help you with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
assignments and stuff.

The feedback doesn't help. We get hardly any feedback and it is not indicative of where you went wrong.

It's just the feedback. Some others can be good but others give a few sentences.

Poor feedback. Lack of consideration when handing in assignments i.e. exam and 4500 word essay on the same day. Long stretches of time to receive markings for essays.

Not enough support, and when you get the support it's not good enough and you feel like you're better off doing it yourself. I've had a few problems with results, having to wait a long time and not being told why I'd had to wait. And when you phone to get hold of them, they're out of the office. For the past three or four weeks, I've left five or six voicemails but still had nothing back yet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment and Feedback - Timeliness</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some particular lecturer who wasn't willing cooperate and help. She expected us to know everything. <em>We received our essays and didn't get proper feedback for like 3 months.</em> She wasn't willing to put up past exams papers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes they are late to put on our grades.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessments have been well timed and the feedback is always prompt</strong> and constructive, pointing out strengths and encouraging areas that need more work.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some of the feedback on coursework has been a bit vague and there have been some delays in getting coursework back within the required two week time period as set out by the university but tutors are always helpful and if you approach them to ask them to clarify feedback, they are more than happy to do so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Too long in giving exam results, no feedback really on areas you went wrong in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback wasn't that great until we got to fourth year you would just get a grade. In fourth year, they would give you detailed feedback but it took months to get it.

Length of time to get exam results.

Work could be marked and handed back more promptly.

Feedback on coursework can often take several weeks meaning you have not always received feedback on coursework before the next assignment is due.

The time it takes to receive feedback on coursework hand-ins.

The one negative is that essays were returned quite slowly. Sometimes outside the 2 weeks window that was promised.

In my opinion, the essay marking process takes too long.

Feedback from assignments aren't always on time.

Not quick at marking and not always reply to their emails.

Sometimes departments have been short staffed so feedback has been slow on getting back to us.

Quality of feedback on the work and the time it takes to get the feedback.

The time to get information and marking back.

I think that this year staff are particularly slow at getting work back to you. In the final year it would be useful if they could get it to you quickly so I can keep track of grades.

Coursework is not given back to the students soon enough.

Took months to receive marked coursework back and there was often little to no feedback.

The coursework is not marked quickly enough. It's
difficult to get a hold of some staff members.

Feedback and general administration is not as effective or as timely as it perhaps could be.

Last year rather badly organized (the coursework should be completed before we start the project last year is way too stressful). We had to wait too long for feedback from our coursework.

Not enough support, and when you get the support it’s not good enough and you feel like you’re better off doing it yourself. I've had a few problems with results, having to wait a long time and not being told why I'd had to wait. And when you phone to get hold of them, they're out of the office. For the past three or four weeks, I've left five or six voicemails but still had nothing back yet.

Long time for feedback.

Delay from handing in assessments and receiving marks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment and Feedback - Type/make-up of assessment</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of academic rigour (exams help focus my thinking). Lack of exams.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the coursework could have been more engaging.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much relies on the exam. More %’s should be applied to the essays and coursework, exams cause too much stress and do not convey an overall picture as to how much you have learned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… I would also do away completely with the module journal as a method of assessment. Don’t feel that it really furthers my knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor advisor of studies. Negative that marks count from first year towards entry into the diploma.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical exams and classes allow students to display practical skill and knowledge acquired through other means other than essays, which is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
good.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>So much coursework coincides with both deadline and issue date and it is completely overwhelming at times.</td>
<td>Maybe more practice orientated coursework from fourth year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 1 exams should be moved back to January.</td>
<td>Maybe EMI is not the correct form of examination for fourth year finals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/W took up a lot of time in comparison to grade awarded. Sometimes missed out on other university experiences in doing so.</td>
<td>Feel that although essays are necessary, my learning on placement is not what I would like it to be. Would be more beneficial to do small essays at placement with regards to learning experience at that time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The burden of assignments has been spread well so that we are not overwhelmed (this is in comparison with other universities).</td>
<td>Far too exam-based compared to other courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload &amp; expectations in 3rd year unrealistically high. Assessment methods poor - too much weighting given to exam performance over coursework, encourages mindless rote learning.</td>
<td>Far too exam-based compared to other courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The workload is probably a bit too high, particularly in my third year (of four). The weighting of the course is a bit harsh; in third Year 6 of the 8 modules were 20% coursework 80% exam. I see no reason why they couldn't have been 33% coursework like in fourth year given the workload was heavier in that year.</td>
<td>Workload &amp; expectations in 3rd year unrealistically high. Assessment methods poor - too much weighting given to exam performance over coursework, encourages mindless rote learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deadlines are frequent and erratic making routine and targeted, enjoyable study often difficult.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unmarked presentations. Although they may help build confidence they also cause unnecessary workload and thus stress.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Some of the coursework (presentations etc.) I found unhelpful and stressful, and did not see how it helped with my development on the course.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount of coursework is moderate, which allows for more planning and research. Higher amount of coursework would make for poorer results.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The amount of coursework and the stress on you makes you a stronger more confident person.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>It was very much like the work situation. There were regular, weekly, assessments which I found to be helpful. I was used to it but it was a realistic assessment.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Particularly fourth year, they changed the format of exam layout. We have 8 coming up after Easter and it's unfair.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sometimes the coursework gets too much but I think that's the way it's supposed to be.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Our course is 5 years long during our 4th year when we did our finals, I felt that there was too much extra coursework at the same time as having to fulfil our clinical requirements that we had to do. That was the only thing I felt that was not handled well.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not enough support for mature students with children. The timing of essays and work placement could have been worked out better.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The numbers of assessments that are due during placements are too high. Could never get help from staff when needed.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assignments are due at 12 noon so if working on early placement shift - as part of the course - we effectively lose time on our assignments as we have to hand them in the day before</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much coursework is given whilst on placement. There is not much time for doing a couple of essays and works full-time. Many placements don’t give you time to do coursework whilst on the ward.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much coursework and not enough work to prepare for dissertation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last year rather badly organized (the coursework should be completed before we start the project last year is way too stressful). We had to wait too long for feedback from our coursework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably just the workload.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor feedback. Lack of consideration when handing in assignments i.e. exam and 4500 word essay on the same day. Long stretches of time to receive markings for essays.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload &amp; expectations in 3rd year unrealistically high. Assessment methods poor - too much weighting given to exam performance over coursework, encourages mindless rote learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Way too much assessments in third year and didn’t allow enough time to prepare for exams.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The workload is probably a bit too high, particularly in my third year (of four). The weighting of the course is a bit harsh; in third Year 6 of the 8 modules were 20% coursework 80% exam. I see no reason why they couldn’t have been 33% coursework like in fourth year given the workload was heavier in that year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload at specific points was very challenging; all the deadlines seemed to come at the same time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The workload can sometimes be very heavy, though this could be due to personal time management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many exams often 3 sets a year: Christmas, Easter and summer. Would’ve been better just having Christmas and summer exams.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework deadlines sometimes overlap and do not take into consideration students that have other commitments such as children/work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Quantitative analysis of student comments on assessment and feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJCAD</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESWCE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing &amp; Midwifery</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall totals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY
A: Consistency and fairness
B: Guidance, clarity and feed-forward
C: Quality and quantity (feedback)
D: Timeliness
E: Type/makeup of assessments
F: Workload and deadline
A meeting of the Quality Forum was held on Tuesday 12th February at 10.00 am.

**Present:** Dr L McLellan (Convener), Ms Rachel Doherty (DUSA), Ms PM Elliott, Dr J Hughes, Ms H Marr, Dr C Normand, Dr A Reeves, Dr D Walker, Dr L Walsh, Ms V White, Dr W Whitfield.

**Apologies:** Professor D Coates, Mr I Kennedy, Dr K Petrie.

**In Attendance:** Dr M Glover.

1. **Minutes**

   **PAPERS A & B**

   **Resolved:** to approve the minutes of the meeting of the Quality Forum meeting of 29th October 2012 & ELIR Working Group Meeting 4th December 2012.

2. **Matters Arising**

   **Meeting of 4th December 2012: AOB – Promotion of ELIR**

   The Forum noted that a number of opportunities to engage with staff on ELIR and quality issues were imminent – including Academic Council, College Boards, through a special edition of Highlighter as well as the workshops. Members of the Forum suggested other ways of communicating progress that might be helpful – including blogs, Hermes messages, social media and eContact.

3. **ELIR Workshops**

   **PAPER C**

   **Feedback from Workshop 1**

   The Convener outlined the approach taken at Workshop 1 on 24th January. Participants were grouped by College with a separate group for SASS staff. Each group was then asked to consider (i) how the University has developed since the last Review and (ii) the methods that we use to measure quality and performance.

   The Forum noted that a range of issues were identified by the workshop participants. It was acknowledged that some of these (the teaching environment, for example) will be explored as part of the planned quality review of student support. Other issues both positive (i.e. student satisfaction) and negative (i.e. staffing, communication and
timetabling) will form the basis of future activity feeding into the production of the reflective analysis.

The Forum also noted that notes from the Workshop will be distributed in due course.

**Planning for Workshop 2**

Forum decided that the main item for the next workshop should be quality enhancement with respect to the student experience and learning & teaching issues. The workshop would be based around college groups with student and SASS representatives in each group.

Forum also agreed that the questions to be addressed at the workshop should be sent out to participants in advance of the meeting.

4. **Review of Student Support Environment Update**  

The Forum noted that unit heads across the student support services have been consulted on the terms of the review and agreement reached that an “all in one” approach be taken. The Forum also noted that the next step would be to identify a project lead and to produce a detailed timetable.

5. **Evaluation of Student Feedback (NSS) Project Update**

The Forum noted that the project was progressing well and that a report will be made to the Learning & Teaching Committee in March 2013.

6. **Quality Enhancement (formerly QAF) Website update**

The Forum noted that Web Development had provided support for the migration and redesign of the QAF website – to be re-launched as the Quality Enhancement Framework (QEF) website.

7. **Any Other Business**

The Forum noted that nominations had now closed for the DUSA Executive Elections to be held on 6-8th March 2013.

8. **Dates of Next Meetings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELIR Workshop 2</td>
<td>26th February</td>
<td>2-4pm</td>
<td>Carnelley CB24B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Forum</td>
<td>29th April</td>
<td>10am-12noon</td>
<td>River Room 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A meeting of the Sub-Committee was held on Friday 21 February 2013.

Present: Mr S Cross (Convener), Dr J Blicharski, Dr M Frame, Dr N Hine, Ms E Kerr, Mrs N Lafferty, Dr A Mason, Mr D McGlade (DUSA), Dr A McGuigan, Dr E Monk, Dr D Moyo, Dr S Schofield, Dr L Walsh, Mrs J Warden-Fernandez.

Apologies: Ms J Aitken, Mrs L Martindale, Dr L Morris, Dr D Sloan.

In Attendance: Dr M Glover.

1. MINUTES  PAPER A

The Sub-Committee decided: to approve the minutes of the meeting of 9th November 2012.

2. MATTERS ARISING

Minute 5 (AOB): The Sub-Committee noted that timetabling and teaching room AV/IT support issues continued to be a focus of some dissatisfaction, particularly for students.

3. REVISED STRATEGIC AIMS & OBJECTIVES

The Sub-Committee received a revised version of the strategy document that included feedback from the e-learning forum meeting in December. The Sub-Committee noted that the revisions amounted to a change of emphasis rather than fundamental changes.

The Sub-Committee expressed a very strong view that the focus now needed to move to delivery and implementation and instructed that the Learning & Teaching Committee now be asked to formally endorse the strategy and to support implementation as a matter of priority.

The Sub-Committee decided: to invite the Learning & Teaching Committee to endorse the Technology Enhanced Learning Strategy and to support its implementation in the current round of operational planning by Schools and Directorates.
4. STANDING ITEMS

(i) Library & Learning Centre (Educational Development)

The Sub-Committee received a report from the Assistant Director of the Library & Learning Centre (Educational Development).

The Assistant Director reminded the Sub-Committee about the e-Learning symposium to be held on 31st May and the call for papers that was open until 29th March. The Assistant Director asked that members promote the Symposium and circulate details in their respective Schools.

The Assistant Director asked the Sub-Committee to recall discussions at previous meetings regarding the policy on recording of lectures. The Assistant Director commended a paper on this topic written by a Dutch team (Appendix A). This concluded that students typically listen more and wrote less at recorded lectures, were more, not less, likely to attend these recorded sessions and saw them as adding value to, rather than replacing, the traditional lecture format.

The Assistant Director indicated that a report on the pilot activities around Exam on Line would be ready for the next meeting of the Sub-Committee. LLC testing of QMP was completed and work continuing with ICS towards upgrade and roll-out as scheduled. It was also reported that discussions had begun, with the Employability Committee and others, on replacing the current Personal Development Planning (PDP) with a more interactive solution.

The Sub-Committee was then asked to support immediate implementation of the following required improvements to the University’s learning & teaching technical infrastructure.

(i) Turnitin. This involves implementing Turnitin, a market-leading solution that offers more functionality – including grading, feedback and peer review support. This system was evaluated by LLC in 2011 and has now been included in LLC operational plans and in School plans where appropriate.

(ii) Media Streaming (Appendix B). A timeline for the proposed project and pilot has been produced with the emphasis on sustainability (after initial investment).

The Sub-Committee noted that both projects will need considerable, but not overwhelming, investment and resources to succeed. However, the Sub-Committee also noted, with concern, that failure to improve in these areas carried considerable risk to the quality of the student experience and to the integrity of academic standards.
The Sub-Committee expressed concern that failure to act decisively now would see the University fall even further behind in core areas where it wanted, and needed, to be leading - in order to meet its own aspirations and the reasonable expectations of its students.

**The Sub-Committee decided:**

1. to recommend immediate implementation of the Turnitin and Media Streaming Projects;

2. to otherwise note the report.

(ii) Information and Communication Services

The Sub-Committee received a report from the Acting Director - Information and Communication Services.

The Sub-Committee was asked to note that work was underway to match the operational plan of ICS with the developing plans of the Schools and Directorates. The main priorities for ICS are emerging as part of this process:

- Upgrading of teaching facilities (AV/IT)
- Information management
- WIFI across campus – including residences
- Rationalisation of web provision
- Extending Storage Capabilities
- Helpdesk support via Apps.

The Sub-Committee expressed a strong view that WIFI in the residences was a reasonable student expectation although the costs involved were not insignificant.

The Sub-Committee also discussed investment in smartboard technology in central teaching rooms as an example where student expectations, teaching staff priorities and operational planning are not coinciding as they should. The Sub-Committee noted that teaching room improvement activities were often focused mainly on décor and furnishings rather than on improvements in learning and teaching technology and suggested that the two areas should be clearly separated in central budgets and planning.

**The Sub-Committee decided:** to note the report.

4. **E-LEARNING FORUM DECEMBER 2012**
The Convener reported that the E-Learning Forum meeting in December was well attended and that the next meeting would be arranged for the third week in March 2013 with an emphasis on the implementation of the strategic aims and objectives.

The Sub-Committee decided: to note the newsletter report of the Forum held in December 2012 (Appendix C).

5. AOB

E-Learning web pages, blog and sharepoint site.

It was noted that some rationalization and co-ordination of the e-learning resources on the web was needed now that the e-learning blog had been reactivated.

The Sub-Committee decided: to ask the Convener and the Sub-Committee Secretary to co-ordinate and report back.

6. Dates of Next Meetings

e-Learning Forum March 2013 – details to follow
e-Learning Sub-committee 10th May 2013 at 2pm. RR3

Mr Stuart Cross
Convener

Appendices

Appendix A Students and recorded lectures: survey on current use and demands for higher education (Gorissen, van Bruggen and Jochems in Research in Learning Technology Vol. 20, 2012)

Appendix B Media Streaming Project Proposal
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Online recordings of lectures provide students with anytime-anyplace access to lectures. Research shows that students prefer courses accompanied by online recordings and an increasing number of universities provide recorded lectures. This paper presents the results of a study into the use of recorded lectures at two universities in the Netherlands. The goal of the study is to gain a better understanding of the way that this group of students use recorded lectures. This understanding will enable the creation of usage scenarios that need to be supported. Our results show that students use recorded lectures as a replacement for missed lectures and for study tasks, like preparing for an exam. A large proportion of the students report that they watch 75\textendash{}100\% of a recorded lecture when they view one. The fact that students did not mention the quality of the actual lectures appears not to influence the use of the recorded lectures. Recorded lectures for courses that only use the blackboard are viewed less often. There are also interesting differences in the use of recorded lectures of the different groups of students at the two universities. To increase the credibility and validity of the results, we need a more direct way to measure the use of recorded lectures by students. Methodological triangulation using the log data for the recorded lectures can provide this.

Keywords: recorded lectures; web lectures; online lectures; video lectures

Introduction

The lecture is the most common form of teaching method in institutions of higher education throughout the world (Behr 1988). Its prevalence has been criticised by many (Phillips 2005; Sheely 2006), yet this criticism has not lead to significant changes in the form or frequency of use of lectures. An increasing number of universities choose to support student learning by providing online recordings of lectures (Leoni and Lichti 2009). These recorded lectures provide students with more control over their schedules and learning, allowing them to review lectures at their own pace and at a time and place of their choosing. Thus, recordings offer a more learner-centered approach for lectures (Baecker, Moore, and Zijdemans 2003; Traphagan, Kucsera, and Kishi 2010).
Research by Traphagan (2005, 2006), Veeramani and Bradley (2008) and Gosper et al. (2008) shows that most students express a preference for courses accompanied by online recordings of the lectures. This is not only the case for traditional distance students, but also for on-campus students as well (Woo et al. 2008). Chang (2007) examined teacher and staff perception towards lecture recordings and results show they favour the use of recorded lectures as well. Little is known, however, about the way in which students navigate within the recordings or how they find (the parts of) the recordings they want to watch. Most studies are limited to the overall opinions and perceptions of students and lecturers about usefulness of the recorded lectures.

This article reports on a study into the use of recorded lectures by students at two universities in the Netherlands. The study looks only at full length recorded lectures of live lectures, the most frequently type of recordings created at both universities, consisting of recordings of 40–45 minutes lectures. This study is part of a larger research project into the use of recorded lectures by students that aims to improve the support for recorded lectures by students within different usage scenarios.

In this stage of the larger body of our research, we asked students directly about their usage of recorded lectures. In the next stage, we will explore means to measure their use of the recorded lectures and the way in which they navigate through the recorded lectures. The goal of this first stage of the research is to get a better understanding of the way this group of students use recorded lectures. This will enable us to create student usage scenarios that need to be supported. In this article, we want to address the following questions: Where and when do students watch the recorded lectures? With what purpose do they watch? If they did not watch the recorded lectures, for what reason did they not watch? Is there a relationship between the use of recorded lectures and the level of ambition of students, the ease of use of the recorded lectures, or the use of other resources available to the student?

This study goes beyond the existing body of research by applying a sampling method that is different from other studies. We specifically selected students with recent exposure to recorded lectures and surveyed them about their use within a single specific course. Both users of the recorded lectures and non-users were included in the study. The subjects were all on-campus students who were able to attend the face-to-face lectures. And although the results are reported anonymously, the survey data allows us to compare the results of this first stage with the results of the second stage of the research. This means we will be able to compare the reported use of the recorded lectures with the actual use of the recorded lectures.

Lecture capturing

There are a number of ways in which video can enhance lectures. Weblectures are video recordings that have been specifically made for use as educational resources (Day 2008). They consist of a studio recording containing a combination of video and audio with a synchronized view of the lecturer’s computer screen while displaying a presentation. Weblectures usually do not exceed 20 minutes. A variation on the weblecture is the screencast (Udell 2004). There the focus is on what happens on the screen, for example, to explain the usage of a computer application. Screencasts can contain video of the presenter, but usually only contain the audio and a recording of the screen. Because weblectures and screencasts are recorded in advance and in a controllable setting, their quality level can be reasonably high. The story they tell can
be scripted in advance, re-takes of the recording are possible and they can be made available to students in advance of the actual lecture.

Lecture capturing involves the capturing of a live lecture situation. The lecture dictates the length, contents and structure. Early lecture-capturing systems often did not include video of the lecturer. One reason for this was that previously the speed of internet connections available to students required high video compression, low frame rates and small frame size (Fardon 2003). One way used to solve bandwidth problems was to create downloadable podcasts that contained audio only or audio and video (Belanger 2005; Campbell 2005; Chan, Lee, and Mcloughlin 2006).

In the conversational framework, Laurillard (2002) uses the concept of “affordances” (Gibson 1979) of multimedia to match them with learning activities. Modern lecture capture systems have a number of additional affordances when compared to more traditional media like a DVD, videocassette or even television broadcasts. Students have direct, on demand or live, access to the recorded lectures. They can play, pause and replay parts of the recorded lecture as often as they like. They can also annotate the recorded lectures, either directly in the interface provided by the lecture capture system, or by saving links (favourites) to parts of the recorded lecture.

Most universities in the Netherlands use commercially available systems to capture lectures; some have home-grown solutions. Both universities that participated in this research study use a lecture capturing system (LCS) called Mediasite by SonicFoundry (Sonicfoundry 2010). All recordings are available online only; currently, no downloadable versions of the recordings are provided by either of the two universities.

The LCS used in this study consists of a combination of hardware and software. It captures a number of different media at once. An external video camera captures the video of the lecturer. The audio, captured through the lecturer’s wireless microphone, is recorded and relayed to the system. Finally, the VGA signal, normally sent directly to the projector, is rerouted through the lecture-capturing system, where it is recorded along with the audio and video of the presenter. The LCS automatically adjusts the recording and synchronisation of the recorded audio, the video and the VGA signal. When the recording is complete, it is automatically uploaded to a server and made available for students. Students’ notes are not recorded by the system. Students either use paper and pen to create notes or use their laptops to type notes during the lecture.

The user interface consists of a three-window display (Figure 1): one featuring the video of the instructor (1), one showing the captured VGA signal as displayed on the projector (2) and one showing general information about the recording (3). Students can move the video play to a specific time in the lecture and play the presentation at faster or slower speeds, as needed. They also can switch to a slide-based view (not shown in the figure). This view shows captures of the slides, generated by the capturing system, that allow direct navigation to certain parts of the lecture.

The study

Participants

Participants were students at either the School of Nursing at Fontys University of Applied Sciences in the Netherlands, or from various faculties of the Eindhoven
University of Technology (TU/e). Student selection was based on their recent participation in a course that used recorded lectures (second half of 2009). The courses all had a set of lectures that were recorded on a regular basis (weekly or more often). Students were questioned about one specific course in order to keep the overlap between subgroups as small as possible. The students were provided with online recordings of lectures that they could also attend in person. This meant they had the choice between either attending the lecture, viewing it online, or both.

For the Fontys students, these criteria limited the number of available students to 203 students participating in a single course. For TU/e, students were selected from three courses with a large number of views and three courses with a small number of views. The six courses had minimal overlap: Only eight students had registered for more than one of the six courses selected for this study. This selection method led to a total group of 919 students for all six TU/e courses. Most Fontys students in the participant group were female (81.3%) while most TU/e students in the participant group were male (84.7%).

Table 1 shows the seven courses that were included in the survey. The courses were part of six different departments; both the C05 Vector calculus and the C06 Calculus course were conducted by the Applied Mathematics department. The Fontys course was aimed at first year students of the School of Nursing, while the TU/e courses were aimed at both third, second and first year students from different programs of TU/e. 83.5% of the Fontys respondents and 20.0% of the TU/e respondents are female, resulting in a slight overrepresentation of females in the responses.

Most of the recordings are traditional university-style lectures, with the teacher standing in front of the class lecturing. Exceptions to this were lectures where assignments and the test were discussed.

All recordings are between 35–45 minutes long. In all of the recordings, video of the lecturer is recorded and displayed. Five of the courses used PowerPoint or other computer-based applications recorded alongside the video of the lecturer, as shown...
Table 1. Courses selected for the survey and response rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>What is being recorded?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TU/e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C01 Methods and models in behavioural research</td>
<td>Industrial Engineering &amp; Innovation Sciences</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>Yes (\text{b} )</td>
<td>Yes (\text{c} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C02 Control Systems Technology</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>Yes (\text{d} )</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C03 Chemical Biology</td>
<td>Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C04 Facades and Roofs</td>
<td>Architecture, Building and Planning</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C05 Vector calculus</td>
<td>Applied Mathematics</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C06 Calculus</td>
<td>Applied Mathematics</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C07 Anatomy &amp; Physiology</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\text{a}\) Number of recordings for this course.
\(\text{b}\) Both PowerPoint and demos of applications.
\(\text{c}\) For additional notes, during 5 recordings.
\(\text{d}\) During 8 of the 20 recordings.
in Figure 1. Two of the courses only used the blackboard during the lectures. In these cases, the same camera was used to record both the lecturer and the blackboard. The interface, as shown in Figure 1, displays a static image as part of window (2) that otherwise would display the captured VGA signal.

**Materials and procedures**

During this stage of the research, the study consisted of two parts: an online survey and a number of semi-structured interviews. The online survey contained 17 questions using both multiple choice and Likert scale questions. Some of the questions are based on questions used in other surveys on the use of recorded lectures (Hall 2009; Kishi and Traphagan 2007; Traphagan 2006; Veeramani and Bradly 2008; Wieling 2008; Williams and Fardon 2007; Zupancic 2006). Students were able to complete the survey in about 10–15 minutes.

The first part of the survey asked students for their interest in the topic of the course, the perceived importance of the course for their course of study and the grade they wished to achieve for the course. In the second part of the survey, students rated the effectiveness of a number of available activities (e.g., attending face-to-face lectures) and supporting resources (e.g., slides, lecture notes, etc.) in helping them to succeed in the course. It also asked about any previous experience with lecture recordings, and whether they had used the recorded lectures for the course in question. In part three of the survey, those students who had used the lecture recordings were surveyed in more detail about their experiences during that use. Those questions were not displayed to students that indicated they had not used the recorded lectures. The final part of the survey contained questions for all students, seeking out reasons they did not watch one or more of the recorded lectures (if applicable). We reviewed the survey and tested it online with a number of peers and experts.

We approached the students using a personalized e-mail that contained the link to the web-based survey. In the e-mail and the survey itself, the students were reminded to complete the survey based on their experiences and use for the one specific course mentioned. The survey was open online for 2 weeks. An e-mail reminder was sent after 1 week and again on the final day of the survey to those students who had not completed the survey.

All questions in the survey and informational e-mails were provided in both Dutch and English because some of the international students at TU/e prefer English over Dutch. Students could switch between the Dutch and English versions while filling out the survey. As part of the survey, we invited students for follow-up questions. A total of 120 students accepted the invitation initially. Of those students, 14 were interviewed using a semi-structured interview lasting 30 minutes. During the interviews, students were asked to elaborate on their use of the recordings during the course. The interviews were recorded and transcribed.

**Results**

The total response rate for the survey was 517 (46.1%, N = 1122). Nineteen partially completed surveys were included in the results. The survey contained a number of questions that were displayed only when the student had indicated that he or she had watched the recordings. Because of this, not all students completed all the questions,
and the number of responses may differ between questions. Where relevant in this article, the actual number of responses \((n)\) is indicated in the remainder of the results section.

Most students participating in the survey had a positive attitude towards the course in question. Of all respondents, 74.2% felt that the topic of the course was important, and 83.9% agreed that the course was an important part of their study. Students were asked about their level of ambition for this course. TU/e students, on average, aim for a 7.35 on a 10-point scale (SE=0.97) on the exam. The mean for Fontys students is 4.18 on a 5-point scale (SE=0.789). Students are motivated for the course and see it as an important part of their study.

Table 2 shows the number of times respondents indicated they used recorded lectures for the course. When compared to the TU/e, there were more heavy users amongst the Fontys respondents. However, these respondents, who might have a more positive attitude towards the recordings, were not overrepresented in the total responses for the survey.

A Chi-square test for interdependence indicated a significant association between the course and the number of times respondents used the recorded lectures, \(\chi^2\) (18, \(n=513\))=183.280, \(p<0.0005\), Cramer’s \(V=0.345\). There also is a significant association between what is recorded (PowerPoint, blackboard, or both PowerPoint and the blackboard) and the number of times respondents used the recorded lectures, \(\chi^2\) (6, \(n=513\))=86.937, \(p<0.0005\), Cramer’s \(V=0.291\). Of all students from the courses where only the blackboard was recorded, 48.9% never used the recorded lectures and 36.7% used the recorded lectures less than five times. A Chi-square test for interdependence showed no statistically significant difference in the number of times that students used the recorded lectures and their reported interest in the topic of the course, \(\chi^2\) (12, \(n=513\))=17.099, \(p=0.146\), or the indicated importance of the course for their course of study, \(\chi^2\) (9, \(n=513\))=15.593, \(p=0.174\). There also was no statistically significant difference in the grade that students wished to achieve and the number of times that students used the recorded lectures, \(\chi^2\) (9, \(n=513\))=4.525, \(p=0.874\).

Table 3 shows that there was a significant difference between TU/e and Fontys students with regard to prior experience with recorded lectures. Of the students who had used recorded lectures for their course five times or more, 65.3% had prior experience with recorded lectures. Of the students who did not use recorded lectures, 53.4% had no prior experience with recorded lectures. Spearman’s Rank Order correlation analysis shows a weak positive relationship for the TU/e students between prior experience with recorded lectures and the number of times that students used the recorded lectures \((r_s=0.266, n=410, p<0.0005)\). Spearman’s Rank Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fontys</th>
<th></th>
<th>TU/e</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>%(%)</td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>%(%)</td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>%(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5 times</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–10 times</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10 times</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
correlation analysis shows no statically relevant relationship for the Fontys students 
\( r_s = -0.067, n = 103, p = 0.504 \).

**Where and when do students watch the recorded lectures?**

Almost all students (Fontys: 99.0%, \( n = 96 \); TU/e: 90.3%, \( n = 299 \)) access the recorded lectures from home. Some students used the “other” option to indicate that they access the recordings from both home and the university. 44.9% indicated that there had been no technical difficulties at all while viewing the recorded lectures. Table 5 gives an overview of the reported technical difficulties.

Bandwidth should no longer be a problem in the Netherlands where 89% of the households have internet access at home and 79% have broadband connections (TNS Opinion & Social 2010). Yet, about 90% of all reports of technical difficulties in Table 4 were from students that viewed the recorded lectures from home, suggesting that either bandwidth problems or problems with the computer configuration at home still might be a bigger issue than on the university campus.

Only 36.4% (Fontys: 36.9%, \( n = 103 \); TU/e: 36.2%, \( n = 414 \)) of students surveyed watch the recordings on the same day or during the same week as the lecture. A large number of students indicate that they use the lecture recordings while preparing for exams at the end of the course. This is supported by their responses on questions related to the purpose for watching recorded lectures.

One student, who participated in the Methods and models in behavioural research course, commented during the interview:

For an exam that I really wanted to pass, I started watching the recorded lectures again, a couple of days before the exam. I would watch for 20 minutes, take a short break and then watch for another 20 minutes. That way I could watch about 10 recordings on a single day. (IVR4)

**With what purpose do students watch?**

We asked students how important different purposes of recorded lectures were to them. Table 5 shows that making up for a missed lecture and preparing for the exam...
score high for both TU/e and Fontys students. The table also shows a number of differences between the TU/e and Fontys students. Fontys students rate the importance of recorded lectures to manage distractions during lectures, to check their own notes, to reinforce the experiences at the live lecture, and to review the material before a lecture about twice as often as “somewhat important” or “very important”. One possible explanation for the differences found is that the Fontys students were first-year students, less used to structuring their own learning than the mostly second and third year students in the TU/e group. Differences in individual courses, the way the lecturer presented or the topic of the course could also account for the differences in responses.

The use of the recorded lectures to overcome language barriers, as suggested by previous research (Schok 2007), was not confirmed by this survey.

During the interviews, students said that the recorded lectures enabled them to organize their schedule:

I am an active student, have a number of other activities and obligations. This means I am not always able to attend the live lectures. […] Lectures are sometimes noisy and the recordings enable me to view them without distraction, even the night before the test. (IVR14)

Reasons for not attending the lectures were other obligations, other lectures even, incorrect planning on my part or overlap in the lectures scheduled by the university. (IVR3)

This course was scheduled on a Monday morning. It was my only course on that day so I only attended the live lecture once and watched the rest online. (IVR2)

How often and how much do students watch recorded lectures?

Fontys has a higher percentage of students than the TU/e that indicated they had used the recordings more than 10 times (see Table 2). Table 6 shows that they also have more students that report that watch most of the recordings. When asked how much of a recording they watch, 68.5% of respondents (Fontys: 73.4%, n = 94; TU/e: 67.0%, n = 297) say they typically watch at least three quarters of the recording.
During the interviews, students confirmed that they usually view the complete recording:

I watch the whole recordings, I do not skip parts. Though while preparing for the exams I only watch the parts that I think I need to watch again. (IVR2)

During the three weeks before the exams, I watched more than half of all the recorded lectures [for the course] completely and created additional notes based on that. (IVR6)

If I have not attended the lecture, I watch the recording from start to finish. (IVR7)

Reasons not to watch recorded lectures

Only a small number of students did not watch a recorded lecture because they didn’t know that they were available. Table 7 shows the reasons selected by students for not watching one or more of the recordings. The most important reason cited for not watching a recorded lecture is because they already had been to the live lecture.

A number of students (2.1% overall) used the “other reasons” option to indicate they watched all the available recordings. During the interview phase, one of the students from the Chemical Biology course stated:

I never watch the recorded lectures if I’ve already attended the lecture. But I had to retake the exam for the […] course this year, and instead of going to the lectures, I only reviewed the recorded lectures for that course to prepare for the exam. (IVR3)

Relationship between ease of use and student use

Only a small number of respondents (Fontys: 6.8%, n = 103 and TU/e: 6.3%, n = 414) chose technical difficulties as a reason for not watching a recorded lecture. A Spearman’s Rank Order correlation analysis shows a weak positive relationship

Table 6. Average percentage of a recording viewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Fontys (n = 94) (%)</th>
<th>TU/e (n = 297) (%)</th>
<th>Total (n = 391) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0–10%</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–25%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–50%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–75%</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75–100%</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Reasons to not watch one or more of the recordings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Fontys (n = 103) (%)</th>
<th>TU/e (n = 414) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because I did not know that they were available</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I did go to class</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of technical difficulties</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I never felt I missed anything important</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I did not have time for it</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I do not like to watch them</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because the quality of the recordings was bad</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
between students that rate the ease of navigation higher and the use of lecture recordings ($r_s = 0.295, n = 384, p < 0.0005$). Furthermore, a weak positive correlation was found between students that rate the ease of finding specific parts of the recording they want to watch higher and the use of lecture recordings ($r_s = 0.270, n = 384, p < 0.0005$). Students like both the possibility to pause/stop the video while taking notes and to replay the recorded lecture at high speed when reviewing the recorded lecture:

The advantage of the recording is that I can pause the video. That comes in handy for example when I want to copy a complex chemical structure formula while he is explaining that formula. (IVR1)

I’m glad I can stop and rewind the video, take notes, and if needed, rewind again. (IVR8)

I often watch a recording at about 1.4 or 1.6 times normal speed to speed things up. (IVR14)

Relationship between use of recorded lectures and other resources available to the student

The survey asked students to rate a number of other resources on their effectiveness in helping them to succeed for the course. The resources were scored on a six-point scale: “did not use”, “very ineffective”, “somewhat ineffective”, “neutral”, “somewhat effective”, and “very effective”. Table 8 shows that the other course resources, the lecture recordings and the face-to-face lectures score high for Fontys students. And though they score lower for the TU/e students, the reported order of effectiveness is equal to the one reported by Fontys students.

We used Spearman’s Rank Order correlation to investigate relationships between these answers and the number of times that students reported to have used the recorded lectures. Students who rank the online virtual learning environment as more effective tend to use recorded lectures more ($r_s = 0.388, n = 513, p < 0.0005$). A weak positive relationship was found between attending fewer live lectures and the use of recorded lectures ($r_s = 0.239, n = 513, p < 0.0005$). Of the students who never used recorded lectures, 66.1% said they always or almost always attended lectures in person. For students that used recorded lectures more than 10 times, that percentage is only 40.0%.

When asked the reasons for not attending face-to-face lectures, only 6.8% of the Fontys students and 14.3% of the TU/e students indicated that they prefer recordings over attending the lecture. Table 9 shows that more Fontys students (44.7%, $n = 46$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other course resources (slides, lecture notes, etc.)</th>
<th>Somewhat or very effective (Fontys $n = 103$) (%)</th>
<th>Somewhat or very effective (TU/e $n = 414$) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture recordings</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending face-to-face lectures</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Virtual Learning Environment</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Students</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to professor or teachers assistant office hours</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to professor or teachers assistant office hours</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
than TU/e students (29.3%, \(n = 103\)) report to have attended all the lectures for the course. Examples of other study-related activities given by students included project activities or other lectures/courses at the same time as the lecture in question.

A number of students commented that they did not think the lecturer minded that they were not present as long as there was a big enough group of students that did attend the lecture. One student of the Chemical Biology course said during the interview:

The lecturer does not mind it if students are not always present. He always has a group of about 70 students that attend the lecture. So nobody really notices it when you’re not there. (IVR1)

Another student, from the Methods and models in behavioural research course, thought that some lecturers preferred smaller groups:

Some lecturers have problems with keeping order in large groups or get nervous if a lot of students talk during the lecture. Now, only the students that are motivated are there and the rest watches the recordings. (IVR5)

### Discussion

Students use recorded lectures as a replacement for missed lectures, either incidentally or as a structural replacement for lectures. They also use them for specific purposes, such as exam preparation, reviewing of material before a lecture or to improve the retention of lecture materials. This conforms with the findings of Traphagan (2006), Veeramani and Bradly (2008) and Gosper et al. (2008).

A large number of students report that they view most of the recorded lectures. This is consistent with Gosper et al. (2008) who, based on a sample of 815 students, reported that 71% of the respondents stated that they listened to the entire recording. It is, however, higher than Traphagan (2006) where only 46% or respondents out of a group of 488 said they watched the complete recordings.

The results show interesting differences in use between students from Fontys and TU/e. The Fontys students use the recorded lectures more than the TU/e students for activities such as managing distractions during lectures, checking their notes, reinforcing the experiences obtained at the live lecture and reviewing material before and after a lecture. These differences can be caused by differences in previous experience (or lack thereof) with recorded lectures, differences in gender, contents of the actual recorded lectures, course or department. Additional research is needed to determine the extent of the effect of each of these possible influencers.
Their reported interest in the topic of the course, the indicated importance of that topic for their study and the grade that students aim for does not appear to influence the number of times that students use the recorded lectures.

In the interviews, even when prompted, students never mentioned quality of the lecture or lack thereof as decisive for watching or not watching a recorded lecture. Practical considerations like already having attended the lecture live or lack of time were much more important. There is a tendency that the recorded lectures for courses that only use the blackboard are viewed less often. This confirms the findings by Traphagan (2006) that while some students are tempted to skip class because of recorded lectures, other factors affect attendance as much or more than the availability of recorded lectures does.

This research does not question the length, structure or contents of the lectures that are being recorded, even though those might merit reconsideration. Our goal was to research the use of recorded lectures in their current setting.

The collected data is based on verbal reports, in this case by students, of their use of recorded lectures. Surveys are prone to a number of errors (Deming 1944). Methodological triangulation (Denzin 2006) increases the credibility and validity of the results provided by the surveys. Research by Sheard et al. (2003) shows it is possible to infer student learning behaviour from their interaction with the system. The LCS used at Fontys and TU/e keeps a log of the students’ interactions with the recorded lectures. This data can also be used to get a more detailed view of the students’ navigation within the recorded lectures.

Conclusions
The goal of this study was to get a better understanding of how students use the recorded lectures available at this moment. This is a first step towards the aim to improve the support for recorded lectures within different usage scenarios. Indeed, our study shows that different usage scenarios may apply. Students use recorded lectures to serve different purposes, such as replacement for lectures, exam preparation and reviewing material. Students of Higher Vocational Education seem to use recorded lectures more often than University students to check their understanding of a lecture they visited. We could not identify a relation between usage of recorded lectures and their quality or the importance of the topics covered.

Students know where to find the recordings and technical difficulties are seldom a reason not to watch the recorded lectures. Most technical problems occur when students view the recorded lectures from home.

In the next stage of the research, we will use the LCS logs to further study the above mentioned student usage scenarios for recorded lectures in a more quantitative way. This will enable us to better guide them to those parts of the lectures that they want to view given their intended purpose of use of the recorded lecture.
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Media Streaming Project Proposal

The use of video and audio content, delivered through a variety of channels, is increasingly important to the University of Dundee. Digital media is becoming more intensively utilised in learning and teaching, the communication of research, and for support and guidance purposes. Schools are increasingly seeing staff creating video content, while distance learning initiatives have high expectations of delivering content via video, with a desire to release material openly for external relation and promotion purposes.

A prioritisation of service needs exercise run by the LLC through the eLearning Sub-Committee in August 2011 showed demand for media streaming and support for use of video in teaching. However, since that date the only progress made towards realising those aspirations has been the development of policy and guidelines on the use of audio and video material by staff and students. The University continues to lack the fundamental infrastructure required for video storage and effective dissemination.

The key issues identified then, and which remain relevant, were:

- Lack of infrastructure available for academic staff to support their use of video content.
- Video content is often duplicated, in numerous formats, to try to make it accessible.
- The need to create procedures to retrospectively manage stray video content.
- Currently no institutional audit or approach to quality control for video release.
- Currently no model in place to support the pedagogic use of a central system.

An updated project scoping and analysis of available solutions is currently underway, however, it is evident that any approach in this area will require significant and ongoing investment in addition to the staff effort which will be needed to support the system and deliver staff training.

This paper outlines a proposed roadmap to develop appropriately resourced and supported media streaming, that is both sustainable and scalable, across the institution.

Library & Learning Centre, February 2013
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Submission for budgetary approval towards the support of set up and first year costs for hosting and delivery of the service and additional staff effort</td>
<td>February 2013</td>
<td>Submitted in LLC operational plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Updated project scoping and analysis of available solutions</td>
<td>February – March 2013</td>
<td>Completed previously, under revision due to time lapse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Policy and guidelines on the use of audio and video material by staff and students under development by Disability Services, LLC &amp; LPGA</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
<td>Submitted for approval to LTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Confirmation of budgetary approval</td>
<td>June – July 2013</td>
<td>Submitted for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Software licencing</td>
<td>August 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Integration of software with existing systems</td>
<td>Aug - Sep 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Audit locally/externally held video content</td>
<td>Aug - Nov 2013</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Service deployment, pilot and testing</td>
<td>Sep – Dec 2013</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Training sessions to be developed and added to LLC inspirED professional development programme for academic year 2013-14</td>
<td>Nov 2013 – April 2014</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Phased rollout of service</td>
<td>January 2014 - ongoing</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Review of project and planning for next steps, summary to be presented to committees as appropriate</td>
<td>From January 2014</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Requirement for service/next steps to be highlighted in School and LLC operational plans and budget processes</td>
<td>Jan-May 2014</td>
<td>Part of University annual planning cycle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Welcome and Introduction

The e-Learning Forum will meet on a regular basis to allow for sharing of ideas and approaches with a strong focus on practice and pedagogy rather than formal policy. A fairly informal agenda will be prepared for each meeting with time set aside for members to raise issues or to share items of interest.

The meetings will, as far as possible, be timed so that issues can be fed into the business of the formal Sub-Committee if necessary.

The Forum is open to all staff with an interest in e-learning and suggestions for topics or ideas for discussion or questions to be raised are very welcome.

Stuart Cross, Convener
Smaller groups were formed to discuss the draft Strategic Aims document - as well as the role of the Forum in shaping strategy and influencing School operational plans.

The role of the Forum:
- Improving lines of communication;
- Sharing ideas and best practice;
- Making the case for investment in an expert central support service;
- Engaging with the non-enthusiasts;
- Providing evidence of effective practice across all disciplines.

The Forum will meet in January, April, August and October as part of the University Calendar and at other times as required.

Recording lectures as podcasts.

Making the most of student contact time?

Murray Frame, School of Humanities, explained that the recent approval of the policy on students recording lectures had led him to re-evaluate the best way to deliver teaching and contact time.

If students are able to record lectures then perhaps these lectures should be provided, in the form of podcasts, online and possibly downloadable – leaving contact time for seminars and other learning opportunities.

The Forum discussed this idea – both in principle and in terms of the best technical solutions available: Camtasia and Articulate were suggested.

Advice was given that the amount of time that it takes to produce a podcast recording should not be underestimated - students will be concerned about the quality of content as well as editorial and production quality.

Good examples of where this approach had worked well – in Medical Education and in Life Sciences – were discussed and LLC advice and support were offered.

The Dundee e-Learning Blog will be re-launched in January 2013 – all Forum members will be encouraged to submit to the blog.

Please email m.glover@dundee.ac.uk if you wish to be added to the Forum mailing list.
A meeting of the Postgraduate Taught Degrees Sub-Committee was held on Monday 25th February 2013.

Present: Mr WI Ball (Convener), Professor R Abboud, Mrs F Brown, Dr K Edwards, Mr G Hutton, Dr D Potter, Mr W Rennison, Dr D Rodley, Mrs G Sharpe, Professor M Stark, Mrs MK Teven, Professor C Wilkinson.

Apologies: Ms R Doherty, Professor D Bearn, Dr L McLellan, Mrs J Paul.

In Attendance: Dr M Glover.

1. Minutes.

The Sub-Committee decided: to approve the minutes of the meeting of 24th October 2012.

2. Matters Arising

(i) Update from Admissions & Student Recruitment (Appendix A)

The Sub-Committee received a report on applicant, admission and conversion data from Admissions & Student Recruitment (ASRS) and noted with interest that while application and acceptance numbers seemed stable in most areas there was a more complicated picture on conversions.

The Sub-Committee noted that the central budget for marketing and recruitment is a fraction of the national average (£455k (Times Higher 7th Feb pg 6). It was suggested that Sub-Committee members should raise this issue at School and College boards during the current round of operational planning and budget setting.

The Sub-Committee also suggested that the Convener should raise the issue funding and staffing levels for postgraduate admissions and recruitment at the Learning & Teaching Committee in March.

The Sub-Committee decided: to otherwise note the report.
(ii) Workplan of the Sub-Committee  

The Sub-Committee agreed details of the membership and remit of the working groups as circulated. It was also agreed that each group will report back with a plan or set of recommendations to the next meeting of the Sub-Committee.

The Sub-Committee agreed that the working groups should seek to make progress, within their respective remits, towards the following objectives:

- Timely and agile business development and admissions decisions.
- Provision of cost, market and competitor analysis.
- Conversion rate analysis and improvement plan.
- Efficient mechanisms to assess financial viability and sustainability.
- A descriptive narrative of current and planned TPG provision.
- A critical analysis of the current infrastructure to support TPG activities
- Testing the idea of a Graduate School both virtual and actual.
- Consistency of approach to academic standards and student experience.

(iii) Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey 2013  

The Sub-Committee noted that the PTES Survey would launch on 5th March and that publicity material would be circulated to members in due course.

3. SFC Outcome Agreement: TPG additional funding

The Sub-Committee received the outcome of the bids for funded TPG places under the SFC Investment Fund call. It was noted that the allocation methodology used by the SFC was unclear and that full information would only be available in the main funding communication from SFC in March.

The Sub-Committee decided: to note the report.


The Sub-Committee received a summary outline of the ELIR process and noted the emphasis on student participation in quality assurance and enhancement.

The Sub-Committee decided: to note the report.

5. Date of next meeting: 10.00 am 1st May 2013 in River Room 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix A</th>
<th>Update from Admissions &amp; Student Recruitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B</td>
<td>Workplan of the Sub-Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C</td>
<td>Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/4</td>
<td>1122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/5</td>
<td>1156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/6</td>
<td>937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/7</td>
<td>695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/8</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/9</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Applications - Matriculations

* Taught Postgraduate

* Year Overview
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>APPLICATIONS</th>
<th>MATRICULATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012/3</td>
<td>2012/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UK/EU</td>
<td>INT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTING</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPM</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJCAD</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>1025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>2012/3</th>
<th>2012/3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UK/EU</td>
<td>INT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSNRLP</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESWCE**</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMANITIES</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAREERS</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1272</td>
<td>3360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>2012/3</th>
<th>2012/3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UK/EU</td>
<td>INT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>2012/3</th>
<th>2012/3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UK/EU</td>
<td>INT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENTISTRY **</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICINE</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** MDSC Orthodontics only runs every 2 years (Even years) New Course Mres Oral Ca

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>2012/3</th>
<th>2012/3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UK/EU</td>
<td>INT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>Offers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENT</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDN (EXCL NUR)</td>
<td>2013/4</td>
<td>2013/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTH</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUL</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE (CS)</td>
<td>2013/4</td>
<td>2013/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE (EM)</td>
<td>2013/4</td>
<td>2013/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE (COM)</td>
<td>2013/4</td>
<td>2013/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE (DC)</td>
<td>2013/4</td>
<td>2013/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE (CT)</td>
<td>2013/4</td>
<td>2013/4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: MOSCcohort sizes vary by year; some years (seven years) have more overall figures above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Package</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Members of sub-group</th>
<th>Timescales for Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Work Package 1** | Updating code of practice, policy and regulations on TPG provision | Professor Mike Stark  
Professor Caroline Wilkinson  
Ms Rachel Doherty  
Ms Gillian Sharpe | 25 February 2013 Committee |
| **Work Package 2** | Developing a strategy and template for business planning for sustainable TPG provision | Professor Rami Abboud  
Professor Caroline Wilkinson  
Professor David Bearn  
Ms Susan Young – co-opted | 25 February 2013 Committee |
| **Work Package 3** | Developing a greater understanding and awareness of competitor pricing and marketing strategies including fee waivers, scholarships etc  
Increasing the investment in TPG infrastructure with specific emphasis on the development of a comprehensive dedicated TPG website presence | Dr Keith Edwards  
Ms Gillian Sharpe  
Mr Graham Hutton  
Dr Doug Potter  
Mr Jason Norris – co-opted  
Dr Ramanee Peiris – co-opted | 25 February 2013 Committee |
| **Work Package 4** | Identifying areas of enhancement of the TPG student experience including increasing the emphasis on employability through internships and work placements | 1 May 2013 Committee |
| **Work Package 5** | Developing SCQF level 11 benchmarks and ensuring M level-ness across all programmes within the University | 1 May 2013 Committee |
| **Work Package 6** | Exploring further opportunities for great articulation with undergraduate provision and research programmes | 1 May 2013 Committee |
We want to make sure postgraduate students have the best possible experience. To do that we need to know what you think, if we are doing well and if there’s anything we can do better.

POSTGRADUATE EXPERIENCE SURVEY
All TPG Masters and PhD students at UoD

Log in to eVision (evision.dundee.ac.uk) to access the PG Experience Survey between 5th March and 16th May 2013
A meeting of the Postgraduate Research Degrees Sub-Committee was held on 25th February 2013.

Present: Deputy Principal Professor A Page (Convener), Professor P Crocker, Professor N Johnson, Mr K Mackle, Dr A Muller, Dr S Oza, Professor R Roslender, Dr K Williams.

Apologies: Professor D Bearn, Dr P Campbell, Ms R Doherty, Dr L McLellan.

In Attendance: Mr J McCaffery (for Item 5), Dr M Glover.

1. Minutes.

The Sub-Committee decided: to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 24th October 2012.

2. Matters Arising

Minute 2: Membership and Remit of the Sub-Committee

The Convener thanked the College representatives in attendance and underlined the important role of the Sub-Committee in providing expert superintendence of research degree programmes at University level.

The Sub-Committee noted that their primary task in the current session was to have oversight of the review of the Code of Practice and related quality assurance issues in the lead into Enhancement Led Institutional Review (ELIR) in autumn 2013.

Minute 3: Statistical Reporting

The Sub-Committee noted that proposals for a defined set of Cognos reports were being developed. It was observed that the research student population had a heterogeneous complexity that had occasionally made accurate information difficult to obtain. The Sub-Committee noted that an outline of the proposed data items would be circulated for comment before the report request is made to Registry/ICS (Appendix A).
Minute 5: Postgraduate Research Experience

The Sub-Committee noted that the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey would launch on 5th March 2013. It was observed that the growing number of surveys that students are asked to complete sometimes led to a degree of apathy and lower response rates. It was noted that this survey was the only one dedicated entirely to the experiences of research students. The Sub-Committee agreed to promote and encourage participation, using supervisors as the most effective channel of communication.

3. Quality Assurance Framework

The Sub-Committee received a proposal for review and revision of the existing research degree quality assurance documentation and processes, motivated partly by the scheduled institutional review (ELIR) and the publication of a new Quality Code by QAA – including Chapter B11 on research degree provision.

The Convener reported a good response from School contacts to the mapping of activities at School level to the QAA indicators of sound practice in Chapter B11 and provided excellent examples of good practice that could be incorporated into the current review project.

Research Degrees Code of Practice

The Sub-Committee then discussed the proposed Review of the Code of Practice and related activity and noted that while some aspects of the current code were outdated it still represented a useful approach in setting out the roles, responsibilities and regulations associated with research degrees. The proposal to produce a more compact and tightly focused Code was agreed in principle on the basis that it would (i) build on the best practices at a local level and (ii) directly relate policy and procedure to the indicators of quality in the QAA Code.

Student FAQ sheets

The Sub-Committee noted that many Schools would already have well developed and maintained student information available – in the form of handbooks and programme level information – and any new centrally produced information should seek to augment rather than replace the current information sources.

It was suggested that a handbook template would be more useful in the long term – as this could be used at a local level to maintain information for students on a regular basis. The Sub-committee noted the scope for re-
distributing material between the revised Code and College/ School handbooks, several excellent examples of which had been identified in the course of the Chapter B11 self-audit by Schools.

Annual Progress Review

The Sub Committee examined the proposals to replace the current Transfer of Ordinance process with an Annual Progress Review and advised caution. It was agreed that the benefits of a very rigorous process to confirm degree candidacy at the end of the first year of study should not be diluted in any new process.

The Sub-Committee agreed that re-matriculation each year should depend on confirmation of progress, linked with reports from Thesis Monitoring Committees where appropriate, but that the end of first year review should remain as the substantive review point for research degree candidacy.

The Sub-Committee decided: to refer each project item to a working group who should plan to seek formal approval of new documentation and processes at the next meeting of the Sub-Committee in May 2013.


The Sub-Committee received a summary outline of the ELIR process and noted the emphasis on student participation in quality assurance and enhancement.

The Sub-Committee decided: to note the report.

5. Research Degree Theses – Submissions and Embargoes Appendix C

The Sub-Committee received a paper from the Senior Assistant Librarian on the growing number of requests for embargoes made by students upon submission of research theses to the University Library.

The Sub-Committee noted that staff in the Library & Learning Centre needed clarification on the University’s policy and procedures on approving such embargoes. The Sub-Committee agreed that the current form needed to be updated and include more information in the form of a checklist to help students and supervisors to quantify and justify requests.

The Sub-Committee also agreed that the assumption should remain that research outputs belong in the public domain and that only a limited set of
circumstances would justify withholding access – even if the copyright is held and retained by the student.

**The Sub-Committee decided:** to recommend that a new library thesis submission form is produced to help clarify the processes involved with embargoes.

6. **Date of next meetings.**  
2 pm 1st May 2013 in River Room 2

---

**Professor Alan Page**  
Deputy Principal (Research Governance)  
Convener

---

**Appendix A:** Outline of Data Item for PGR Cognos Reports  
**Appendix B:** Code of Practice Project Outline  
**Appendix C:** Postgraduate Research Theses – Deposit Workflow and Restrictions.
Appendix A: Research Student Data/Report

The tables below identify data items, for three distinct groups, that form the structure of proposed standard reports – using the Cognos tool to query the SITS Student Management System. Once these reports have been finalised it is proposed that they are used, on an annual basis, to provide information to the relevant Senate and College committees. These reports will enable the identification of any problem areas – late submissions, referred theses, poor viva outcomes, withdrawal/non-completion rates, conversion and rejection rates in the admissions process.

**Current Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student (Head Count) &amp; (FTE)</th>
<th>Entry Year</th>
<th>MOA</th>
<th>(Report Date) - (Max End Date)</th>
<th>Domicile/Fee Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qual Aim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Completed Students (last 5 years)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student (Head Count) &amp; (FTE)</th>
<th>Entry Year</th>
<th>(Max End Date) – (Submission Date)</th>
<th>Domicile/Fee Status</th>
<th>Viva Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qual Aim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Applicants (last 5 years)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student (Head Count) &amp; (FTE)</th>
<th>Application Year</th>
<th>Conditional Offer</th>
<th>Unconditional Offer</th>
<th>Rejection</th>
<th>Decline</th>
<th>Matriculation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qual Aim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Martin Glover, PGLA
Keith Mackle, Student Services
February 2013
Research Degrees Sub-Committee 25.2.13
Appendix A

Research Student Data/ Reports

The tables below identify data items, for three distinct groups, that form the structure of proposed standard reports – using the Cognos tool to query the SITS Student Management System. Once these reports have been finalised it is proposed that they are used, on an annual basis, to provide information to the relevant Senate and College committees.

These reports will enable the identification of any problem areas – late submissions, referred theses, poor viva outcomes, withdrawal/ non-completion rates, conversion and rejection rates in the admissions process.

Current Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student (Head Count) &amp; (FTE)</th>
<th>Entry Year</th>
<th>MOA</th>
<th>(Report Date) - (Max End Date)</th>
<th>Domicile/Fee Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qual Aim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Completed Students (last 5 years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student (Head Count) &amp; (FTE)</th>
<th>Entry Year</th>
<th>(Max End Date) – (Submission Date)</th>
<th>Domicile/Fee Status</th>
<th>Viva Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qual Aim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applicants (last 5 years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student (Head Count) &amp; (FTE)</th>
<th>Application Year</th>
<th>Conditional Offer</th>
<th>Unconditional Offer</th>
<th>Rejection</th>
<th>Decline</th>
<th>Matriculation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qual Aim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Martin Glover, PGLA and Keith Mackle, Student Services
February 2013
The University needs to demonstrate compliance with its own stated intent to review the current CoP during 2012/13.

In addition the QAA has published a new Quality Code Chapter B11 that replaced the earlier published guidance and precepts (1999 and 2004). The University will need to demonstrate compliance with Chapter B11. QAA during ELIR in 2013 will use Chapter B11 as a reference point. The Reflective Analysis will need to include a full account of the CoP review process - this constrains the project both in scope and in timescale – a new Code will need to be approved at Senate in May 2013.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Audit of Current Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Approval of Project Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Remapping Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Draft Code Structure and sample Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Production of Draft Code</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to focus the voice and relevance of the new Code it will be necessary to disaggregate those elements of the current code that seek to give advice and guidance to students. Instead these student focused elements will be reworked into a series of Student Frequently Asked Questions type information sheets – with input from all stakeholders and most importantly from a number of research students at different stages of their studies.

### 2. Student FAQ Sheets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Disaggregate information and plan FAQ sheets.</th>
<th>The task will be defined and the scope/content of each sheet set out in draft form for RDSC approval in February 2013. A starting point will be the extant (but out of date) Postgraduate Portal and the “Rough Guide...” section in particular (see <a href="http://www.dundee.ac.uk/advancedundee/PG/b009s.htm">http://www.dundee.ac.uk/advancedundee/PG/b009s.htm</a>).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Appoint Sponsor and constitute Working Group</td>
<td>RDSC will also appoint a sponsor for this element of the project. The sponsor will then invite relevant staff and students to join the Working Group to begin the task of producing the FAQ sheets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Production of Draft FAQ Sheets</td>
<td>The Working Group will meet on a regular basis to allocate tasks, agree drafts and attend to practical production issues. In addition careful liaison will be required between this Group and the Group working on the new Code to ensure coherent and compliant content and a coordinated production schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Focus Groups and Student Feedback</td>
<td>The timetable for the production of the FAQ Sheets will be less constrained by the need for regulatory approval and the fact that production period can continue into the late spring early summer months will enable full student testing and feedback before the official launch in September 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Launch of FAQ Sheets</td>
<td>The new information should be made available to new PGR students at induction in September 2013. The RDSC and Schools will need to consider online vs. print (or a mix of both) methods of production. A plan for annual maintenance of these sheets will also need to be put in place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The co-incidence of quinquennial review, a new QAA Quality Code and ELIR in 2013 provides an opportunity for modernization of student progression and thesis monitoring procedures across the University. It is proposed that the current system of “Transfer of Ordinance” and supervision/thesis monitoring is replaced with a comprehensive but flexible Annual Progress Review (APR) that links with attendance monitoring and student re-matriculation processes.

### 3. Annual Progress Review (APR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Business Process Review</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Information gained in the audit of current practice across all schools will need to be augmented with a clear account of current processes in each School specifically with regard to (i) transfer of ordinance (ii) thesis monitoring and (iii) student re-matriculation. This information to be compiled during February 2013 for presentation at RDSC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Business Process Re-Design</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>A Sponsor and working group to be agreed by RDSC will be tasked with the development of a new business process to meet the demands of the developing regulatory context. A clear set of goals, deadlines, operating constraints and deliverables will be agreed by RDSC in February 2013 and a draft design produced by May 2013.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Implementation of the new Annual Progress Review will be expected by the start of session 2013/14: this will mean that amendments to existing regulations will need to be coordinated as part of the Research Degree Code approval process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>It is essential, even at such an early stage of development, to acknowledge that the introduction of a clear Annual Progress Review system for research degree students is undertaken for sound academic and student support objectives that will only be met through long term operation. The implementation plan will need to include a clear account of how the APR system is to be operated, enforced and evaluated (both locally and centrally) over an initial 5 year period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Martin Glover  
Policy Officer (Academic Governance)  
February 2013
Policy area: Code of Practice for Supervised Postgraduate Research

Instigator(s) of Policy or changes to Policy:
Professor Alan Page (Deputy Principal for Research Governance)
Dr Lesley McLellan (Director of Quality Assurance)
Dr Martin Glover (Policy Officer, Academic Governance)

Brief rationale for development or change:
The University’s current Code of Practice for Supervised Postgraduate Research (CoP) is due for its quinquennial review in 2012/13. This would normally include a survey of current School procedures, to ensure compliance with existing quality assurance and student support standards, and general maintenance of the CoP to reflect developments in University structures, nomenclature and responsibilities.

The current CoP is based on a mapping to the precepts published by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) in 1999 and revised in 2004. However, these have now been superseded by the publication of a chapter (Chapter B11) of the new Quality Code by QAA – in an interim version in June 2012 with a full and final implementation in July 2013.

The scheduled review of the University’s CoP should take into account the expectations contained in Chapter B11 and a fundamental remapping exercise must now be carried out to ensure full compliance – in the knowledge that QAA will use Chapter B11 as the reference point during the Enhancement Led Institutional Review (ELIR) in October/November 2013.

However, the main impetus for a fundamental review of the University’s research degree regulatory and quality processes go beyond the need to demonstrate compliance with QAA expectations (i.e. this is not an end in itself) rather it is the need to maintain excellence in research degree provision that should be taken as the primary purpose. The focus should be maintaining and enhancing excellence in the quality of research undertaken by our graduate students, the support they receive during their studies, the relevance of skills acquired and honed – both generic and specific to their research discipline. The University’s research degrees, and the Dundee doctorate in particular must continue to be the gold standard of academic excellence that enables our students and graduates to make a significant and transformational contribution to knowledge in their chosen field of expertise and to play an increasingly leading role in the development of the intellectual life of their discipline and their University.

Version: First Draft prior to submission to Research Degrees Sub-Committee

Confidentiality: Open paper.
Resource implications: Developmental resources will be limited to staff participation in each of three work streams and associated support from the central secretariat. There will also be costs at delivery associated with a limited print run for hard copies of documents to be used in internal quality enhancement activities, staff development and student inductions or examinations.

Equality and diversity considerations: An equality and diversity impact assessment will form an integral part of the revised Code.

Action requested: To approve three work streams associated with the project and to agree deliverables and draft timetable for the project.

The Sub-Committee is invited to

(i) approve the proposals for review, remapping and disaggregation of the current CoP;
(ii) approve the proposals to develop and publish a set of student-focused FAQ sheets;
(iii) recommend to URC and Senate the revocation of elements of the Higher Degree Regulations – so as to replace the current “Transfer of Ordinance” and Thesis Monitoring processes with an Annual Progression Review (APR) to be formally linked with attendance monitoring, thesis monitoring and re-matriculation.

Contact for comments: Martin Glover, Policy Governance & Legal Affairs: m.glover@dundee.ac.uk
Postgraduate Research Theses – Deposit Workflow and Restrictions.

It would appear that some confusion surrounds the process of electronic and hard copy submission of postgraduate research theses, particularly surrounding the question of restricting access to theses by means of an embargo.

In light of this, it is proposed to replace the existing Access to Thesis form, with a new form which will clarify the responsibilities of all of the key parties involved.

In addition, some minor alteration to the existing workflow is proposed, as follows.

1. Pre-viva, when the student is ready to submit the final version of their thesis, they should complete the new Thesis Deposit Agreement form, and submit to Registry.
2. Registry supplies copy of Thesis Deposit Agreement form to Library & Learning Centre.
3. Student submits electronic copy of thesis to Discovery. A confirmation e-mail is generated and sent to the student, who takes a print copy together with the print copy of their thesis to Registry.*
   i. If the student & supervisor are in agreement that the thesis need not be restricted, the full-text is made available on Discovery.
   ii. If the student and supervisor are in agreement that the thesis must be restricted, a suitable embargo period, as indicated on the Thesis Deposit Agreement, will be implemented.
   iii. If the student & supervisor are NOT in agreement on the need for the thesis to be restricted, the full-text will not be made available on Discovery, and the Library & Learning Centre will contact the supervisor to seek a resolution.
4. If the thesis is to be restricted, an e-mail detailing Freedom of Information requirements is generated by the LLC and sent to the supervisor and Alan Bell as the FoI compliance officer.

Should a request be received to retrospectively embargo a thesis, the LLC will take down any full-text, and will contact the relevant supervisor to obtain their agreement on whether to grant an embargo, and if so, for how long.

* It should be noted that Registry staff should NOT accept a hard copy version of the thesis if no e-mail from Discovery is presented at the same time.
UNIVERSITY OF DUNDEE
ACCESS TO THESIS PRESENTED FOR HIGHER DEGREES

1. AUTHOR’S DECLARATION

The University Library receives many requests from other libraries to supply photocopies or microfilms of theses of this University. Such requests are normally complied with, provided that the consent of the author can be obtained. Occasionally, however, it is difficult or even impossible to contact an author, especially in the case of graduates from overseas.
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Library Building Developments

The Main Library ground floor refurbishment and development project has progressed considerably since the last L&T meeting. A user-consultation process was undertaken in December, with an online survey running for 2 weeks as well as lunchtime opportunities to discuss the plans with LLC staff. The full results of the consultation process are shown on the LLC’s website. The requests for enhancements to facilities and services can be shown as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility/Service</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More silent study desks</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More fixed PCs</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive provision of power</td>
<td>1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable study space</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved WiFi</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More collab/group study desks</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group study pods</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group study rooms</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More printers/photoscopiers</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved wireless printing</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More informal seating (sofas, etc)</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Short Loan area</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More lockers</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved enquiry services</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS Service Desk staffed for longer</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More scanners</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

441 responses. 1st choice score 10, 2nd 9 etc. Common other responses were more toilets, and more silence monitoring in the silent areas and more books.

As the highest demanded facilities/service was “more silent student study spaces”, the design team have altered the zoning of the building by designing the ground floor space to be largely collaborative study facility; making the upper two floors silent study. Reconfiguring the design has allowed 170+ additional silent study spaces. Overall, the occupancy of the building will increase by over 300 spaces, taking the total student study spaces from 1160 to 1489. One zone within the ground floor area will be designated a flexible zone. This will operate as a collaborative area for most of the academic year, but will have the facility to be changed to a silent study zone during examination periods. There will be 185 seats in this zone.

The design team have now finalised the plans and the building work is scheduled to commence on 27th May, this year. In the meantime there are preparatory works to be undertaken in the Main Library ground floor area, and patrons will already have noticed that books and journals are being relocated to the upper floor shelving and to off site storage. The Special Collections, currently housed in the compact shelving on ground floor will shortly be relocated to the basement of the
Scrymgeour Building and will be retrieved on demand, exactly as now. The building work is scheduled to take place from 27th May with a completion date of 23rd August. This will mean there will be no access to the ground floor of building during this time. There will also be limited access at times to the middle floor, as this area is changed from a collaborative space to a silent study space. Book and journal collections will be available at all times, and there will be adequate access to study facilities, including PC provision during the resit diet.

The Ninewells Library has undergone a renovation and relocation as part of the Medical School development project. On 1st March, the Ninewells Library relocated to the newly built extension and is now operating from a new two floor-facility. IT and Library resources are now in a shared space, ensuring the development of an active learning environment, with Library staff and additional facilities available within the new space. Some collections have remained in their previous location and can be accessed by contacting the Ninewells Library staff.

**Study Space provision**

In preparation for the examination diet in April/May, the Main Library has made a further 30 study places available in a temporary space recently vacated by library staff. These spaces all have power available. The Slessor IT Suite within the building has recently been upgraded and now houses 15 student PCs. These are both additional study spaces available to the students. As before, as the examination diet approaches, the rooms currently on central room booking (Fairlie and Watson-Watt) will cease to be available, other than as study spaces for students in the building. This increases study provision by a further 40 seats.

In addition, 60 desks in the older part of the building have recently had power provided, making them more useable and no longer a ‘last resort’.

**University Teaching Awards**

Colleges are asked to remind winners of their college-level teaching awards that they may go forward to the University level awards, for Innovative Teaching and for Excellence in Teaching, and should make their submissions to l.walsh@dundee.ac.uk by 29th March. Submissions are also being invited for the University’s inclusive practice award. This award recognises good practice across the University that removes barriers to access for disabled students or others protected by the Equality Act. It is open to College and SASS-based staff and takes the form of a £1,000 practice development fund. The deadline for submission this year is the 29th March. Further information is available from Shirley Hill (s.hill@dundee.ac.uk) or Lorraine Walsh (l.walsh@dundee.ac.uk) and from http://www.dundee.ac.uk/library/teachingexcellence/supportingscholarship/awards-201112/

In addition, as part of the InspirED programme, Disability Services is running staff development sessions this semester on supporting students with hearing impairments (on the 19th March) and also on inclusive learning and teaching practice (on the 18th April). Additional development opportunities are planned for next academic session on supporting students with dyslexia and also on the provision of alternative and accessible formats of teaching and other materials http://www.dundee.ac.uk/library/teachingexcellence/supportingcpd/workshops%202012/
The Library & Learning Centre is delighted to announce this semester’s programme of inspirED seminars to support excellence in teaching and scholarship.

*Wednesday 20 March 2013, 12.30 - 2pm
Grainne Hamilton (e-Assessment Advisor with the Jisc RSC Scotland) ‘Liberating assessment with Open Badges’

* Chrissi Nerantzi (University of Salford) ‘Would Plato Love Lego? Using metaphors through model making to aid reflection’

Wednesday 17 April 2013, 12.30 - 2pm

Seminars are open to all academic, research and support staff and will be held in the EduZone, located in the Main Library. To register for a seminar please email inspirED@dundee.ac.uk and state the title of the seminar you wish to attend. A light lunch will be provided.

http://www.dundee.ac.uk/library/teachingexcellence/supportingscholarship/seminar201213/

Teach@dundee

There has been an excellent response to the new Teach@dundee academic induction programme which begins on 25th March. The programme will run again on 19th & 20th August and new colleagues may register for this now by contacting inspirED@dundee.ac.uk

http://www.dundee.ac.uk/library/teaching/teachatdundee/

Extension of Journal Resources

Online access to the full text of an additional 2000 journals has been secured for University of Dundee staff and students. The LLC is continually striving for the cost effective use of the journal budget, and wherever possible changes in journal provision are matched with School expectations. A recent analysis of usage, turn-away statistics and School requests has identified a range of resources for additional licensing, and many of these are highlighted in 2013 School Operating plans.

The additional 2000 new titles have been licensed due to a number of elements. The shared digital academic library for Scotland, SHEDL, has negotiated additional access to journals from Oxford (22), Springer (7), Sage (558) and Berg (2). National licenses through JISC Collections have provided a further 51 titles from Elsevier and access to Springer Protocols from 2004 to 2012. The University has extended its journal licensing with Taylor & Francis to the full bundle offer, and this brings an additional 1363 titles. A SHEDL contract with Cambridge University Press for eBooks has provided access to 5000 eBooks from 2005 to 2013. Full information on the additional journal and ebook titles is available from LLC College liaison staff and is available as a spreadsheet that can be sorted by subject.

Denise Jackson
Deputy Director - LLC