

ROBERT GORDON UNIVERSITY

TEACHING, LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT SUB-COMMITTEE

Minute of the meeting held on 15 April 2021.

Present: J Strachan (Convener), E Akerele, Dr P Bremner, M Buchan, Dr K Burgess, J Cleary, K Cross, A Davidson, L Gibbons-Wood, Dr M Goua, Dr S Henderson, S Marini, P Matthews, J Nicol, J Pryor, Dr J Scott and Dr Y Zhao.

Apologies: E Berrill, N Dave, Dr S Douglas, V Draghici, W Jackson, Dr R McGregor, I Morrison, C Park, A Du Plessis, D Wynne and Dr M Zarb.

In Attendance: L Barry (Secretary), K Campbell (for item 3b), T Lauterbach, S Lawrie, Dr K Martzoukou, J Mifsud (for item 6) F Roberts and Dr F Work.

	Action
1. MINUTE AND MATTERS ARISING	
The Convener welcomed the Sub-Committee to the final meeting of the session.	
The Minute of the meeting held on 26 January 2021 [reference TLASC/21/2] was approved.	
The Convener noted that there were a couple of matters arising around Assessment which we will be picked up in Items 5a and 5b. There were no further matters arising on review of the minute.	
2. SHARING EFFECTIVE PRACTICE	
The Sub-Committee received a summary from Dr Pauline Bremner, Teaching Excellence Fellow from School of Creative and Cultural Business, on RGU's Scottish Innovative Student Award (SISA) activity. A paper was circulated prior to the meeting for members to view.	
Dr Bremner gave an overview, detailing that the main activity in 2020-2021 was the in-house accreditation process of SISA level 1 which received both internal and external approval from The Scottish Institute for Education (SIE) by May 2020, with RGU being the first, and only, SISA Level 1 accrediting body.	
In the past 3 years, there had been an increase in applications for SISA accreditation across the UK. Notably at Level 2 and 3, RGU hold the highest numbers of applications across Scottish Institutions. SIE will cease at the end of April, and consequently SISA will also cease in its present format. To maintain momentum and ensure students continued to benefit from involvement in the programme, a proposal will shortly be considered by RGU's Academic Development Committee which outlined a new process and series of RGU awards.	
In recognition of the progress to date and positive impact on learners, RGU entered the Imaginative Educator Awards at the Scottish Institute for Enterprise (SIE) Festival of Innovation and was awarded the team award which recognised the collaborative efforts across RGU including the involvement of Governance and Academic Quality, Entrepreneurship and Innovation Group (EIG), Employability and Professional Enrichment (EPE), and Academic Schools. Further to this, the University had also nominated the team for a Collaborative Award for Teaching Excellence (CATE) Advance HE award; with the outcome of the nomination likely to be announced in July 2021.	
Members were directed to the SISA Staff Resources page on Campus Moodle here for further information and invited to promote the SISA scheme within their Schools. The Level 1 accreditation cycle was open for new applications for Session 2021-22 with a May 2021 deadline to submit applications which may be extended in recognition of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. Further resources were also	

available on the EHub platform.

At the suggestion of the Sub-Committee, Dr Bremner will be invited to a future GA Course Leaders meeting in order that course leaders may consider the relevance of the future RGU award to GA provision.

Dr Bremner was thanked for her involvement and for being a driving force for such an important initiative which was supportive of RGU's whole person teaching approach and the Learning and Teaching Framework.

Action

J Strachan

3. EMERGING STRONGER

3.1 Digital Learning

Members received a presentation from Jacqui Nicol, Step Change Lead, Department for the Enhancement of Learning, Teaching and Assessment (DELTA) on the Digital Learning project taking place as a strand within RGU's QAA Enhancement Theme work.

The presentation reminded the Sub-Committee of the University's confirmed arrangements for Semester 1 2021/22 which includes an online institutional Welcome programme, blended approach to delivery of on-campus courses with the expectation that all students will have the opportunity for some face to face learning on campus in groups of 50 or less, use of appropriate social distancing and hygiene measures and no invigilated on-campus assessment. While the detail of RGU's future approach to learning, teaching and assessment continues to evolve, it was evident that digital learning will remain a core element of delivery, engagement and assessment into the long-term.

In light of the heavy reliance on digital learning since March 2020, and likely continued use of digital learning into the future, the Digital Learning project will create a roadmap to guide the evolution of digital learning at RGU. The project will draw upon effective practice across the sector; insights gathered through National Student Surveys (NSS) and RGU's Student Experience Questionnaires (SEQ); and feedback from staff and students gathered by external consultants who have experience in developing digital learning.

The Digital Learning project comprises 4 work strands:

Digital Learning Practice which will review and refresh the current RGU Baseline via a working group ahead of the 2021/22 session.

Digital Learning Environment which will review and plan for enhancement of the University's Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) CampusMoodle and explore the potential to expand RGU's existing educational technology toolset with a priority to facilitate consistent and sustainable VLE development and the phased implementation of any plans.

Online Assessment which will focus on an online proctoring pilot to explore how third-party proctoring services could be implemented to offer identity verification and monitor student behaviour throughout exams.

Learning Analytics for Evidence-Based Decision Making which will seek to explore the analytics capabilities of Moodle not currently activated with RGU's bespoke CampusMoodle environment; understand what was required of learner analytics; and make recommendations for the future.

Sub-Committee members welcomed these work strands and expressed enthusiasm to get involved. Members also acknowledged how much work had been done across Schools and support departments to date in the digital learning space which had been of particular benefit to the student experience since March 2020. The Sub-Committee agreed the project was an excellent opportunity to

redefine the digital learning experience for students and that exploring the full capabilities of CampusMoodle would facilitate that.

Members attention was brought to AttendR, which is an app used for monitoring attendance, which was developed by the School of Computing. This app can be used for remote sessions as well and DELTA staff were in communication with the app development team to explore how it may connect to the Digital Learning project.

Sub-Committee discussion highlighted members were keen to understand how students were engaging with digital learning. For example, members suggested it would be helpful check student engagement with online content and to check understanding of subject matter via formative assessment in CampusMoodle. Members noted some concerns with the use of discussion forums suggesting that many forums were not being used for the intended purpose or that purpose hadn't been made clear to students thus causing confusion and lack of interaction. Members agreed that a key consideration was building and sustaining human engagement to create a learning community for each cohort. Using forums with clarity, consistency and use of standardised language would help to encourage engagement.

Members suggested there was opportunity to further guide staff on the use of discussion forums via the University's staff development programme.

Sub-Committee discussion further highlighted that students appreciate standardisation and clarity on the VLE with clear and consistent signposts of where to find learning, support and other tools.

The Sub-Committee agreed the Digital Learning project and its associated strands complemented RGU's aspirations to emerge stronger from the pandemic and RGU's Learning and Teaching Framework (LTf). The Sub-Committee noted a range of institutional enhancement projects led by Teaching Excellence Fellows and aligned to the RGU LTF were currently being scoped and these will feature as an agenda item at a future meeting of TLASC (likely October 2021).

3.2 Student Partnership Objective

The Sub-Committee received a presentation from Emmanuel Akerele, Student President of Education and Welfare and Kirsty Campbell, Learning Analytics Partnership Lead, Department for the Enhancement of Learning, Teaching and Assessment (DELTA), on the Student Partnership Objective.

To place the focus of the new Student Partnership Objective in context, members were reminded of RGU's rapid transition from on campus to blended and online learning with a priority throughout being to protect the wellbeing of staff and students. In recognition of this, the student partnership objective seeks to understand the impact of the transition on the mental, physical and social health of students; specifically, to understand what had worked and what hadn't to inform RGU's continuing evolution. The 2021 Partnership Objective is investigative in its approach and aims to listen and learn from students and staff in new and evolving ways in order to inform future decision making.

Sub-Committee members acknowledged the work which went into the Student Partnership Objective and the efforts needed to raise awareness of it across the wider University community. The focus of the Student Partnership Objective was in alignment with, and feeds into, the Emerging Stronger ambition, also echoed in RGU's planned work in response to the latest QAA Enhancement Theme; commitment to partnership activity and recent Chat, Comment, Change events; use of evidence-based enhancement; and the Student-Facing Services Review.

Action

Action

Members heard that the Healthy University forum was to be re-established, providing opportunities to consider whole system perspectives in support of health and wellbeing. Additionally, there will be a specific mechanism in place to consider perspectives of Social Health and this will be established by the Director of Student Life.

It was highlighted that there was national research currently taking place on the status of students studying in Scotland regarding their mental health. Researchers were analysing the results with a view to establishing emerging themes on a national level. It was hoped that there would be enough data from this research to inform practice nationally and give greater insight into what makes learners thrive. Members heard that over 15000 responses had been received.

The Sub-Committee was reminded that RGU's QAA Enhancement Theme Awards were now open for application. The scheme offers small grant awards to enable successful staff and student applicants to take forward an enhancement project of their choosing. Proposals may focus on any aspect of the student learning experience and topics related to the Partnership Objective were particularly welcomed. The deadline for application deadline was noted as 5pm, 30 April 2021.

Members were asked to raise awareness of these events, forums and feedback opportunities, more details of which will be issued in the coming weeks and months.

As part of this item there was discussion around Creativity from Crisis. Members received an update on the annual RGU Learning and Teaching Conference. The conference will take place online on the afternoon of 8th June 2021 and the morning of 9th June 2021.

The Keynote speaker, Professor Bugewa Apampa, Professor of Access and Participation at Birmingham City University, was noted to be one of only 40 black female Professors across the UK and a motivational speaker who will talk about pertinent items that were on the HE-radar including curriculum, accessibility and helping everyone to engage optimally. The conference will include presentations, workshops and a debate to end, with the aim of enabling high levels of participant engagement.

The Sub-Committee were positive about the conference programme and response to the call for abstracts which will see a wide range of presentations from across Schools, Support Departments and Students.

Members were reminded that conference registration was open, with promotion via the RGU Staff Bulletin and sign-up via [CampusMoodle](#). Staff can register to attend one or both dates.

4.**ONLINE STUDENT CONDUCT**

The Convener reminded the Sub-Committee of a previous Sharing Practice agenda item which showcased the School of Computing's 'Code of Conduct' designed to guide the interactions of staff and students online. This Code was presented to TLASC and Learning Infrastructure Sub-Committee (LISC) in the early part of 2021 with a wholly positive response from both committees. Subsequently, Dr Mark Zarb, author of the Code of Conduct, was invited to form a working group to create an institutional guide with the aim for implementation ahead of the 21/22 session. The working group shared a paper with Sub-Committee members prior to the meeting and the Convener invited members to comment on this.

The paper received positive feedback from the members with a suggestion for one addition – supportive guidance to students to encourage cameras to be turned on during synchronous sessions.

Action

Sub-Committee members shared that students with cameras off can create feelings of isolation for staff and that it can impact on the quality of their teaching. Student Sub-Committee members highlighted that in some instances staff were not always leading by example and students would welcome staff use of cameras. Students also fed back that the more students who do turn their cameras, the greater the encouragement for others to do the same. Student members agreed that where cameras were turned off, it did limit human interaction and impacted on the learning experience however student members agree that strict requirements were not something that could be implemented.

It was acknowledged that students may be faced with constraining personal circumstances and technology challenges, therefore the use of cameras should not be required, but should be encouraged and therefore the working group document would be updated to incorporate 'cameras on' encouragement.

Dr M Zarb

Related discussions highlighted a concern amongst Sub-Committee members that there had been instances of students recording staff without their knowledge and consent. Sub-Committee members were reminded of the new policy on Recording of Teaching Activities approved via the January 2021 meeting of TLASC and it was agreed that a student-facing video resource providing guidance on social presence and online conduct would be beneficial as part of the online Welcome resources for 2021.

DELTA**Secretary's Note**

Subsequent to the discussions during the meeting of TLASC, Dr Zarb provided an updated version of the Guidance to Student Online Conduct [[appendix 1](#)]

5 ASSESSMENT**5.1 Assessment Policy Review – Close out report****L Barry**

Following the January meeting of TLASC, the Assessment Policy Review Close Out Report had been reviewed by the University's Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee (QAEC). QAEC passed a small number of points back to the Sub-Committee for further consideration to ensure alignment in terminology between policy, guidance and regulations. It was agreed, that the Sub-Committee Secretary would pull together the recommendations and circulate draft wording for comment/approval to Sub-Committee members via email.

Secretary's Note

Subsequent to the meeting of TLASC, members were consulted regarding the points raised by the Quality and Enhancement Committee (QAEC/21/2/4.4) and the following wording was **approved** [new wording underlined in red and deleted wording ~~scored through~~] for inclusion in the Assessment Policy and Glossary as appropriate:

**L Barry to
QAEC
[11/5/21]**

- Section 3.2(iv) that assessment briefs should explicitly state what penalty would apply for excess wordage (QAEC);**

3.2 Coursework**iv Excess wordage**

If the word count of an assessment is considered critical, then this should be reflected within the assessment brief, ensuring consistency within a discipline. Schools should discuss this issue in order to ensure the standardisation of the marking process in the event that a student exceeds the required word count, and the application of penalties within Schools. A penalty would not normally be appropriate unless the deviation was at least plus 10%. Any penalties for excess wordage must be explicitly stated within the assessment brief. Students should must be informed of any penalties.

- **Section 3.3(ii): retention would be for 10 working days to ensure consistency with the Academic Appeals (Awards and Progression) Procedure;**

3.3 Practical examination

ii Record

Where a practical examination is a summative assessment a record of the assessment submission must be made. This will be retained until a minimum of 20 10 working days* following the meeting of the Assessment Board in accordance with the policy for retention of assessed work [refer [paragraph 5i](#)].

*Monday to Friday and excluding days that the University is closed.

- **Section 4.7: that assessment briefs should explicitly state what penalty would apply for excess wordage (QAEC);**

4.7 Marking penalties for excess wordage

Excess wordage will be penalised provided this is indicated in the assessment brief and the relevant penalties explicitly detailed [refer [paragraph 3.2iv](#)].

- **Section 4.8: reference to 'penalties' be replaced by 'sanctions' to ensure consistency with the Student Misconduct Procedure (QAEC);**

4.8 Penalties Sanctions for academic misconduct, including plagiarism

Academic misconduct including plagiarism is not penalised sanctioned directly by the marker.

Where there are reasonable grounds to believe that misconduct has Occurred then the Head of School shall be informed in the first instance.

[*Academic Regulation A3 – Section 2: Student Misconduct Procedure*]

Students should be strongly advised to keep a copy of all coursework planning and development materials in addition to the submission. Refer [Guidance: Academic Honesty Integrity](#).

- **Section 5.2: the proposed wording be checked (QAEC);**

5. Assessment results

5.2 Student debtors and assessment results

~~The University's current sanction is to withhold the conferment of University awards to students who are either in academic debt to the University and/or have not enrolled~~ The University can withhold the conferment of a University or partner institution award to a student where the student is in tuition fee debt to the University.

Results will be released to such students but this data ~~do~~ does not constitute official conferment of an award. Data protection rights of the student to access ~~these~~ this personal data will still be upheld. Schools shall take responsibility for ensuring that all candidates for assessment are fully enrolled students of the University.

- **Consideration be given to incorporating the definition of 'coursework', contained in the University's Fit to Sit Policy, as this was consistent with the QAA Quality Code, and this would be forwarded to the Sub-Committee's Convener (QAEC);**

Action

Action

The [Glossary of Assessment Terms](#) currently detail examination and coursework as:

Examination: A question or set of questions relating to a particular area of study [source: HESA]

Coursework: An assessment which is not time limited except by a deadline for submission and which involves the submission of written work or an artefact. If an assessment comprises of work in the form of artefacts such as sketchbooks, large scale design work, exhibitions or portfolios, produced in either a classroom or self-study environment it is considered to be coursework. This includes work that counts towards continuous or examinable work.

Currently, the *Fit to Sit Policy* and *Academic Regulations* define examination and coursework as:

Exams: 'For the purposes of this form examinations are defined as invigilated and/or time released written examinations, oral assessments and presentations, and practical skill assessments.' (*Fit to Sit Policy: Deferral Request Form*)

Coursework: 'Coursework includes continuous assessment such as assignments, laboratory and project reports and any such exercises where specifications are given to students in advance for submission by a specified deadline.' (*Regulation A4*).

5.2 Short-Life Working Group

The Sub-Committee had been tasked by QAEC [refer QAEC/21/1/5.4] to carry out a review of the University's criterion-referenced grading scheme and percentage marking. This review was intended to enhance and harmonise practice across the University and it was agreed this would be carried out via a Short-Life Working Group (SLWG) led by Fiona Roberts, Lead Teaching Excellence Fellow.

The members heard an update on the Grading Scheme Short Life Working Group which had held two (2) focus group meetings with staff and students to review relevant literature around the grading scheme and experiences with current practice across all Schools. Sub-Committee members were asked to consider and discuss the recommendations contained in a paper that had been provided prior to the meeting of TLASC.

The SLWG findings highlighted that only four (4) Schools used the true criterion-referenced grading scheme as recommended across RGU. The remaining Schools uses a variant of criterion-referenced letter grading and percentage grading with no consistency; for example, one school has introduced a variant on the criterion referenced grading scheme by implementing + and – points on the letter grading spectrum. It was apparent that across the Schools there was varied practice and there was a need to be unified in the need for consistency.

Members of the SLWG had acknowledged there were advantages and disadvantages to both types of grading/marketing practices, however, the SLWG agreed the goal should be to ensure students were provided with clear and constructive feedback through a system which was fair, consistent and equitable.

The SLWG had heard from student members and there was varied feedback from these students on moving to alphabetical grading. Many students liked the system in use within their own school and student perceptions often related to familiarity with the existing system in use. Students generally felt they would like to understand why they were getting a particular grade. They were not necessarily concerned about the grade itself, but rather the quality of feedback that they were getting.

The recommendation of the SLWG was that:

1. Assessments that were **purely qualitative**, such as coursework and presentations, should be graded using a **letter criterion** grading scheme at both component and overall module level. This was based on the concerns in the literature about precision when allocating a percentage or number grade. This would provide consistency across the university in the context of these

- | Action |
|---|
| <p>assessment types.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Assessments that were purely quantitative, such as exams or CampusMoodle quizzes, should remain marked in percentages at component level prior to being converted to the University Grading Scheme at overall module level as this was the most appropriate scheme for this assessment type. 3. Assessments that were a mixture of qualitative and quantitative questions should remain as they were currently being graded or marked within Schools due to the hybrid nature of the assessment and the decision deferred on this until a later date. 4. Institutional support for designing high quality rubrics was required, especially for staff who would be changing their practice for qualitative assessments. 5. A University-wide review of Module Performance Descriptors and grading descriptors would be beneficial to monitor consistency across the institution. 6. The proposal, if approved, should be from Session 2022-23 onwards to ensure an appropriate staff development time in advance, to ensure grading scheme changes were not affecting cohorts mid-year and to enable appropriate discussion with PSRBs. 7. No change be proposed to the current Masters grading, which aligned with the University Grading Scheme as it remained fit for purpose and reducing to a pass/merit/distinction scheme was too simplistic. 8. A University Assessment Charter should be developed and each School then tasked with working in partnership with their students to contextualise this to their School. |

In considering this recommendation, Sub-Committee members noted a range of points, including:

Students undertaking a range of qualitative and quantitative assessments in their course would have a mix of letter and percentage grades. However, it was noted that all grading would be converted to letter grades when inputted into the student records system (SITS).

The number of modules with mixed grading might be confusing for students and clarity for students would be dependent on the quality of assessment rubrics.

Some Sub-Committee members noted a concern that a move to letter grades would lead to students being disadvantaged since a borderline result would be less evident than when using a percentage approach to marking. It was noted that the use of a criterion-referenced letter grading scheme would avoid borderline results for students on qualitative pieces of work from the outset.

Sub-Committee members raised a concern that the proposed change might be problematic in relation to meeting professional, statutory and/or regulatory body (PSRB) requirements. This had been considered by the SLWG who had conducted a review of all current RGU PSRB requirements finding that only the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Scotland (ICAS) had a published requirement for percentage grading which the SLWG could be accommodated within the draft recommendations.

It was felt that in some cases whilst this debate had been ongoing for a long time, staff felt that students did not appear to look past the percentage and had not engage with the feedback as there was often a pronounced outcomes-focus rather than developmental focus for students.

Action

Conversely, Sub-Committee members also suggested that quality and timeliness of feedback was the biggest concern for students. While Sub-Committee members appreciate that students liked to understand how they had performed in comparison within their peers, Sub-Committee members strongly felt that feedback should focus on helping students to understand how they should develop to enhance their understanding and their future work.

Consistency of implementation across and within Schools was imperative.

Any ambiguity on where a number/percentage came from should no longer be a concern as students will be able to see where they fall in the alphabetical grade.

A move to letter grading may help to simplify the moderating process for qualitative work, removing some of the complexity in understanding how a particular percentage outcome was reached by a colleague.

The Sub-Committee reached agreement that the recommendations of the SLWG should now proceed to QAEC for consideration.

SLWG members were thanked for the extensive work which had been undertaken in a short space of time.

6. TIMETABLING

The Sub-Committee received an update on automated exam timetabling via a presentation from Jane Mifsud, Timetabling Manager which followed an initial presentation to the Sub-Committee in October 2020.

Automated timetabling will ensure a good student experience, based on sound scheduling principles and will enable more efficient use of the physical and digital estate. The auto-scheduling of exams project had allowed the University to gather feedback from staff and students to inform the final approach and scheduling principles and while automation will create approximately 75% of the exam scheduling, there will still remain a need for some manual input and oversight.

The automated timetabling of exams project should enable earlier production of exam timetables allowing students to better plan & manage their time, for example by sharing the dates and times with others including family members and employers.

Since October 2020 feedback had been gained from a student survey which showed their preferences for exam scheduling whereby there was a maximum of one exam a day, and one day off between exams. Additionally, the feedback highlighted that students often had evening jobs and where exams were scheduled for an 8pm period that would not be helpful. Therefore, the initial proposal to extend the exam day from 2 exam periods per day to 3 exam periods per day would be revisited with this in mind.

Sub-Committee members heard that Schools and the Student Records team had completed a time intensive task of reinstating the labelling of module components within the student records system (SITS). This included examination, coursework, and practical exams in support of the auto-scheduling exams. Accurate assessment data was deemed important since the timetabling system, CELCAT, used data extracted from SITS and this would be one of the building blocks of the automation of the exam timetable. Additionally, it would allow for data to be better analysed and give a much clearer presentation for Assessment Boards and Student transcripts.

Action

Sub-Committee members were informed that a CELCAT training day would take place in early May for Central Timetabling. The training would take the current April exam timetable, along with student-module data from SITS and the relevant exam data held by the Inclusion Team to run a parallel test of the new automation tool with a view to producing a comparative automated timetable. Following a successful test, the implementation plan will be put together to use the automation tool to create the next live exam timetable. Potentially this could be in place for the August resit diet of the current session.

It was envisaged that the exam timetable would be made available in the same place as the teaching timetable, accessed from MyRGU, and would be available for students.

Members felt that anything that speeds up the release of the timetable to aid student planning is a positive step forward.

Members agreed that a lot of work had gone into this project and the Convener thanked all colleagues who had been involved.

7. ANNUAL SUB-COMMITTEE EVALUATION

Members received a report from the Annual Sub-Committee Evaluation results. The overall feedback was positive however it was noted that feedback from a small number of Sub-Committee members had been offered for two consecutive years that the agenda can be too busy leaving insufficient space for discussion. As a new Convenor of the Sub-Committee, the Convenor welcomed any feedback or suggestions from Sub-Committee members to enhance how the Sub-Committee works for committee members, their Schools/Departments and the University.

It was agreed that the Sub-Committee was a helpful conduit to share practice and therefore it would be helpful if School-level teaching and learning committees can put forward practice sharing or other agenda items to TLASC. To enable this, the Secretary will contact Sub-Committee members prior to each Agenda Setting meetings to request such items.

L Barry

Members enquired whether the Sub-Committee should be looking at school responses to the RGU Learning and Teaching Framework. The Convener clarified that these were overseen by School Academic Boards and monitored at QAEC, however stemming from school responses a range of institutional enhancement projects were currently being scoped by the University's Teaching Excellence Fellows. These projects were again complimentary to the RGU ambition of emerging stronger from the pandemic and would be brought to a future meeting of TLASC.

L Barry/
J
Strachan/
Lead TEF

8. FELLOWSHIP OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACADEMY

The Committee noted the membership of the Fellowship of the Higher Education Academy: –

Dr Mohamed Amish (SFHEA), School of Engineering
Dr Siew Hwa Lee (SFHEA), School of Nursing, Midwifery and Paramedic Practice

9. AOCB

Sub-Committee members enquired about the status of interim module and course changes which had been implemented across all courses as a result of COVID-19, in particular how these interim changes would be managed in the longer term. Sub-Committee members noted that there may be inconsistency with contact and

	Action L Barry to QAEC [11/5/21]
<p>activity time currently described in Module Descriptors since these indicative hours were based on face to face contact time in an on-campus mode. Sub-Committee members agreed this question should be highlighted to QAEC.</p>	
<p>Sub-Committee members posed a question regarding External Examiner remits and requirements, particularly in relation to where External Examiners have oversight of a couple of large modules. Some Sub-Committee members indicated uncertainty around the sample size for review. In sharing practice, Sub-Committee members highlighted different procedures for the selection of samples, including arrangements where External Examiners have access to all student summative assessments and can independently select the samples.</p>	
<p>The Sub-Committee were reminded that the University's Assessment Policy, provides instructions on these matters and that queries should be directed to the Governance and Academic Quality team.</p>	
<p>Members were also informed that DELTA will offer staff development on assessment design and assessment administration with details to be released in due course.</p>	DELTA
<p><u>Secretary's Note</u> Guidance around number of samples provided for an External Examiner is not explicit and is agreed between the External Examiner and the Course Team. Academic Regulations A5 para 4.2 (iv) and Academic Quality Handbook Section 4 relate to the following guidance: -</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To have access to the work of those students recommended for the highest category of the award(s) and of those deemed to have failed the assessment for the award. External Examiners shall also have authority to request representative samples of work for each category of the award to ensure that the relative placing of the students in order of merit is fair and impartial. 	
<p>Further guidance is available within the Assessment Policy Guidance under paragraph 4 Marking, specifically 4.1 and 4.2. Additionally, DELTA have guidance on Marking and Moderation on CampusMoodle here.</p>	
<p>Sub-Committee members enquired about timetabling and delivery plans for Semester 1 in relation to the anticipated blended model. Members asked if there was going to be a revised Covid-19 form for alternative assessment and delivery for the next Academic Session; the secretary noted this would be released in due course</p>	L Barry
<p>Finally, Sub-Committee members queried whether the September public holiday would be recognised in the University calendar for the 21/22 session. CELTCAT had the holiday Monday blocked out, therefore members asked for clarity on this the status of the holiday.</p>	L Barry
<p>10. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING</p>	L Barry
<p>The dates and times for the meetings of Session 2021-22 were in the process of being confirmed and will be circulated in due course.</p>	