84th Meeting of the BOARD OF STUDIES
Minutes of the meeting held at 1.30pm on Wednesday 16 November 2016
in A/EW/104, Department of Health Sciences

Present: Cathryn Britton (Chair) Helen Bedford Pauline Bland Penny Broadley
Bridget Broughton Ros Brownlow Adrian Clark Paul Evans
Paul Galdas Beth Hardy Ted Hewitt Ada Keding
Tracy Lightfoot Clare Metcalfe Jess Powell Rose Pringle
Helen Recchia Anita Savage Grainge Rachel Skipper Alison Smalley
Russell Yates

Student Representatives: Angelique Denys (PGDip); Holly Wilkins (PGDip)

In attendance: Veronica Gillies (Secretary)
Matt Cornock (Lecture Recording Coordinator)

MAIN AGENDA – CATEGORY 1

BoS/Nov16/01 Apologies for Absence
Student Representatives: Natalie Salt (PGDip), Sadie Bell (PhD)

It was noted that quorum had not been achieved as insufficient members were present.

BoS/Nov16/02 Lecture Capture Update
The Chair welcomed Matt Cornock (Lecture Recording Coordinator) to the meeting. Members were reminded that at the last meeting it had been agreed that it would be helpful to have a refresher on the Lecture Capture system and how this could be used to support teaching.
MC presented an overview of the Lecture Capture system, an extended version of which can be accessed here. It was noted that the system had recently been migrated to a new platform with improved functionality. It was emphasised that the recording captured audio and what was on the screen of the lectern PC and the projector, and was not a video recording of the room: although there were two rooms on campus where it was possible to capture video as well as audio. It was noted that indicator lights had been introduced which showed when recording was taking place, and that it was possible to use these to pause the recording or to stop it entirely. MC explained that all recordings for a given module were automatically stored to a folder within the module VLE site, from
which the module leader could edit the recordings and control the availability to students. Members were advised however that it was not possible to retrieve recordings which had been deleted.

RY noted that he had experienced difficulties with the Capture system in A/TB/056-7. MC explained that this was because there were two lecterns in this room and the system defaulted to recording from the front one rather than the central one. It was confirmed that if the space were being used as two rooms then each would automatically record from the appropriate lectern. PBI enquired whether there was a deadline for requesting Lecture Capture for a specific session. MC advised that it was best to book this at the point of timetabling to ensure that appropriate facilities were available, but that the Timetabling Team could organise individual captures given three days’ notice, provided that the session was in an equipped room. TL noted that some research had been done on student use of captured lectures and queried whether there was any evidence around the effect of provision of captures on attendance. MC reported that in the survey conducted by the team approximately 20% of students had responded that they were likely to miss one or more lectures if they knew they were being captured. However it was emphasised that factors such as programme-related workload may affect students’ decisions to use captures instead of attending sessions in person. It was also noted that if a student was disinclined to attend in person anyway then provision of captures would provide an opportunity for them to remain engaged with their programme.

BoS/Nov16/03 Minutes from the Meeting held on 29 June 2016
The minutes from the meeting of the Board of Studies which took place on Wednesday 29 June 2016 were approved.

BoS/Nov16/04 Matters Arising
BoS/Sep15/13 Student-Facing Statement on Module Evaluation
PBr reported that the module evaluation form was now in use and that students were aware that a summary of the results would be published on the module VLE site within four weeks of the evaluation being completed.

BoS/Jun16/04.02 University Review of APL Policy
RB reported that all paperwork had been updated to reflect the change in University terminology from APL (Accreditation of Prior Learning) to RPL (Recognition of Prior Learning), and had been approved by the Academic Support Office as required. It was noted that the Department’s standing exceptions to the University RPL policy had been agreed by the Chair of University Teaching Committee. RB reported that the Committee Terms of Reference had yet to be updated as a result of the ongoing project to update all Committee and Board Terms of Reference, but that this was being addressed.

BoS/Jun16/04.05 Leave of Absence Processes
The Chair reported that guidance had been prepared to assist supervisors to complete and submit Leave of Absence requests for students, and that this would be published online shortly. Members were reminded that failure to complete the form fully could result in delays to the process for the student. The Chair encouraged supervisors to seek advice from Programme Leaders, the Student Assessment Office and the Allocations Team in order to ensure that correct dates for return were provided. In addition it was noted that a period of orientation was required for undergraduate programmes and that this should be factored into the student’s return date.
TL advised that the process differed slightly for postgraduate students in that forms would not be completed by supervisors: it was agreed that TL and the Chair would discuss this further outside of the meeting to ensure that the published guidance reflected processes for postgraduate students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>BY WHOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To review leave of absence process guidance to ensure compliance with postgraduate processes</td>
<td>Cathryn Britton &amp; Tracy Lightfoot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BoS/Jun16/10 Departmental Annual Student Prize
The Chair reported that the Departmental Annual Student Prize would be awarded to Karim Habib, a student on the BSc Nursing (Mental Health) who had progressed from the Foundation Degree. Congratulations were expressed to Karim on behalf of the Board.

BoS/Nov16/05  Board of Studies Chair’s Report (Standing Item)
BoS/Nov16/05.01 E-Learning Working Group Change of Name
It was reported that the name of the E-Learning Working Group had changed to Technology Enhanced Learning Group with immediate effect.

BoS/Nov16/05.02 Board of Studies Terms of Reference
It was noted that the approval of the Board of Studies Terms of Reference remained outstanding. The Chair explained that this was pending additional work as part of the Periodic Review Action Plan and that the Terms of Reference for all Committees and Boards would be approved once work on the Action Plan commenced.

BoS/Nov16/05.03 Module Catalogue
It was noted that the module catalogue was now in use for all changes to modules. The Chair reported that she had enquired regarding training in the use of the catalogue and had been advised that colleagues should refer to the guidance which was available online.

BoS/Nov16/05.04 Student Handbooks
Members were reminded that student handbooks had been updated and that it was important to refer to the current versions as there were a number of important changes for 2016/7, in particular to the Exceptional Circumstances policy and practice hours information for pre-registration programmes.

BoS/Nov16/05.05 National Student Survey (NSS)
The Chair reported that work remained ongoing with regard to the results of the NSS and that the Department was making progress towards addressing the issues raised. It was noted that a number of actions linked to points within the Periodic Review Action Plan. PG reported that all programme teams had identified priorities for addressing the results of the Survey which had been considered by the Undergraduate Programmes Board. Members were advised that the next Survey would open on 6 February 2017 and would run until 30 April 2017. It was noted that additional questions had been added to the Survey and some existing questions had been amended, and that information on the revisions was available online.

BoS/ Nov16/05.06 Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES)
It was reported that the initial report on the results of the PTES had been received. TL explained that the Department had achieved 100% overall student satisfaction although the Department’s response rate was down on previous years. It was noted that the results remained aggregated which meant that it was difficult to identify to which programme specific comments related. TL reported that it had been requested that in future as a minimum the results for the PGDip in Nursing be disaggregated from those for other taught postgraduate programmes, to allow issues raised to be directed to the appropriate programme team. It was confirmed that a full report of the results would be presented at the next meeting of the Graduate School Board.
BoS/Nov16/05.07 Alcuin College
The Chair reported that she and Matthew Jacobs (Student Services Manager) had liaised with Alcuin College with the aim of improving student access to facilities between taught sessions, for example use of the JCR for drinks and warming up food. It was confirmed that the College facilities were automatically available to students resident in Alcuin College, and that students who lived off-campus could gain access if they transferred their college membership to Alcuin, which could be done without a further college membership fee being payable. It was clarified however that students who were resident in other colleges were not able to transfer their college membership while they remained in on-campus accommodation. The Chair reported that this information had been circulated to students but that not all students seemed to be aware and therefore the information would be recirculated by Student Services. In addition posters were being displayed in the Seebohm Rowntree Building reception area advertising the availability of these facilities. Members were also advised that Alcuin College was keen to enhance the experience of mature students and those with families, and would be publicising events to which they were warmly welcome.

BoS/Nov16/05.08 You Said … We Did
The Chair reported that new ‘You Said … We Did’ statements in relation to undergraduate and postgraduate programmes had been compiled for dissemination. It was explained that these would be published both on the University webpages dedicated to this project and on Departmental webpages so students were aware of responses to their feedback. It was emphasised that it was important to capture the Department’s responses to feedback and accordingly Programme Leaders were encouraged to record these and to forward suggestions for inclusion to the website.

BoS/Nov16/05.09 Appeals
Colleagues were reminded to ensure that supervision records were complete and all communications were saved on Alfresco so that these could be accessed if required to respond to an appeal. It was reported that the new system for saving student records would be rolled out shortly and that all Alfresco files would be transferred to the new system. It was noted that records for postgraduate students would need to be maintained on e:Vision as well as on the new system once this was rolled over, to meet requirements for monitoring students on Tier 4 visas.

BoS/Nov16/06 Student Issues (Standing Item)
BoS/Nov16/06.01 Practice Educators
Holly Wilkins noted that the role of Practice Educators was not always a well-publicised as it could be and that many students were not aware of the support which they offered. The Chair advised that this issue would fall within the remit of the Nursing Programmes Committee and should therefore be referred to the NPC for discussion and further action.

BoS/Nov16/06.02 PGDip Part 3 Timetable
Angelique Denys reported that there had been some difficulties in how modules for the PGDip were scheduled within the timetable and how these aligned with summative assessments. It was confirmed that the matter had been discussed by the Nursing Programmes Committee and that the Programme Leader was aware. RB explained that feedback had been received that the timetable for Part 3 of the programme was full and challenging, particularly in relation to two modules. Students had requested a shorter day however it was not possible to address this for the current year because the sessions in question were shared with the BSc Nursing. RB confirmed that for the next run of these modules it had been requested that the timetable was negotiated between the two programmes to ensure that the needs of both student groups were met.
BoS/Nov16/07 Periodic Review Update and Action Plan (Standing Item)

TL presented an overview of the Periodic Review report and Action Plan. The following key points were noted:

— The report recognised the ongoing uncertainty faced by the Department as a result of the external environment.

— The Department was commended on a number of strengths which included: the approachable nature of staff; the support provided by administrative teams; processes for managing practice placements; focus on practical skills resulting in benefits to employability for all programmes; electronic systems and processes; provision of desks for PhD students; good relationships with central University support services; good relationships with Student Representatives; and the positive approach to Periodic Review.

— The report concluded that institutional and national expectations for standards and for quality assurance and enhancement of programmes were being met and that programmes offered appropriate curricula.

— The report made a number of recommendations which would be addressed through the Department’s Periodic Review Action Plan:
  o Work with Learning Enhancement Team in relation to academic skills, assessment guidelines & tasks, marking criteria and feedback.
  o Review provision of advice on assessment tasks.
  o Develop a more robust system for quality assurance of exam papers.
  o Review guidance documents for PebblePad for placement mentors.
  o Review IT needs of students on placement.
  o Work with colleges to identify study space for students.
  o Work with colleges to investigate how undergraduate students could be better integrated into colleges.
  o Review synergies between postgraduate taught modules.
  o Update formative assessments for postgraduate taught modules.
  o Review pastoral support for part-time postgraduate taught students.
  o Identify opportunities for PGWT (Postgraduates Who Teach).
  o Build more integrated postgraduate research student community.
  o Introduce induction activities for postgraduate research students in January and April.
  o Update guidance on use of taught modules as training for postgraduate research students.
  o Work with the Academic Support Office in relation to governance documentation.
  o Develop and implement a workload model.
  o Work with Faculty Operations Manager to address issues relating to student record systems.

It was noted that work to address some of these had already commenced, while others would be addressed through projects such as the York Pedagogy.

— The initial Action Plan had been approved by University Teaching Committee in part: revisions to the actions relating to assessment, feedback, marking criteria and academic skills were requested.

— Once approved, the Action Plan would be disseminated through the Department and Working Groups put together to take forward specific actions.

— Implementation of the Action Plan would be monitored as part of the Annual Programme Review process until all actions had been completed.

BoS/Nov16/08 York Pedagogy

The Chair reported that the submissions for undergraduate Nursing and Midwifery programmes were almost complete. It was noted that the relevant Programme Committees had been involved in the submissions, reporting to the Undergraduate Programmes Board. It was reported that a meeting would be taking place on 30
November 2016 to approve the submissions, at which the Departmental University Teaching Committee representative would also be present. The Chair noted that there remained a degree of uncertainty as a result of the new Nursing & Midwifery Council Standards which were due to be published and that this would be brought to the attention of the University. It was noted that work had commenced on the submissions for postgraduate programmes. TL reported that Programme Leaders had been invited to attend training events and that the Pedagogy represented a positive opportunity to review programmes and to make changes to improve these.

BoS/Nov16/09 Student Partnership Agreement
The draft Student Partnership Agreement (SPA) and proposed policy modifications were circulated for discussion. It was noted that, as the meeting was not quorate, feedback would also need to be sought from members via email. The Chair explained that Departments had been invited to comment on the rationale for introducing the SPA; the structure of the document; the five identified themes; and any individual statements within the SPA. The following points were raised in the course of a full discussion:

- It was noted that many other institutions had already implemented an SPA of some kind, although these varied between legally binding contracts and aspirational agreements, and therefore the University felt that it was important to introduce an SPA to make explicit the roles and actions expected of staff and students and what was unique about the University.
- The Chair clarified that it was anticipated that the SPA would be presented as a web-based document with links to other supporting documents and websites, rather than in the format in which it had been circulated to Departments.
- It was acknowledged that the SPA was aspirational; however, it was commented that the aims were not always measurable and the content tended towards vagueness, thereby reducing its effectiveness in terms of managing expectations.
- PE added that the SPA did not clearly articulate what was different or unique about York as a learning environment and that it was unclear how it would relate to students who were also members of staff, such as those undertaking postgraduate qualifications.
- TL reported that YUSU and the Graduate Students’ Association had been involved as part of the Working Group which put together the SPA, but that neither the Working Group nor University Teaching Committee had been involved in the development of the proposed policy modifications which had been circulated with the SPA.
- PG questioned the purpose of the SPA; it was noted that while the principles were admirable the proposed policy modifications did not take account of the variability across the University and were therefore not all practicable.
- The Student Reps present were invited to comment. HW advised that it would be helpful for students’ understanding to have a clear statement of what was expected of them and also what they could expect from lecturers and supervisors. The Student Reps agreed however that the SPA was vague and AD noted that some of the information was already available in the student handbooks.
- The Chair reported that it had previously been queried what the outcome of not meeting the standards set out in the SPA would be, and it had been confirmed that the document was not binding and therefore no sanctions would be imposed if it was not adhered to.
- It was queried whether the Board agreeing to the SPA necessarily meant accepting the proposed policy modifications and the Chair clarified that the two were separate and the Board could accept one but not the other.
- RY suggested that the SPA had begun as a service level agreement and that the vagueness in the final document had occurred as a result of trying to meet the demands of varying stakeholder groups.
The Board considered the proposed policy modifications document. The following points were raised:

---

- The Chair noted that in the area of ‘electronic and online resources’ the Department was already meeting the proposed standards in relation to electronic submission and feedback, and was aiming to expand its use of Lecture Capture.

- Views were invited on the proposal to provide feedback on summative assessments within four weeks and on formative assessments within three weeks. It was noted that under the new model of academic support for undergraduate programmes the turnaround time for feedback on formative assessments was two weeks, thereby exceeding the proposed standard.

- PBI reported that the turnaround time for feedback on resubmissions of summative assessments had already been reduced to four weeks for written assessments and three weeks for ‘live’ assessments such as presentations and vivas.

- AD noted that on the PGDip in Nursing programme feedback was provided on presentations within two weeks and for other assessments within three weeks; it was acknowledged however that this was a relatively small student group.

- It was agreed that reducing the time available for marking would have an impact of staff workload and the feasibility of this would therefore require consideration of other workload commitments: it was added that there was a risk that allowing less time for marking to be completed would have an adverse effect on the quality of feedback provided.

- The Chair clarified that the proposal document stated that where there were recognised ‘pinch points’ it would be acceptable for feedback to be provided later than four weeks from the assessment, provided that the student group was alerted to this in advance.

- HB stated that reducing the turnaround time would be valuable for students. HB added that it would be helpful to know whether the timescales referred to working weeks or calendar weeks as this would make a difference for example during the Christmas period.

- There was consideration of the proposal for more than half of all modules to include formative work that received immediate feedback in class. It was agreed that it would be helpful to clarify what was meant by this as it was suggested that this already happened in the majority of modules.

- It was noted that while the proposed standards generally represented best practice the resource implications meant that there were likely to be challenges for Departments in meeting these and this raised a question of how the University intended to support Departments to do so.

- ASG advised that if the turnaround time for feedback was to be reduced it would be important to be mindful of External Examiners and their workload, to ensure that sufficient time was provided for them to complete their role appropriately.

- RB suggested that the proposal to deliver seminars in groups of 20 or fewer would require consideration: it was mentioned that new teaching rooms were designed to accommodate a maximum of 20 students and therefore failing to adhere to this standard may present other difficulties such as in timetabling.

- The Chair noted that the Department already met the proposed requirements in relation to individually supervised advanced work. It was agreed that the proposals relating to small group and seminar teaching were best practice but that it was likely that additional resource would be required for these standards to be met.

- There was consideration of options provision: it was noted that this was not relevant to the Department’s pre-registration programmes but that it may cause difficulties for postgraduate programmes. It was also highlighted that given the current external constraints on SSPRD provision it was unlikely that these programmes would be able to meet this standard.
It was agreed that the Chair would put together a draft response, taking into consideration the points raised, and would circulate this for additional comments from members who were not present. It was noted that the deadline for submitting responses to the consultation was 21 November 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>BY WHOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To draft Departmental response to Student Partnership Agreement and proposed policy modifications and circulate for additional comments</td>
<td>Cathryn Britton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BoS/Nov16/10 Annual Programme Review**

The draft Annual Programme Review 2015/6 was circulated for comment. The Chair explained that this was an annual requirement which offered the opportunity to quality assure programmes and to highlight areas of good practices as well as identifying areas which could be strengthened. It was noted that report would be considered by University Teaching Committee, while some questions which related specifically to postgraduate research programmes would be considered by the York Graduate Research School. There were no comments from the Board.

**MAIN AGENDA – CATEGORY 2 (Items for Reporting / Receiving Only)**

**BoS/Nov16/11 Minutes Received from Board’s Sub Committees**

The Board received the minutes from the following sub-committees:
- Undergraduate Programmes Board (May 2016, July 2016 & Sept 2016)
- Graduate School Board (May 2016)
- UG Student-Staff Forum (Feb 2016 and June 2016)

**BoS/Nov16/12 Masters in Public Health Change of Award Title**

The Chair reported that there had been an irregularity relating to the naming of the award for the Masters in Public Health programme. It was explained that the University had identified that the correct award for this programme should be ‘Master of Public Health’, in line with other awards such as Master of Science and with the national standard. It was reported that it had been agreed that award records for current and future students would be amended to correct the error, but that past students would be dealt with on a case by case basis if, for example, an employer refused to recognise their award. It was confirmed that all public-facing documentation had been amended to show the correct award title.

**BoS/Nov16/13 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Wednesday 22 February 2017 commencing at 1.30pm in A/EW/104

**SUMMARY OF ACTION POINTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENDA ITEM AND TITLE</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>BY WHOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BoS/Nov16/09 Student Partnership Agreement</td>
<td>To draft Departmental response to Student Partnership Agreement and proposed policy modifications and circulate for additional comments</td>
<td>Cathryn Britton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board of Studies (84th Meeting) – 16 November 2016 – approved
Prepared by: Veronica Gillies