The Department of Health Sciences

87th Meeting of the BOARD OF STUDIES
Minutes of the meeting held at 1.30pm on Wednesday 18 October 2017
in A/EW/104, Department of Health Sciences

Present: Cathryn Britton (Chair) Rob Allison Helen Bedford Pauline Bland
John Blase Linda Currie Paul Evans Paul Galdas
Ian Hamilton Ted Hewitt Matthew Jacobs Mona Kanaan
Mike Kitching Marysia Koc Amanda Mason-Jones Helen Recchia
Sarah Redfern Laura Scott Rachel Skipper Alison Smalley
Jerome Wright

Student Representatives: Eleanor Barton (BA Midwifery Practice - Mid16)
Liana Cashman (PGDip Nursing - Mar16)

In attendance: Veronica Gillies (Secretary)

MAIN AGENDA – CATEGORY 1

BoS/Oct17/01 ResponseWare Overview

The Chair welcomed James Youdale (E-Learning Adviser & Lecture Recording Coordinator) to the meeting. JY presented an overview of the capabilities of ResponseWare including examples of how this could be used in the classroom (see Appendix 1). Members were advised that ResponseWare was an electronic voting system which could be used to increase student engagement in lectures and facilitate a peer instruction pedagogy approach. The following key points were noted:

— ResponseWare could be used with students’ own mobile devices rather than requiring additional hardware such as clickers.
— Students accessed polls via a website so ResponseWare could be used anywhere that had a stable wi-fi connection.
— Student feedback indicated that they were often embarrassed about asking questions in a lecture context, and found the use of anonymous polling helpful as it allowed them to engage without the risk of embarrassment.
— It was important to manage student expectations regarding the use of ResponseWare, including letting them know if it was going to be used in a specific session and making clear how it related to the session content.
— Information on how to use ResponseWare was available in the York Technology Enhanced Learning (TEL) handbook (bit.ly/ytelhb)

There was discussion of the difference between ResponseWare and other polling methods such as clickers. JY explained that the process was the same but that as ResponseWare used students’ own devices it meant that lecturers did not need to manage distributing and collecting the clickers. LC noted that with clickers it was possible to track individual responses. JY reported that this could also be done with ResponseWare but it was
emphasised that the opportunity to respond anonymously was of key importance in encouraging students to engage.

HB enquired whether ResponseWare could be used for short-answer questions as well as for multiple-choice questions. JY confirmed that it could and that it could either illustrate responses as a ‘word cloud’, which worked well for one- or two-word answers, or simply show all responses, which was likely to work better for longer answers. JY recommended trialling individual examples before using with students to make sure that results could be displayed as expected.

MKa asked whether it was possible to perform analyses on responses. JY reported that the word cloud feature automatically analysed the frequency of responses, and that all responses were also saved as a CSV file which could then be used for analysis if required.

The Chair thanked JY for attending the meeting. It was noted any queries about the use of ResponseWare could be directed to the E-Learning Development Team.

BoS/Oct17/02 Apologies for Absence
Karl Atkin, Karen Bloor, Bridget Broughton, David Brown, Tracey Bywater, Pete Coventry, Kelly Davies, Patrick Doherty, Kate Flemming, Lorna Fraser, David Graham, Tracy Lightfoot, Charlie Lloyd, Jim McCartridge, Catriona McDaid, Devi Nannen, Sarah O’Reilly, Kate Pickett, Jess Powell, Rose Pringle, Gillian Punton, Angela Simpson, Duncan Stewart, Pete Turner, Ian Watt.
Student Reps: Holly Dale (MSc AHR), Cara Hayes (Mid15), Dianne Wallis (FD16), Holly Wilkins (PGDip Mar16)

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

BoS/Oct17/03 Minutes from the Meeting held on 21 June 2017
The minutes from the meeting of the Board of Studies which took place on 21 June 2017 were approved.

BoS/Oct17/04 Matters Arising
BoS/Jun17/04.04 EARL Rollover
Members were reminded that it had been agreed that a Departmental training session on Reading Lists software would be organised and it was confirmed that this had taken place. MKa noted that anyone with questions about the new system should contact her or David Brown (Academic Liaison Librarian).

BoS/Jun17/04.06 Programme Administrator Attendance at Board of Studies
MKo reported that Debbie Walton (Strategic Development & Project Manager) would be meeting with programme administrators to discuss why they felt attending Board of Studies meetings would be useful for them, and would feed back at the next meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>BY WHOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To discuss attendance at Board of Studies meetings with Programme Administrators</td>
<td>Debbie Walton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BoS/Jun17/10 Student Prize Criteria
The Chair reported that the Departmental Annual Student Prize would be awarded to Nicole Valtorta (PhD programme). Congratulations were expressed to Nicole on behalf of the Board.

BoS/Oct17/05 Board of Studies Chair’s Report
BoS/Oct17/05.01 Student Services Function Change of Name
Members were advised that the Student Information Guidance and Help Team (SIGHT) had changed its name to Student & Academic Support Services with immediate effect.
BoS/Oct17/05.02 Programme Catalogue
It was reported that the University was working on the development of a programme catalogue to align with the existing module catalogue. It was expected that this would be a year-long project.

BoS/Oct17/05.03 Mental Health & Well-being
The Chair updated members on changes within the Open Door Team to improve the support available to students. It was noted that an online referral form was now available to allow students to self-refer. In addition, more staff had been appointed to cover the peak period from January to March and opening hours would be extended during this time. The Open Door Team would also be working more closely with Unity Health and NHS providers to ensure that students were appropriately supported when they were away from the University, for example when on leave of absence. MJ reminded members that if any colleagues had serious concerns about a student they should contact him directly as the agreement that he could triage students for a more urgent appointment with the Open Door Team remained in place.

The Chair noted that the Department had been encouraged to consider whether to engage with Mental Health First Aid training. It was suggested that it would be helpful if a list of people within the Department who had completed the training was available as a resource for other colleagues. MJ reported that Danielle Simpson (Student & Academic Support and E-Portfolio Administrator) had completed the training and therefore colleagues could refer students to her if he was not available himself.

BoS/Oct17/05.04 Student Partnership Agreement
It was reported that ‘Together York’ would be launched by the University: the Chair explained that this was the new name for the Student Partnership Agreement. Members were reminded that the Board had considered the draft Student Partnership Agreement and a Departmental response had been submitted to the University consultation. It was noted that Departments had not had sight of the final Agreement before launch and that the Chair had raised this as a concern with the University.

BoS/Oct17/05.05 Fitness to Study & Exceptional Circumstances Policies
The Chair reported that the University Fitness to Study and Exceptional Circumstances Policies were under review.

BoS/Oct17/05.06 Repeat Year Option
The Board was informed that the University was introducing the option of a repeat year for undergraduate students failing in Stage 1 of their programmes, for students commencing programmes in 2017/8. The Chair invited comments from members regarding whether the Department should apply for an exemption from this. The following points were noted in the course of a full discussion:

- Students would be required to pay fees for the repeated year. The whole year would have to be repeated and students would be required to retake all assessments, including those that they had passed.
- Under the current system students failing in Stage 1 often followed the appeal process and the automatic provision of the option to repeat the year would reduce the need for this.
- Some other institutions offered more reassessment opportunities than York and the opportunity of a repeat year may address perceived inequity in this area.
- Some competitors had already introduced the repeat year for their nursing and midwifery programmes.
- Public perception should be considered as it may be felt that the option for failing students to repeat a year was inappropriate in a professional programme.
- Practice partners would need to be consulted as there were implications for placement capacity and potentially also for placement funding.
The availability of maintenance loans for a fourth year of study was not guaranteed, and although students could apply for this it was normally granted on grounds of personal or medical circumstances and not purely on academic grounds.

Students failing resits at the end of Stage 1 would not get their results until December, meaning they would be part-way through Stage 2 before the fail was ratified. It was estimated that this would apply to approximately ten students per year.

It was not thought that the provision of a repeat year was prohibited by any of the regulatory body rules affecting the Department’s programmes.

It was unclear whether any distinction could be drawn between academic failure and failure in practice, so that students failing academically could repeat the year but those failing as a result of unsafe practice could not.

The Board agreed that there was some urgency around providing clarity as the change was already in effect. It was suggested that the Department could apply for an exemption for the current year on the grounds that it was necessary to explore the wider implications for professional programmes. It was agreed that the Chair would discuss the matter further with the Academic Support Office, and that it would then be referred to the Departmental Management Team for consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>BY WHOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To refer to Departmental Management Team for decision on Departmental exemption</td>
<td>Cathryn Britton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BoS/Oct17/05.07 Marking Turnaround Time**

The Chair reported that the University was reducing the maximum time from submission of assessments to provision of marks and feedback from six weeks to 20 working days with effect from 2018/9.

**BoS/Oct17/05.08 Course Reps**

It was noted that there had been some challenges in identifying Course Reps for 2017/8. Members were asked to encourage students to put themselves forward. MJ reported that this had been a problem across the University and that YUSU and the Graduate Students’ Association was exploring possible reasons why engagement was so low. It was explained that not having Course Reps was unconstitutional and therefore it was important to identify Reps for all programmes.

The Chair reported that YUSU was planning to provide more training and support for Course Reps this year, including how to engage with student issues. It was noted that this was a good developmental opportunity for students and that the skills and experience could have a positive impact on employability.

HB reported that students had complained of technical problems with the system for nominating themselves. Members were advised that if they were aware of students wishing to nominate themselves they should let MJ know as he was able to bypass the nomination system if necessary. Similarly if only one student was nominated for a specific position then MJ should be notified as they would not need to go through the election process.

**BoS/Oct17/05.09 HYMS & DoHS Student Integration**

Members were notified that information had been received from YUSU indicating that Hull York Medical School (HYMS) students would like more contact with Health Sciences students. It was noted that YUSU was planning to facilitate greater integration by organising socials, for example, and that the Chair would be meeting with the two Departmental Student Reps to discuss the matter further. Members were asked to forward any additional suggestions to the Chair.
BoS/Oct17/05.10 Student & Staff Achievements
The Chair reported that she, Alison Smalley and Russell Yates had recently achieved Senior Fellowship of the Higher Education Academy. Members were invited to forward any student or staff achievements to the Chair for noting at Board of Studies meetings.

BoS/Oct17/06 Student Issues
BoS/Oct17/06.01 Parking Permits
Liana Cashman (PGDip Mar16) reported that students on the PGDip programme had experienced difficulties obtaining parking permits. It was explained that the programme ran from March-March but students had been required to pay upfront for permits which ran from September-September and then claim a refund at the end of the year for the unused period. It was noted that students had contacted the University’s parking office and been informed that they were unable to issue six-month permits or annual permits with a March start date.

MJ reported that he had referred the issue to YUSU, who had been supportive of the students’ concerns. YUSU had advised that they would raise it with the University’s Senior Management Team and were hopeful that a response would be provided before the end of the Autumn Term.

BoS/Oct17/07 Periodic Review Update and Action Plan
The Chair reported that focus groups had taken place over the summer with undergraduate and postgraduate students to discuss assessment and feedback. These ran alongside the evaluation of the new model of academic support for undergraduate students and all feedback from this was shared with the Learning Enhancement Team. It was noted that two workshops had been run for module leaders which focussed on assessment tasks and guidance. It was anticipated that work on this would be ongoing and discussion would take place with the Chairs of Undergraduate Programmes Board and Graduate School Board to agree how best to take this forward. A review of the Department’s marking criteria would also be taking place to ensure that these reflected best practice. It was explained that the Department was required to provide an update on the Action Plan for the November meeting of University Teaching Committee and that actions would also be reported in the Annual Programme Review.

BoS/Oct17/08 York Pedagogy
It was reported that work on the implementation of the York Pedagogy for postgraduate programmes was almost complete, in preparation for an approval meeting on 6 November 2017. It was confirmed that Programme Design Documents had been completed for the PGDip Nursing, MSc International Humanitarian Affairs and Master of Public Health programmes, and final amendments were being made to the Programme Design Documents for the PGCert Health Research & Statistics and MSc Applied Health Research. All work was being monitored through the Graduate School Board.

BoS/Oct17/09 Annual Programme Review 2016/7
Members were reminded that it was an annual requirement for the Department to report on its successes and challenges and how these were being taken forward. It was noted that the draft Annual Programme Review 2016/7 was not ready for circulation and the Chair requested the Board’s agreement for this to be considered at a separate meeting with the Department’s UTC Representative and the Departmental Student Reps, and for the report to be circulated to members after this had taken place. The Board agreed this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>BY WHOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To organise meeting with Department’s UTC Representative and Departmental Student Reps for consideration of draft Annual Programme Review 2016/7, prior to circulation of draft report to Board of Studies</td>
<td>Cathryn Britton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAIN AGENDA – CATEGORY 2 (Items for Reporting / Receiving Only)

BoS/Oct17/10 Minutes Received from Board’s Sub Committees
The Board received the minutes from the following sub-committees:
- Undergraduate Programmes Board (May 2017 & July 2017)
- Graduate School Board (June 2017)
- Departmental Library Committee (April 2017)
- UG Student-Staff Forum (June 2017)

BoS/Oct17/11 Careers Placement Year
The Chair reported that University Teaching Committee and University Executive Board had approved the Placement Year proposal, which provided the opportunity for undergraduate and integrated masters’ students to take an additional placement year as part of their studies from 2018/19. It was explained that the placement would be taken at the end of a student’s second year and would be formally acknowledged in their programme title (e.g. BA in X with Placement Year). It was confirmed, however, that the Department was exempt from implementing the Placement Year as it was not currently possible to facilitate this, but that it might be considered as part of the development of the new pre-registration nursing programme.

BoS/Oct17/12 Student Disability Committee Terms of Reference
The Board received the updated Student Disability Committee Terms of Reference and Student Disability Protocol.

BoS/Oct17/13 Recognition of Prior Learning Committee Terms of Reference
The Board received the updated Terms of Reference for the Recognition of Prior Learning Committee. It was noted that these had been amended to reflect changes in membership.

BoS/Oct17/14 Any Other Urgent Business (previously agreed with the Chair)
None.

BoS/Oct17/15 Date and Time of Next Meeting
Wednesday 21 February 2018 commencing at 1.30pm in A/RC/014

Student representatives left the meeting.

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/Jun17/04.06 Programme Administrator</td>
<td>To discuss attendance at Board of Studies meetings with Programme Administrators</td>
<td>Debbie Walton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at Board of Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoS/Oct17/05.06 Repeat Year Option</td>
<td>To refer to Departmental Management Team for decision on Departmental exemption</td>
<td>Cathryn Britton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoS/Oct17/09 Annual Programme Review 2016/7</td>
<td>To organise meeting with Department’s UTC Representative and Departmental Student Reps for consideration of draft Annual Programme Review 2016/7, prior to circulation of draft report to Board of Studies</td>
<td>Cathryn Britton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ResponseWare Overview

Health Sciences Bespoke

James Youdale
E-Learning Development Team
University of York, UK

Session Overview

- ResponseWare Tool Overview
- Pedagogy-first approaches to Interactive Classroom Technologies
  - Peer Instruction
- How we can use ResponseWare to:
  - Facilitate In-Class Polling
  - Promote Discussion
  - Solicit Synchronous & Asynchronous Feedback
- Next Steps & Support Resources.
Electronic Voting Systems in Education

- Utilises electronic response devices for students to respond to polls
- Instantly aggregates responses in histograms
- A method to ‘empower’ rather than ‘enforce’ participation (Graham, C. R. et al. 2007)
- Can facilitate anonymous responses

Tool Overview: TurningPoint ResponseWare

- BYOD Model - Support for in-lecture polling via mobile or other portable devices (such as laptops, tablets)
- Allows integration of polls, with graphed visual feedback, in PPT
- Students poll responses with their own devices (mobile, tablet or laptop)
- Available in all teaching rooms
APPENDIX 1 – BoS/Oct17/01

Tool Overview: TurningPoint ResponseWare

- Can be installed on Managed-PCs via the ‘Software Center’, ‘Zen Works’
- Downloadable Free Online
- Instructors can register an account (required to conduct polling)
- Can be used anywhere with a stable WIFI connection where the software is installed.

Question Types Supported:
- MCQ
- True/False
- Short Answer

Other features:
- Team/Demographic Leaderboards
- WordClouds
- Conditional Branching (Slide-order controlled by user-response)
- Back Channel ‘Messaging’ feature
http://www.responseware.eu

ELDT2017

How much do you agree: ‘The United Kingdom was correct to vote to Leave the European Union’

A. Strongly Agree
B. Agree
C. Somewhat Agree
D. Neutral
E. Somewhat Disagree
F. Disagree
G. Strongly Disagree
Some Typical Modes of Interaction.

- Class Group Discussion
- Instructor-Led Questioning posed to a whole cohort
- Assignment Feedback
- 1:1 - Ad-hoc Drop-in & Formal Mentorship

Why might a student not engage with these modes of classroom interaction?
Challenges for Encouraging Engagement

A Matter of Confidence & Competence

Large cohort sizes may not only limit interaction opportunities, but also deter inclination to engage even when opportunities are provided.

Beatty (2004) concludes:

- Students often ‘more afraid of being incoherent than incorrect’ in public.
- Students ‘may want to know their peers opinions but may feel reluctant to share their own’
- Students are often hesitant to ask questions in class when they do not understand the material – (are these not the students that we need to engage?)
- Some students prefer classes without ‘traditional participation’

Do traditional interaction modes disadvantage unconfident students?

2016/17 Replay Student Survey

‘As a student with social anxiety disorder, [Lecture Capture is] particularly helpful for me. Emailing or meeting a lecturer to ask for clarification on something simple is really daunting’
So how can we encourage and facilitate reluctant participants?

  - Mazur argued that the greatest value in the lecture is the intrinsic potential for spontaneous interaction
  - But the social etiquette around lectures (and even the architecture of lecture theatres) encourages passive participation
  - Peer Instruction pedagogy champions that:
    - Students who have solved a given problem may better explain the thought processes involved in finding a solution to peers
    - This process of ‘externalising’ answers shifts the pedagogical focus of engagement exercises from fact retention to reasoning
    - Serves to challenge or validate a student’s own thought processes
    - Even if initially incorrect, the fact that reasoning has taken place makes the correct explanation more meaningful and rewarding.

There are 8 planets, 181 known moons and over half a million known asteroids in the Solar System

What percentage of the Solar System’s total mass does the Sun represent?

A. 99.8%
B. 55.2%
C. 25.7%
D. < 10%
Discuss your answer with your peers - try and convince them why you’re right.

There are 8 planets, 181 known moons and over half a million known asteroids in the Solar System

What percentage of the Solar System’s total mass does the Sun represent?

A. 99.8%
B. 55.2%
C. 25.7%
D. < 10%
**Peer Instruction Polling Workflow**

- Encourages anonymous engagement
- 'Safe' externalising of understanding
- Students invested in solution
- Tutor addresses misconceptions

Initial poll of conceptual question → Students Discuss with Neighbour → Re-Poll → Reveal correct answer, instructor explains

**Tests Foundation/Confidence**

**Fosters Discussion**

**Reinforcement**

---

**Crowd-Sourcing Knowledge Gaps - Electronics**

- ResponseWare utilised in Electronics
- Lecturer reported he cannot ‘predict how long it will take me to explain something, but I can now get a clear idea of whether my explanations have been understood by the majority of the students.’
- Found that ‘level of engagement far exceeded [his] expectations’
- Can be used in conjunction with Lecture Capture (Demonstrated)
Formative Assessment – Health Sciences

- Introduction of MCQ activities into long lecture slots (2 – 3 hours)
- Use of TurningPoint ‘Clickers’ – Each student assigned a device.
- Breaks up flow of theory slides, and tests immediate factual recall and understanding

Used in tandem with the VLE

- Use of the VLE for publication of MCQ results (anonymously)
- Students can safely reflect on their own performance
- Results can be reflected upon by lecturer to shape teaching – (Nicholl, O. 2009 - C-essment by design: using multiple-choice tests to good effect)

Managing Expectations

- Important to appropriate TEL
- Demystify and provide clear signposting to how it maps to the lesson
Next Steps

- Approaches, case studies and advice on choosing the right tool for a learning activity:
  - ELDT Wordpress Site: http://elearningyork.wordpress.com
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