



Education & Representation Board  
Minutes

*The third Ordinary Meeting of the Education & Representation Board for the 2017-18  
Session was held on Thursday 15 March 2018.  
Location: Meeting Room 5*

Deputy President (Education)	Nicholas Burstow
Aeronautics Dep Rep	Lachlan Price
CGCU Academic Affairs Officer	Alejandro Luy
Design Engineering Dep Rep	Michael Hofmann
Earth Science and Engineering Dep Rep	Beth Holman
Electrical and Electronic Engineering Dep Rep	Karmanya Sareen
ICSMSU President	Rhys Smith
Materials Dep Rep	Alice Robinson
Mathematics Dep Rep	Michael McGill
Mechanical Engineering Dep Rep	Harry Mitchell
Physics Dep Rep	Michaela Flegrova
RSMU Academic Liaison Officer	Alice Bennett

Observers

Representation Coordinator	Nayab Cheema
Aeronautics Dep Rep 2018/19	Esme Hotson Moore

---

## **Formal Business**

1. Chairs business
  - a. Welcome and Introductions
2. Minutes of last meeting – 18 January 2018
  - a. DPE asks board to review minutes from last meeting-18/01
    - i. A point of clarification was raised regarding the term 'Emerald City'. It was noted that this term was used to distinguish the three week promotional period during the SACAs nominations period.
    - ii. Minutes are accepted.
3. Matters Arising
  - a. Action Tracker noted and discussed
    - i. DPE informs the board that the draft NSS action plan has been completed. It will now go to Provost Board in April/May for final approval.
    - ii. DPE thanked the board for their contributions to the guidance on student involvement in the curriculum review process. DPE has taken this guidance to the *Learning and Teaching Committee* and this document has been forwarded to departments. Student involvement in the curriculum review process will be a standing agenda item for subsequent *Learning and Teaching Committee* meetings.

## **Matters for Report**

4. Updates from Deputy President (Education)
  - a. DPE provided the board with an update on the SACAs. This year, 1868 nominations were received, a record-breaking number. The Education and Welfare team were in the process of mug packing and distribution, and will also be looking to send nominees their nominations. DPE thanked the board for their help in promoting the SACAs this year.
  - b. DPE suggested that having a standing ERB agenda item regarding the curriculum review process, would help provide regular updates on the curriculum review process in individual departments

## **ACTION: RC to add 'Curriculum Review' as a standing agenda item for subsequent ERB meetings**

- c. It was noted that departments were at different stages of the review process; Mechanical Engineering and Earth Science and Engineering had begun the review process prior other departments and therefore were further ahead than other departments. Similarly, ICSM were now working towards a September 2018 deadline.

- d. It was observed that many departments had taken things ‘back to basics’, setting up focus groups and looking at core course content, others were looking at workload, course-credit, and degree alignment
  - e. It was noted that there were also differences in the level of student involvement in the process, with some Dep Reps heavily involved in the process and other being consulted after the majority of decisions have been made
  - f. The board expressed concerns with regards to how meaningful student consultation is within the review process, observing the difference between thorough student consultation and a mere ‘tick-box’ exercise with students being consulted too late within the process
5. Updates from Academic Affairs Officers
- a. CGCU Academic Affairs Officer (AAO)-
    - i. CGCU AAO has begun preparing for handover next year. Informs the board that whilst the VP Education role has been filled, the deputy position was not filled and will likely be elected in a bye-election.
    - ii. CGCU AAO also stressed the importance of providing a good handover to next year’s reps, particularly in light of the curriculum review process.
  - b. RSMU Academic Liaison Officer (ALO)-
    - i. RSMU ALO has begun preparing handover with a view of starting the handover process ahead of the Summer Term.
  - c. ICSMSU-
    - i. ICSM have had their second EDU/MERU working group, where they are looking at various projects such as students as lead researchers, a feedback quality tracker, an accredited peer teaching scheme. Alongside this, the first-year cohort will be increasing to 400.

### **Matters for Discussion**

6. Panopto
- a. The board discussed the reasoning behind why the use of Panopto is not College policy.
  - b. It was noted that this issue had been widely debated amongst College staff; some progress had been made at a departmental level with regards to consent to record, automated recording, an opt-out button system, however, implementing a College-wide policy has proven to be difficult
  - c. The board observed that rather than focussing on enforcing a College-wide policy, the best course of action would be to look at enforcing a policy at a departmental and faculty level
  - d. It was noted that in order for the use of Panopto to be consistent, there needed to be a culture shift within departments and that it was worth working with members of staff within departments who value Panopto
  - e. The board observed that the benefits of using Panopto such as its use in blended learning methods and the accessibility it provides for students with

learning disabilities and those who have been unwell, can also be used to generate a valid argument in support of adopting a College-wide policy

- f. It was noted that ICSMSU have worked to implement such a policy and that anyone interested in pushing their departments to do the same should contact the ICSMSU President for historical evidence
  - g. DPE noted that in order to lobby College further, a recommendation encouraging the wider use of Panopto could be placed in this year's SACAs programme.
7. Strikes
- a. Regarding strike action, the board discussed the steps that are being taken to mitigate the impact of strike action on students, specifically around the missed lectures and assessments
  - b. It was noted that if there's sufficient Panopto content and pre-course material then that is still considered 'taught' material and therefore eligible to appear in exams
  - c. The board observed that there should be clear and specific information on what is or isn't going to be in exams, ensuring students are well-informed
  - d. It was noted that reps should be looking at how impacts are mitigated within departments, particularly with regards to tutorials that are being missed by some students and not others
  - e. It was noted that reps should be keeping an eye on how students within their departments feel, pushing for a solution to the strikes
  - f. The board observed that there are ongoing discussions happening at College, and it was just a case of sharing best practice more widely amongst departments

8. Horizons/BPES

- a. It was noted that as part of the Curriculum Review process, there is a push to broaden students horizons by mandating one small additional module at some point in a students' degree programme in either Horizons, BPES or a module in another department
- b. Several board members expressed the opinion that they were strongly against anything that wasn't a pass/fail module
- c. It was noted that undertaking such a module shouldn't be about the final mark, particularly if College's goal is to create more well-rounded students
- d. The board observed that marks appearing on a student's transcript can often help with career development. It was noted that this module will appear on a student's transcript, however, will not be graded
- e. It was noted that students will still have the option to do a Horizons course as it currently stands, in addition to this proposal
- f. It was noted that the US had a similar system in place, which encourages students to embrace failure and try new things
- g. The board expressed concerns that such a system may be prove to be difficult to administer on such a large-scale

- h. It was also noted that Horizons would need to extend their delivery to non-South Kensington campuses; linked to this, it was noted that both the Business School and Horizons would need to integrate themselves more with College, particularly with regards to timetabling, exams and mitigating circumstances
  - i. It was noted that pre-requisites to entry would also need to be considered
  - j. The board expressed concern over the lack of prior student consultation regarding this, with many board members considering this to be contradictory to College's 'students as partners' approach. The board noted that this hollow approach to student consultation set a dangerous precedent
  - k. The board discussed how best to influence this proposal going forward, particularly if such a proposal sat with Educational Development
  - l. It was noted that a framework outlining how undertaking a Horizons course can improve a student's leadership and communication skills would be helpful
  - m. It was noted that initiatives such as the Imperial Award were already in place to create more well-rounded students, and so, the board struggled to see the difference between the Imperial Award and this initiative
  - n. DPE asked the board to send him any further comments they may have regarding this, so that he can raise it with relevant College staff.
9. Feedback Traffic Light Update
- a. DPE updates the board on the progress of the Feedback Traffic Light audit, which was a manifesto point that has been completed
  - b. DPE thanked the board for the assistance in ensuring that year reps filled in the audit document
  - c. DPE presented the written audit to the board; it was noted that there was a lack of communication with going out to students when feedback was returned late
  - d. The report contained recommendations for College which have been presented to the faculties and will be presented to QAEC in May
  - e. The board discussed the best way to ensure that College remain accountable to this report and follow-up on the recommendations outlined in the report
  - f. It was noted that until the recommendations are considered at QAEC in May, it would be difficult to consider College's response to the report, however, the audit served to prove that monitoring feedback at a College level was doable
  - g. It was noted that departments should be monitoring feedback return, independent to an audit
  - h. The board observed that owing to the small sample size of the audit, the results should be considered carefully and discussed the feasibility of expanding the audit out to other years
  - i. It was noted that when feedback is being returned late, it should be communicated to students with clear reasoning behind the late return

- j. It was noted that ICSM were looking at feedback quality, working with the EDU on quality assurance markers. These markers are checked off by Year reps when they receive their work, and if work does not fit these criteria, the administrators chase this up
- k. The board observed that it was not the responsibility of students to monitor and evaluate feedback timeliness and quality, departments should be looking at this
- l. It was noted that anything under 100% feedback return was not good enough and consistency in marking was key to feedback quality

#### 10. TEF Submissions

- a. It was noted that a TEF subject-level pilot was underway at Imperial where departments that fell either side of College's overall TEF rating had to write a five page TEF submission
- b. It was noted that these submissions covered everything that had taken place up to the start of this academic year
- c. It was noted that relevant Dep Reps were involved in the TEF submissions for their department and both the DPE and Union President looked over each submission , every department that falls either side of College's score had to write a 5 page TEF submission
- d. Only about things that have been done up to start of this academic year
- e. Dep Reps were involved in individual submissions and DPE and Union President looked over them all

### **AOB**

#### 11. Access to Exam Scripts

- a. The board observed that the debate around students accessing exam scripts boiled down to issues around problems around the scale of marking, administrative difficulties and issues around policy
- b. It was noted that Physics had trialled a system where students are able to go through an exam paper with their personal tutor on an opt-in basis. The rationale behind this was that students want access to their exam scripts in order to see how they perform in exams. However, it was noted that such a policy was very administratively heavy
- c. The board discussed the logistics of scanning exam scripts to allow for them to be accessed electronically
- d. It was noted that Maths had a system where 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> years are able to pick an exam script to go through with their Personal Tutor, this offer was opened made to 400 students, however only 80 took up the offer
- e. It was noted that other departments had systems where markers give general overviews of what went wrong in the exams, and in other departments, students could request access to their exams scripts via their Personal Tutors
- f. The board expressed concerns that these systems relied heavily on Personal Tutors and can result in a varied approach

- g. The board also expressed concerns that in such a system, students will get competitive and compare their individual marks with each other
- 12.
- a. DPE congratulated the CGCU AAO on his successful election to the post of Deputy President (Education)
  - b. DPE noted that this was NC's last ERB meeting, DPE thanked NC for her contribution to the board over the years

Meeting concluded: 19.59