

Quality Assurance & Enhancement Committee

Wednesday 19th May 2021 2.00pm-4pm



Minutes

Present: Prof Rachel Allen (Chair); Dr Baba Sheba; Dr Carwyn Hooper; Derek Baldwinson; Dr Fran Gibson; Prof Iain Beith; Syed Islam; Prof Jane Saffell; Jenny Laws; Prof Jane Lindsay; Dr Mark Bodman-Smith (until 3pm); Philippa Tostevin; Sally Mitchell;

In attendance: Glen Delahaye (clerk); Michael Downes

1. Apologies for absence:

Reported

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from: Dr Aileen O'Brien, Dr Marcus Jackson, Sarah Jones, Dr Vanessa Ho, Dr Saranne Weller; Dr Rosie MacLachlan

2. Minutes

To receive and consider: the minutes of the meeting held on 20th April 2021.

Paper QAEC/20-21/8/A

Agreed

- 2.1 The minutes were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.

3. Action points and matters arising not covered elsewhere

To receive and consider: the action points arising from the minutes not covered elsewhere.

Paper QAEC/20-21/8/B

Reported

- 3.1 Updates on the action points were presented to QAEC members. There were no further updates to discuss.

4. The impact of Covid-19 on quality assurance

To receive and consider: a paper on how Covid-19 has impacted quality assurance processes

Paper QAEC/20-21/8/C

Reported

- 4.1 The report reflected on the effectiveness of St George's quality assurance processes since the closure of the campus to students and all but essential staff from the 25th March 2020 and suggested possible changes to quality assurance processes for the 2021/22 academic year to alleviate the burden on staff workload.

Annual monitoring

- 4.2 The number of questions on the Annual Programme Monitoring Report (APMR) template would be reduced to narrow the focus and to instead review specific issues.

- 4.3 Data and metrics would be used to highlight specific issues. It would be important to agree which metrics to focus on.

- 4.4 SOLTS data could be included in the annual monitoring cycle.

Periodic review

- 4.5 To reduce the burden on staff in the next academic year, the Paper invited QAEC to consider extending the approval period of all St George's programmes by one additional year.

- 4.6 Course directors would have the option to undergo review earlier if they wished to, for example if they intended to introduce a revalidated version of the course, as this would require a one-year lead-in time before launch.

- 4.7 Kingston University was moving to a risk-based approach to review, using metrics to determine if a review was required.
- 4.8 QAEC considered introducing a light-touch review in place of the periodic review, but found that such an approach would remain burdensome and would be of less value in terms of enhancement.

Additional areas to QA

- 4.9 QAEC was invited to consider any additional areas that could be quality assured that weren't covered by St George's usual processes, but may have added significance when reflecting on the 2020-21 academic year.
- 4.10 It was not currently clear where responsibility lay for monitoring standalone modules, but this would be considered under agenda item 5.
- 4.11 A rethink of the quality assurance of online delivery was proposed. The current feedback mechanism relied on SOLTS. This could be considered through the Online and Distance Course Implementation project, of which several QAEC members were involved.
- 4.12 The scope of APMR forms could be widened to include all types of placements.

Agreed

- 4.13 With the exception of courses undergoing revalidation, all courses would have an additional year added to their approval period, meaning that periodic reviews for 2021/22 would be delayed to the following academic year.
- 4.14 **Action: RM and QPD to ensure that the Data Improvement Group (DIG) discusses and agrees a process to provide course teams with SOLTS data in time for annual monitoring.**
- 4.15 **Action: QPD will commence work on redesigning the APMR template and will consult with Monitoring Committee Chairs.**
- 4.16 **Action: RA, CH and JLi to work with Kathy Curtis to agree a mechanism for the quality assurance of all placement types.**

5. Short Course Committee

To receive and consider: proposed revision to the Short Course Committee process and Short Course Proposal Form (two versions of the form are included, one has tracked changes to highlight the revisions)

Paper QAEC/20-21/8/D

Reported

- 5.1 The paper defined three types of short courses:
 - a. TYPE A: Credit-bearing short courses (Standalone modules) that are part of an existing award programme/award.
 - b. TYPE B: Credit-bearing short courses (Standalone modules) that are not part of an existing award programme/award.
 - c. TYPE C: Non-credit bearing short courses (with varying duration, including one-day courses).
- 5.2 A 'one-stop' solution was recommended within the Paper, whereby all short courses would be scrutinised and approved by the Short Course Committee (SCC).
- 5.3 The SCC would be responsible for the academic approval of short courses and would also consider the marketability of the proposed short course.
- 5.4 QAEC was concerned that SCC might not have the appropriate membership to identify all of the additional resource constraints that could arise from introducing a new short course. More detail of resource requirements should be requested from teams developing short courses. Sign-off from the head of centre could also be made a requirement.

- 5.5 Healthcare Practice, which included many standalone modules, was known for being challenging to administrate. There may be learning to be gained from that programme.
- 5.6 It was proposed that ESSC provide an oversight role for the SCC. For example, it could receive all of the newly approved short courses from SCC every few months.
- 5.7 It was not yet entirely clear how much responsibility the SCC would have over Type A courses, as the existing programmes that they would be part of were already reporting to Monitoring Committees.

Agreed

- 5.8 The one-stop solution was agreed, but following SCC approval, short courses would also be submitted to ESSC.
- 5.9 BS would work with QPD to agree a mechanism for the quality assurance of short courses, in place of APMRs. This would be particularly important for Type B short courses, as these were credit-bearing and not part of any existing programmes. **Action BS and QPD**
- 5.10 The timelines for approving and launching short courses would also need to be considered: **Action BS and QPD**
- 5.11 Following this, BS would provide QAEC with a revised ToR and membership for the Short Course Committee.

6. **Lecture Capture Policy**

To receive and consider: an annual report reviewing the Lecture Capture Policy

Paper QAEC/20-21/8/E

Reported

- 6.1 The [Lecture Capture Policy](#), which was approved by QAEC in November 2019, included within it a requirement for Learning Technology Services to submit an annual report to QAEC on the implementation of the Policy.
- 6.2 Learning Technology Services would welcome feedback from QAEC on any particular areas they wished to see covered by the report in the future.
- 6.3 It had been difficult to monitor compliance with the policy, as Covid-19 had an impact on timetabling which made it difficult to know which lectures were expected to be recorded.
- 6.4 All of St George's Panopto recordings for modules leading to awards were captioned automatically by machine. These captions were not always accurate, depending on audio quality, and the automated captioning software had difficulty with technical subjects and medical terms.
- 6.5 Students who had declared a need for it through their Statement of Support Needs (SOSN) were receiving accurate human-generated captions. This academic year (as of 13th May 2021), the Institution had spent USD \$25,972 on the professional, human-generated captioning of 701 recordings.
- 6.6 There was a need to modify the policy to clarify which types of session should be recorded. It would be helpful for students if they could determine from their timetable exactly which sessions would be recorded. There were also cost implications for making recordings.
- 6.7 Work had commenced on a new draft of the policy and QAEC members were invited to come forward to provide input into the new draft. **Action: QAEC members**
- 6.8 It was proposed that Emma Catlow be included in the drafting of the new policy.

7. **Update on revisions to Quality Manual**

To receive and note: an overview of planned revisions for the 2021-22 reissue of the quality manual

Paper QAEC/20-21/8/F

Reported

- 7.1 The paper provided an overview of minor updates to the Quality Manual to be completed for the 2021-22 edition.
- 7.2 There was an intention to review the Periodic Review process in the future to develop a new approach to review that would be more meaningful to programme teams and support institutional needs. **Action: SI would meet with QPD to provide insight into Kingston University's revised approach to review.**
- 7.3 The OpEx project focussed on Schemes of Assessment was proposing that there would be a "big bang" roll-out of the SoA framework for all years of all programmes at the same time from September 2022.
- 7.4 QAEC members noted that there would be a significant amount of changes as a result of the new framework and requested clarify over how this could be achieved by 2022.
- 7.5 A paper on the SoA project was expected at the next QAEC meeting, where this would be discussed.

8. Any other Business

Reported

Online teaching

- 8.1 Following the University site closure and move to online teaching in 2020, a number of course teams had a desire to continue to offer some modules online indefinitely. Guidance was requested to clarify whether modules could remain online in 2021-22.
- 8.2 The Online and Distance Course Implementation (ODCI) project had recently been launched to agree a process for offering online provision, but it was not expecting to conclude its work until November 2021.
- 8.3 There were concerns about the impact offering online modules would have on HESA reporting. On courses with a mix of online and on-site modules, depending on their selected modules, some students would need to be reported as distance learners, while others wouldn't be.

Agreed

- 8.4 St George's was not in a position to offer online courses in 2021/22 and courses should run as validated with the exception of any modules where Covid-19 had made this impossible.

Patient and Public Involvement in Curriculum Development

- 8.5 It was agreed that there was a need for an institutional strategy for patient and public involvement in curriculum development.

9. Dates of Meetings in 2020-21

22 June 2021

All meetings will start at 2pm and will take place online until further notice.

GD/May 2021