MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Group considered the minutes of a meeting held on 13 January 2015.

The Group approved the minutes as a correct record.

MATTERS ARISING

a) Chair’s report: thoughts on the future of SEEG

Arising from 15/M2, the Chair reported that:

i) the Registrar was aware of the Group’s discussions about its future and these would inform his deliberations as Chair of the task and finish group considering the University’s committee structure. The Group would have an opportunity to return to its discussions at an appropriate point in the future.

ii) the Teaching, Learning and Student Experience Strategy Task and Finish Group had developed the brief overall statement and University-level commitments. It planned to send these to departments and services prior to Easter to inform the development of their own statements. The aim was to have the Strategy finished by the summer.

b) Strategic discussion: teaching and learning spaces

Arising from 15/M3, the Chair reported he had informed the group considering teaching and learning spaces about SEEG’s discussion. The development of the Estates Strategy would need to be coordinated with the development of the Learning and Teaching Strategy. Although the University was now unlikely to commit to any large estates project in the very near future, the research led by the Director of Estates into feasible projects would continue in the meantime to enable action to be taken once funds become available.

c) Referencing styles

Arising from 15/M4, the Chair reported that the Department of Economics had confirmed to him that it was content for its departmental referencing style to be selected to fit those of its partner departments. The Group requested that the Deputy Librarian take this matter forward.

[ACTION: B WYNNE]
Matters arising continued

d) Teaching Funds Approvals Group

Arising from 15/M6, the Group noted that Dr Norman had prepared some helpful guidance about how to structure funding bids and arrange for allocated funding to be rolled over to the following year's budget.

15/M9 STRATEGIC DISCUSSION: PEER MENTORING

The Group received a paper from the Education Officer of the Students’ Union that outlined various benefits associated with peer-mentor support and proposed the development of a University-wide pastoral and academic peer mentoring scheme. The Group noted that the proposal had been prompted by discussions with members of the Group, student feedback and recognition of a need to bring consistency across the University. The paper noted opportunities to draw upon known existing good practice within the University and at several other institutions. It identified resources that would be needed to support the scheme, which could be run by the University, the Students’ Union or a partnership of the two.

The Group discussed past and current peer mentor schemes operating within the University, including a Residential Services scheme that used paid student mentors and a student organised peer-teaching mentor scheme in the School of Medicine. The Group noted that the School-run Biological Sciences peer mentoring scheme was particularly long established and had proven very popular with both mentors and mentees. Several departments had been involved in a piloted extended version of the scheme a couple of years ago, which had featured a large scale mentor training event involving student support services. The Group noted that lack of resources had prevented the project from being taken further forward at that time.

The Group welcomed the proposal to establish a University-wide peer mentor scheme for first year students as a supplement to existing support mechanisms. It considered that a well-run scheme had the potential to greatly benefit both mentees and their mentors and noted that its existence was also likely to offer reassurance to the parents of new starters.

The Group agreed that it would be important for the mentor role to be well-defined, fairly demanding and have appropriate praise and recognition connected with it. Mentors would need to undertake suitable training, conducted at an appropriate time, to equip them to provide fitting support. The Group suggested the training should take place in the Spring term to allow mentors to initiate contact with their assigned mentees over the summer. The Group noted that central training would be a more effective and practical arrangement for a University-wide scheme.

The Group agreed that the President and the Education Officer of the Students’ Union should meet with the Chair to discuss the development of a business case [ACTION: M RUBIN, Y NIKOLVOV & M PEEL].

15/M10 HEAR 6.1: VERIFICATION OF ACTIVITIES

The Group considered and ratified the HEAR 6.1 activities listed below, following their endorsement by the HEAR 6.1 Approval Panel:

- OSV CL President
- Forum Champion
- Street Law Presenters/Researchers

The Panel noted that the Street Law activity was revised version of the proposal presented at its November 2014 meeting (14/M31 refers).
15/M11  **ASSESSMENT AND FEEDBACK WORKING GROUP**

The Group received a report of a meeting of the Assessment and Feedback Working Group held on 27 January 2015. It noted items of particular interest:

**Plagiarism**

The Chair of the Working Group reported that the plagiarism officer training session held on 25 February 2015 had been a useful event that had involved discussion of different examples of plagiarism and judgement of their severity.

**Double marking and moderation practice**

The Group noted that the Working Group had discussed at SEEG’s request double marking practice across the institution (15/M5 refers). The Working Group had suggested in light of this consideration that departments would benefit from additional guidance about the University’s moderation policy. **The Group agreed** that the Chair of SEEG would assist the Academic Registrar in drafting this guidance  
*[ACTION: J SCOTT & M PEEL]*

**E-assessment**

The Group noted that the Working Group was developing a glossary of assessment types as part of online assessment and marking theme of work. The Group noted that the list would be able to be added to the Leicester Learning Institute website. The Group considered that the glossary could form part of a useful potential set of resources for colleagues involved in developing new and revised programme proposals; by showing the wide variety of assessment types in use across the University as a whole it may encourage proposal teams who favour typically traditional assessment methods to consider use of more innovative assessment types.

The Group discussed various delivery methods for e-assessment currently used within the Institution. The Group noted that there was not currently a requirement for programme teams to consult in advance with IT Services, or for the proposal paperwork to be shared with IT Services, when a programme proposal had significant IT implications. The Director of IT Services advised that this made it more difficult for IT Services to respond efficiently to requests for e-assessment suitable devices and software with access restrictions and to effectively manage associated costs. **The Group agreed** that the programme approval form may benefit from review and noted that it may be worthwhile for the University to agree at a suitable point in the future some parameters for e-assessment devices and software.

As part of its discussion about assessment, the Group reflected upon the suitability of the current module specification template as a tool for developing and approving new and significantly revised programme proposals. The Chair reported that he wanted the template to include a requirement to explain the matching of the module’s assessments to its intended learning outcomes. He was also keen for it to be more interactive and have guidance information embedded within it. **The Group agreed** that the Chair would involve the Group in amending the module specification template.  
*[ACTION: M PEEL]*

Duration of meeting: One hour and 40 minutes