

ACTION PLAN IN RESPONSE TO FEEDBACK ON THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE: SESSION 2016-17

School of Philosophy, Religion and History of Science: Faculty of Arts and Humanities


EXECUTIVE SUMMARY																		
Aspect	National Student Survey						Undergraduate Programme Experience Survey						Postgraduate Programme Experience Survey					
	2015-16		2014-15		2013-14		2015-16		2014-15		2013-14		2015-16		2014-15		2013-14	
	School	Uni	School	Uni	School	Uni	School	Uni	School	Uni	School	Uni	School	Uni	School	Uni	School	Uni
Overall satisfaction	94	90	91	90	89	88	92	87	88	87	84	85	82	86	86	85	100	85
Teaching	95	91	93	92	91	90	91	87	89	86	87	85	76	86	81	85	94	86
Assessment & feedback	77	73	75	74	74	71	64	63	61	63	62	62	56	73	80	71	87	71
Academic support	83	84	84	85	79	82	73	75	72	74	70	73	76	84	90	82	97	82
Organisation & management	88	85	88	85	87	85	86	78	81	76	78	75	63	82	76	82	92	81
Learning resources	86	91	88	92	89	91	80	84	81	84	81	83	87	87	95	87	85	85
Personal development	80	85	78	85	77	82	71	73	70	72	64	72	57	77	48	76	76	77
Sector position		20/146		21/145		50/146												


Scores in each category are expressed as a percentage of the number of respondents who mostly or definitely agreed with a range of statements (score 4 or 5)


Headline achievement from 2015-16	<p><i>Provide a single, concise headline achievement for the School from 15-16 which can be included in further communication to students.</i></p> <p><i>95% satisfaction with our undergraduate teaching.</i></p>
Main actions for 2016-17	<p><i>List 3 actions – to be included on the posters to be produced for each School</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. Increase communication with partner schools for Integrated and JH programmes, through programme directors, link tutors and SSFs.</i> <i>2. Greater consistency and engagement among module leaders in approaches to blended learning.</i> <i>3. Strong support for students' confidence in their Final Year Project.</i>

<p>Good practice examples from 2015-16</p>	<p>List examples of innovative practice and developments which are of wider interest across the University</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Appointment of Student Interns for Employability and Student Engagement & Development 2. Appointment of PG Writing Mentors 3. Mentoring of PG tutors
<p>Summary of student involvement in the production of this Action Plan</p>	<p>Discussion at Student Staff Forum Meeting, November 2016.</p>


AGREED ACTION PLAN IN RESPONSE TO FEEDBACK ON THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE: SESSION 2016-17

Aspect	School: Progress with 2015-2016 actions and indication of impact	Faculty: Agreed Issues/Actions for 2016-2017	Responsibility/Expected completion date
<p>Overall satisfaction</p>	<p><u>Issue</u> Joint honours programme experience continues to be a particular concern in PRHS, and it is clear from survey scores and comments that poor JH experience is having an impact on whole School scores. </p> <p><u>Actions</u> 1. New programme leaders actively engage co-teaching Schools in programme review process. 2. JH student reps asked to report concerns swiftly to the relevant programme leader. 3. JH Programme leaders meet with students from induction onwards at key points in the year to offer support and address concerns as they arise.</p> <p><u>Issue</u> Personal development scores and comments (including around practical work and career readiness) were disappointing and suggest further work required.</p>	<p><u>Issue</u> Qualitative comments indicate some improvement in relations with partner school in one interdisciplinary programme (PPST), but concerns remain. Continued feeling that JH and Interdisciplinary students at a disadvantage in relation to SH students, and the view expressed that there is a need for a unitary Centre for Joint Honours (!).</p> <p><u>Actions</u> 1. Programme leaders to ensure good levels of contact with, and involvement in programme review of, link tutors. 2. Inclusion of JH/Interdisciplinary students in induction sessions in partner schools 3. School presence, or contact with, SSFs in partner schools. 4. Appointment of writing mentor in Psychology for PPST students.</p>	<p>Programme leaders, link tutors, ongoing</p> <p>Link tutors, start of academic year</p> <p>SSF staff convenor, School reps, ongoing</p> <p>Programme leader and link tutor, PPST, semester 1, 2015-16</p>

	<p><u>Actions</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Student development intern appointed to support workshop and other School provision 2. Use of welcome back and other meetings to flag and encourage opportunities 3. More effective use of School space after co-location (workshop room bookable by students for study groups) 4. Encourage engagement in office hours for non-academic development (e.g. meeting with personal tutor for advice on skills) <p><u>Issue</u> Module choice and contact hours continue to be raised in the qualitative comments.</p> <p><u>Actions</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Curricula reviews are using student feedback to drive a more sustainable and effective core curriculum 2. Students are being encouraged to establish their own study groups. 3. Induction activities focus on training students in the management of their time, opportunities for training and other non-timetabled activities, and the importance of reading and preparation 	<p><u>Issue</u> Level 2 scores across range encouraging, Level 1 scores less so.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. New Level 1 structure provides a more coherent, less fragmented structure, with key reasoning skills the focus of new module. 2. Establish Level 1 committee, including DSE, Head of Tutoring, Head of Induction and L1 module leaders. <p><u>Issue</u> Very low response rate in module CEQs through online system, meaning that module reviews not sufficiently informed by student feedback.</p> <p><u>Actions</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Module leaders to use whatever methods they find most effective, including return to paper CEQs. Guidance document, with CEQ template, available on Staff drive. 2. Module leaders encouraged to use mid-semester questionnaires. 3. Communication of issues brought up in SSF to module leaders. 	<p>Already in place, but success of new structure to be monitored: DSE and Level 1 module leaders, ongoing.</p> <p>DSE, semester 2</p> <p>Module leaders, ongoing</p> <p>Module leaders, ongoing</p> <p>School reps, SSF course reps, ongoing</p>
<p>Teaching</p>	<p><u>Issue</u> Concerns raised about lack of consistency in sharing resources e.g. lecture slides and lecture recordings. </p> <p><u>Actions</u> Individual staff are responsible for explain their pedagogic decisions to students and this will be encouraged over the coming year.</p>	<p><u>Issue</u> Continued concerns about lack of consistency in approach to blended learning. Access to lecture recordings sometimes necessary to resolve timetable clashes.</p> <p><u>Actions</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A uniform approach to be introduced at Level 1 as a minimum requirement. 2. Appointment of Blended Learning Champion to lead teaching enhancement in this area. 	<p>DSE, Level 1 module leaders</p> <p>HoS, DHoSs for 2017-18</p>

		<p><u>Issue</u> A persistent comment is the need for more tutorials, as opposed to lectures. Lectures with a discussion element are not perceived as an adequate substitute. Poor student preparation can lead to tutorials turning into lectures. But enforced seminar participation can be source of anxiety for some students.</p> <p><u>Actions</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teaching delivery, particularly at Level 3, to be reviewed. 2. Consider extending degree to which participation in online blog (involving discussion of set reading) forms part of assessment. 	<p>DSE, module leaders, semester 2, 2016-17</p> <p>DSE, module leaders Away Day, December, 2016, Blended learning Champion</p>
<p>Assessment and feedback</p>	<p><u>Issue</u> Feedback is an ongoing issue as evident from NSS and UGPS scores and comments. Some clarity emerging that students specifically do not understand how to apply the feedback to further work. </p> <p><u>Actions</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Focus on increased use of office hours and supporting students through workshops and other guidance opportunities to seek clarification. 2. Working with staff to review feedback quality and share good practice. 3. Increased engagement with student module representatives to report module level concerns about assessment and feedback. 	<p><u>Issue</u> Although slight improvement from 2014-15, this is the area where there is least satisfaction, with a notable drop in PGT satisfaction on this score. Specific UG issues: perception that marking standards differ across modules; feedback sometimes limited; insufficient guidance concerning what is being asked for in assignments.</p> <p><u>Actions</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clear guidance on marking criteria and advice on assessment preparation to be provide in advance of assessment. 2. Academic Skills module to include advice on variety of feedback and support available (office hours, writing mentor scheme, accessing comments on GradeMark). 3. Use of optional consultation sessions with module leaders to discuss upcoming assignments. 4. Communication of clear expectation vis-à-vis feedback to markers pf PGT work. 	<p>Module leaders, ongoing</p> <p>Head of Induction, ongoing</p> <p>Module leaders, ongoing</p> <p>PGT director, ongoing</p>

<p>Academic support</p>	<p><u>Issue</u> Students continue to experience difficulties in accessing the right sort of support.</p> <p><u>Actions</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Focus in welcome back and induction on the range of opportunities available 2. Introduction of PG writing mentors to address issues with writing style and skills 3. School focus on use of office hours through Academic Skills module, induction and welcome back meetings. 	<p><u>Issue</u> Low scores in some programmes often reflect concerns with co-ordination between schools, mentioned above.</p> <p><u>Actions</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Greater contact between students and link tutors in JH and interdisciplinary programmes. 2. Appointment of writing mentors in partner schools. 3. Continued focus in induction and welcome back on support mechanisms available. 4. Increased visibility of SSF reps. <p><u>Issue</u> Students would appreciate a greater sense of being part of an academic community with their fellow students, providing peer support.</p> <p><u>Actions</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Personal tutees to have group meetings, with their tutees, as well as individual ones. 2. Creation of Facebook group for students on particular programmes. 3. Student-run meetings for particular cohorts (e.g. JH students), increasing sense of peer support 	<p>Programme directors, link tutors, ongoing</p> <p>Programme directions, link tutor, HoS (to approve funding) Head of induction, programme directors, start of semester School reps, ongoing</p> <p>Personal tutors, ongoing</p> <p>SSF course reps, ongoing</p> <p>Student interns, School reps, ongoing</p>
<p>Organisation and management</p>	<p><u>Issue</u> It is clear from student comments that students do not always understand the rigorous processes for student education management that are in place in the School.</p> <p><u>Actions</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ongoing review and development of new management structures 2. Communication through induction and welcome back meetings of key processes 3. Review PGT programme and module catalogue entries for omissions and inconsistencies across programmes, and 	<p><u>Issue</u> PGT scores on this question have dropped significantly. UG scores somewhat higher, but qualitative comments on this often linked to concerns indicated above about communication and co-ordination between schools. Pre-requisites sometimes seen as an unwelcome constraint on student choice. SSF reports concerns about communication of procedures for Integrated Final Year Project.</p>	

	<p>amend accordingly to streamline organisational and management processes.</p>	<p><u>Actions</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PGT assessment administration now managed alongside UG assessment. 2. PGT concerns an agenda item on next SSF (January. 2017) 3. PGT programme structure part of curriculum review for 2016-17. 4. Clear communication of management and support structure through induction and Upper Year welcome back meetings. 5. Increased contact between course reps and programme leaders. 6. Review of prerequisite structure to be included in curriculum review. 7. Clear communication of procedures and expectations for Integrated Final Year Project through module leaders and supervisors. 	<p>School SES Manager</p> <p>SSF staff convenor, semester 2</p> <p>PGT director, semester 2</p> <p>Head of induction, programme leaders, start of semester</p> <p>Programme leaders, course reps, ongoing</p> <p>DSE, DHoSs, ongoing</p> <p>Integrated FYP module leader</p>
<p>Learning resources</p>	<p><u>Issue</u></p> <p>Students continue to raise concerns about the access to reading, and particularly the emphasis on the use of electronic resources</p> <p><u>Actions</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whole School discussion of use of coursepacks as alternative, particularly in level one 2. Training during induction and academic skills which highlighted the use of IT systems including email access on smartphones and use of onedrive/m:drive. To be extended to all years via welcome back meetings 	<p><u>Issue</u></p> <p>Qualitative comments express repeated concerns about expense of course texts and reading packs, and view that these should be regarded as already included in course fees.</p> <p><u>Actions</u></p> <p>SFF discussion indicates a preference for free hard copies of course packs over online-only readings, but latter preferred to buying course packs. School to look into feasibility of subsidising course packs. If not practical, recommendation to module leader to have online readings only.</p>	<p>DSE, HoS, semester 2</p>
<p>Personal development</p>	<p><u>Issue</u></p> <p>Personal development scores and comments (including around practical work and career readiness) were disappointing and suggest further work required. </p> <p><u>Actions</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Student development intern appointed to support workshop and other School provision 	<p><u>Issue</u></p> <p>Overall scores for personal development show some improvement from 2014-15, but still lower than the University average, and more significantly so for individual programmes.</p> <p><u>Actions</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This year (2016-17) shows a marked uptake of Industrial Year option. This can be further promoted at induction, welcome back 	<p>Industrial year tutor, student intern, start of semester</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Use of welcome back and other meetings to flag and encourage opportunities 3. More effective use of School space after co-location (workshop room bookable by students for study groups) 4. Encourage engagement in office hours for non-academic development (e.g. meeting with personal tutor for advice on skills) 	<p>meetings, and through student employability intern.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Personal tutors to attend and assess Industrial Year module presentation, enabling them to reflect with their tutees on career development. 3. New Integrated FYP includes presentation component; again personal tutees could be invited to attend, along with supervisor. 4. MA programme directors to explicitly discuss personal development aims in the first meeting, and organise personal development workshops to meet any general needs identified (e.g., PhD application advice sessions, dissertation preparation seminars). 	<p>Industrial Year tutor, personal tutors, beginning of 2017-18 (when Industrial Year students return)</p> <p>Integrated FYP leader, personal tutors, semester 2</p> <p>MA programme directors, ongoing</p>
--	--	--	---