

The London Interdisciplinary School

Student Voice Committee

Minutes of the Meeting on Wednesday 11th May 2022 at 14.00 via Teams and in F1.3 Ubuntu

Start: 1402

Attendees

Dr Ash Jay Brockwell (Evaluation Lead, Faculty)
 Hayley Dawson (Faculty Manager)
 Dr Michael Englard (Registrar and co-chair)
 Ella English (Student Representative)
 Prof. Carl Gombrich (Director of Teaching and Learning)
 Jet Hayden (Student Representative)
 Lucy Magri-Overend, (Student Representative and co-chair)
 Dr Andrew Redford (Head of Quality & Secretary)
 Christopher Sarjantson (Student Representative)
 Ethan Tungpalan (Student Representative)
 Corey Woodward (Student Representative)
 Marielle van der Meer (Director of Student Experience, Careers and Partnerships)

Observer: Laila Halani, QAA Panellist

Papers submitted in advance.

- 1 – Minutes of meeting held on 23/02/2022
- 2 a/b– Report on Module Evaluation Surveys from Spring Term
- 3 - Draft Annual Student Engagement Report

MINUTES

1. Welcome and Apologies.

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, there were no apologies.

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting (paper 1) (ME to Chair) [Standing item]

- 2.1 The Committee received and **approved** the minutes from the meeting held on 23/02/2022.

3. Matters Arising (paper 1) (ME to Chair) [Standing item]

- 3.1 Actions from previous meetings. The Committee reviewed outstanding actions from previous meetings (paper 1) noting the following:

- 3.1.1 **Focus Groups.** (23/02/2022, minute 3.1.3). It was reported that this was completed. This has been considered in terms of integrating with 'mixed methods', but it was determined that the content needed to be covered separately and the timing was not appropriate. It can be offered separately within the context of MEF.

- 3.1.2 **SEATS.** (23/02/2022, minute 6.2.4). It was confirmed that this had been completed.

4. Module Evaluation Results from Spring Term

- 4.1 The Committee received the results and cover sheet from the Spring Term MEQs (paper 2a/b).
- 4.2 It was stated that when the surveys are sent out it is a busy time for students, but that there is not much that can be done regarding the timing. It was queried whether students could complete the survey verbally. *[Action: AR explore possibility of digital voice feedback]*
- 4.3 It was suggested and **agreed** that the MEQs could be completed after the end of teaching for the modules.
- 4.4 It was proposed that there could be two rounds of MEQs – halfway through and at the end. The halfway through point could be just 3 quick ‘temperature check’ style questions. It was also suggested that a dedicated class time for MEQs in the middle of a session might be beneficial as some students leave immediately rather than stay to fill out a survey. It was stated that given the current response rates a mid-term point may also prove difficult in achieving a satisfactory level of responses.
- 4.5 It was suggested that the survey could be ‘live’ throughout or part way through a module and allow students to build on their responses during the term. *[Action: AR to explore possibilities for amendable responses or other midterm survey]*.
- 4.6 It was suggested that a small incentive for each student could be implemented for the surveys. It was noted that there is already a prize draw. *[Action: ME to consider further incentives]*.
- 4.7 It was suggested that the anonymous drop box for comments could be modified to include a drop-down list of topics to comment on, which could enable students to comment specifically on a given module; this data could then be looked at alongside the MEQ data. It was **agreed** that any change in the drop box would need to be tested on students first and in addition the Committee **agreed** that any individual comments must be considered and balanced against the broader student community view.
- 4.8 It was stated that the response rate is not representative of whole cohort and that the data contradicts what some peers say in person to student representatives. It was noted that students had seen how seriously the School takes issues raised but that there is a need to not pivot too much where the response rate is low.
- 4.9 It was noted by student representatives that in-person conversations often focus on the negative or things to improve so they understand how the data can then be different. However, it was stated that it is reflective of the other side of conversation that often don’t hear which is that people appreciate what the School is doing. It was stated that there was a positive sentiment about LIS doing its best, the cohort knew there would be teething points in the first year and generally everyone is positive but sometimes the understandable mistakes are where frustration builds.
- 4.10 The DOTL said that the quant feedback was being taken seriously and are making 2-3 staff hires, including related to quants. Whilst some respondents felt that it was challenging, others felt that more support was also needed and that it could be better organised. The new hires will therefore focus on these points moving forward. However, in contrast it was noted that Qualitative Methods had been well received this term and overall was going in the right direction with the correct tweaks. It was stated that at the Townhall meeting the feedback on Problems 1B had been discussed and the module leader had discussed the ‘module leader log’ and actions in it at the meeting. It was noted that in the MEQ only 3 questions from Problems 1B received less than 70% satisfaction. It was stated

that the text comments in the survey had expanded helpfully on the results enabling the creation of a systematic action plan. *[Action: AJB to circulate module log action plan for Problems 1B].*

- 4.11 It was noted that many students had a concrete and wonderful experience in doing the Consultancy Report on Problems 1B, and that it was a great example of how it would be detrimental to make a change to a module on the basis of a few negative comments. It was noted that the School wishes to be creative and innovative in its approaches but that as a result there may be areas that need to be amended when introduced for the first time.
- 4.12 It was suggested that those with a more traditional education background may have different, more traditional expectations whilst LIS provides a different experience. It is inevitable therefore for them to experience uncertainty and anxiety from those students. However, it was noted that being uncomfortable for example on a particular topic or with a Policy Client is not a reason to change.
- 4.13 It was suggested that there could be a question on policy clients in the MEQ for Problems 1B. It was reported that following the involvement of policy clients in Problems 1b, three of the clients had offered internships.

5. Student Representatives items and feedback

- 5.1 Student Representative items. The Student Representatives reported on items from their own committees:
 - 5.1.1 It was reported that Sasha Morgan, Director of the Social Mobility Commission is a new member of the Board of Directors.
 - 5.1.2 It was stated that Academic Council had received a presentation on research and development which was very useful. In addition, it was stated that the Admissions Review Report had been very impressive, and the review had been informative and comprehensive.
 - 5.1.3 It was stated that EDIC is looking to increase training for Founder's Week about open conversations and being more comfortable in discussions as well as refining the process for anonymous reporting on sexual misconduct. It was noted that there was some great work occurring in London by the School on Widening Participation.
 - 5.1.4 The DOTL commended the Student Representatives for their rigorous reading of documents at committees and their significant contribution in them across a wide range of issues.
 - 5.1.5 It was reported that EDIC had discussed, following Student Rep feedback, the timing of different topics between Problems 1A and Problems 1B. It had been suggested that some topics such as inequality, which some students have direct personal experience of, might be better suited later in the year. It was noted that both Module Leaders were supportive of this however one student rep queried whether students would struggle with inequality as a topic with Policy Clients. *[Action: AJB, EE, CG and LM-O to discuss].*

6. Draft Annual Student Engagement Report

- 6.1 The Committee received the draft report (paper 3). It was stated that this was an opportunity for members to feed in comments to the development of the report to influence its structure and content. It was stated that the report will be shared with members as it continues to develop through the term. It was noted that it will change following conclusion of term 3 activities such as MEQS and the End of Year survey.

- 6.2 It was noted that the report states that the Committee will be expanded to include postgraduate representatives however many issues will be shared between the undergraduate and postgraduate bodies. It was **agreed** that postgraduate representation was essential. It was stated that at this stage it was not felt necessary to have two separate undergraduate and postgraduate Committees and it was noted that in other institutions, smaller cohorts are often consolidated in terms of similar committees.
- 6.3 It was suggested that information on students' societies could be included within the section on the development of the Student's Association. *[Action: AR to include student societies in Annual Engagement Report].*
7. **Feedback mechanisms and priorities**
- 7.1 The Committee noted that there was a need to make a distinction between being heard and acting upon and that it was not possible or appropriate to act on every piece of individual feedback.
- 7.2 The members discussed the anonymous drop box, one student representative stated that they had directed feedback to their Coach rather than use the drop box. The Committee noted that coaching is not a feedback mechanism and that Coaches had been asked to direct students to the drop box when they bring up matters in the coaching sessions.
- 7.3 The Committee discussed the Townhalls. It was felt that they generally worked well, providing the opportunity for a two-way conversation on issues as well as to provide feedback on how matters had been dealt with. It was stated that whilst having some standing items there was still a lot of flexibility in terms of the agenda. However, it was felt that information from them for those that could not attend should be on Cortex and that some form of formal record should be established; this may not be formal minutes but could be a list of actions or short summary. However, it was queried as to how matters raised at the Townhalls were then dealt with. It was stated that as the Townhalls are so well attended it is the best method of feedback however it was **agreed** that the informal nature of the meetings should be retained whilst finding a way to standardise them more.
- 7.4 It was stated that arranging the Townhalls was a lot of work for those involved in organisation, but it was worth doing as the meetings are really valuable. However, their organisation needed to be solidified for future years to avoid losing what has been gained. It was **agreed** to consider the resource needed to support the organisation of the meetings.
- 7.5 The Committee **agreed** that it was important to clarify communication channels and what is and isn't a formal feedback mechanism. It was **agreed** to keep the informal and formal distinct but to refer people to formal channels so that information is always captured.
- 7.6 It was suggested that a culture of WhatsApp can turn issues into a downward spiral whilst not being formally raised. It was stated that there will always be people who choose to discuss issues in social media and try to rally support for certain opinions whilst not raising them formally and therefore the formal channels should be routinely highlighted.
- 7.7 It was suggested that the School could compile categories of matters that can be acted on immediately and what cannot and why (e.g. why assessment deadlines cannot be just changed). *[Action: ME to compile categories of examples what can/cannot be acted upon].*

8. Any Other Business

- 8.1 Committee effectiveness survey. It was noted that the School will be reviewing its committee and governance structure during the term and as part of that members feedback is requested. The link to the survey will be circulated shortly and all members are encouraged to complete the survey.

9. Next Meeting and future meetings

- 9.1 It was stated that elections for 2022//2023 will be held after Founder's Week. The DOTL thanked the student representatives on their first year always balancing positivity and providing constructive feedback.

END: 1554

POST MEETING NOTE:

Immediately after the meeting it was suggested that a further meeting is scheduled for the term which was **agreed** by the co-chairs. *[Action: AR to convene]*

INCOMPLETE ACTIONS

Meeting/minute	Action	By Whom	Deadline	Outcome
11/05/2022; minute 4.6	MEQ. To consider further incentives for participation	ME	Oct 2022	
11/05/2022; minute 5.1.5	Timing of topics Problems 1 and B. To discuss	AJB, CG, EE and LM-O	ASAP	
11/05/2022; minute 7.7	Categories of issues. To compile categories of examples of what can/cannot be acted upon	ME	Oct 2022	

Completed Actions

Meeting/minute	Action	By Whom	Deadline	Outcome
17/11/2021; minute 2.2.1	MEF. AR to draft MEF terms of reference and circulate to SVC	AR	26/11/2021	Circulated on 23/11/2021
19/01/2022, minute 3.1.6	RWG Student Member. To facilitate co-option of runner up or SVC member for remainder of 2021/2022	ME		Completed
17/11/2021; minute 5.2.1	Discord. to review use of Discord App	MvdM		Completed. See 19/01/2022 minute 3.1.1
17/11/2021; minute 5.2.4	Digital skills. To discuss digital skills with Exco-/Head of Digital	ME		Completed. Refresher and other sessions planned. See 19/01/2022, minute 3.1.2

CONFIRMED

17/11/2021; minute 6.1.1	Financial Support Information. To discuss with Marketing and Recruitment in terms of timing of information and prominence.	ME		Completed. See 19/01/2022, minute 3.1.3
17/11/2021; minute 6.1.2	Diversity Awareness. To investigate diversity awareness session and on-line resource for next Founder's Week.	MvdM		Completed. Will form part of Community Manager role. See 19/01/2022, minute 3.1.4
17/11/2021; minute 6.2	Miroboard feedback. To provide feedback via e-mail and through in person meeting.	DOTL		Completed, no longer required. See 19/01/2022, minute 3.1.5
17/11/2021; minute 8.1	RWG Student Member. To circulate proposal to SVC	ME		Completed. SVC agreed position on 19/01/2022. See 19/01/2022, minute 3.1.6
17/11/2021; minute 9.1	Paper. To circulate to SVC.	AJB		Circulated on 17/11/2021
19/01/2022, minute 3.1.2	Digital Skills. By correspondence to determine dates	MVDM, KG and LM-O		Completed. 5 sessions planned over terms 2 and 3
19/01/2022, minute 3.1.3	Financial Support Information. To circulate information to EE to view and provide feedback.	KS		Completed, info provided to EE
19/01/2022, minute 4.1	MEQs. to reopen survey and provide links to Student Reps	AR		Completed
19/01/2022, minute 4.1	MEQs. Student Reps to communicate survey links to students	Student Reps		Completed
19/01/2022, minute 5.2	Town Hall Meetings. To check date and then circulate	HD		Completed. Next session scheduled for 10/03/2022
19/01/2022, minute 6.1	MEF. JH and AJB to discuss what a MEF meeting might cover and best research methods for chosen project.	JH & AJB		Completed
19/01/2022, minute 6.1	MEF. to assist in prep work for meetings with AJB	ME		Completed
23/02/2022, minute 3.1.1	Digital Skills. To discuss timing on digital skills sessions.	AJB/LM-O/HD/CG/MvdM/KG		Completed
23/02/2022, minute 3.1.3	Focus Groups. To consider session on how to run a focus group within mixed methods.	AJB		

CONFIRMED

23/02/2022, minute 4.3	MEQ. To provide feedback at next Townhall meeting on actions taken and planned.	CG		Completed
23/02/2022, minute 4.6	Prize Drawn. To send suggestions to AR.	Student Reps		Completed
23/02/2022, minute 6.2.4	SEATS. To liaise with KG on notifications/messaging.	HD		Completed
23/02/2022, minute 6.2.4	SEATS. To investigate how coding may have changed.	HD		Completed
23/02/2022, minute 6.2.4	SEATS. To send examples of inconsistent and inaccurate terminology on SEATS to HD.	Student Reps		
23/02/2022, minute 7.1	Feedback Forum. To add Townhall meetings as a standing agenda item	AR		Completed
11/05/2022; minute	Annual Student Engagement Report. To include student societies in Report.	AR	ASAP	
11/05/2022; minute 4.10	Problems 1B. to circulate module log action plan for Problems 1B	AJB	ASAP	
11/05/2022; minute	MEQ. To explore possibility of digital voice feedback	AR	Oct 2022	Completed, only to the extent of availability within Cortex
11/05/2022; minute 4.5	MEQ. To explore possibilities for amendable responses or other midterm survey.	AR	Oct 2022	Completed, A mid term survey has been created, but a 'live' amendable version is not available
11/05/2022; Post meeting note	Convene additional SVC meeting in term 3	AR	ASAP	Completed, there was insufficient available dates/times in remainder of term