

Faculty Education Committee (FEC)
Faculty of Medicine

13 March 2017
Unconfirmed minutes

Present

Ms Hayley Atkinson, Dr Laki Buluwela, Ms Giskin Day, Dr Dan Elson, Ms Susan English, Ms Rebekah Fletcher (Secretary), Professor Steve Gentleman, Mr Gerry Greyling, Dr Jo Harris, Ms Jo Horsburgh, Professor Des Johnston (Chair), Mr Martin Lupton, Professor Myra McClure, Mr Luke McCrone, Professor Alison McGregor, Dr Sophie Rutschmann, Professor Sue Smith, Ms Renay Taylor, Ms Sophie White.

Apologies

Mr Nigel Buck, Mr Chris Harris, Dr Jeremy Levy, Professor Jeremy Nicholson, Mr Ahmed Shams, Mr Richard Viner, Professor Helen Ward.

1 Welcome and Apologies

The chair welcomed attendees to the meeting and apologies, as above, were noted.

2 Minutes of the meeting held on 8 December [MEC2016-21]

The committee approved the minutes.

3 Matters arising

There were no matters arising for discussion.

ITEMS TO CONSIDER

4 Surveys

4.1 Undergraduate SOLE Lecturer/Module Autumn Results [MEC2016-22]

The Committee noted that Medicine's feedback results compare unfavourably to other faculties'. It was felt that the BSc year in particular scored poorly in this domain, and it was noted that the structure of this course, including feedback timeliness, was under review. The ICU Deputy President (Education) is working with the Head of Technology Enhanced Education on a traffic light system for feedback, and will report back to the committee with updates.

It was noted that participation rates in SOLE for the School of Medicine remain very low, particularly for classroom based teaching. The College has agreed that at undergraduate level all departments should run SOLE lecturer/module evaluations. Whilst the Faculty has opted out of centrally run lecturer/module surveys, we must still use the same question set as other faculties when surveying students. These questions are disliked by students and teachers alike. It was reported that students also suffer from feedback fatigue, since they are surveyed more than thirty times a year in the first two years. The alternative, as used by other faculties, would be to survey once a term on all aspects of the module and lecturers; however, with so many different teachers in the Faculty, this would mean a 350 question survey each term. Students have reported that end-of-term lecturer SOLE is of no value since they have too many lecturers to identify by name after ten weeks. It was recommended that not all lecturers need be included in the survey; however, without feedback lecturers cannot provide evidence of the student voice during promotions round.

The committee made several suggestions; promoting alternative methods of feedback such as focus groups, and surveying only part of the year for every survey, in order that each individual student need only fill in a proportion of surveys. The existing set up for SOLE does not fit well with the structure of Medicine and if we are to obtain meaningful feedback it will need to be via some other means. It was noted, however, that the Faculty must continue to run SOLE, even if students do not participate in it.

The new Qualtrics platform gives higher participation rates; however, It was noted that the existing Qualtrics product could not be used for lecturer/modules surveys by the College

without the development of a bespoke “dashboard”. It is hoped Qualtrics would launch this “classroom application” in spring 2018.

4.2 **Postgraduate SOLE Lecturer/Module Autumn Results [MEC2016-23]**

The Committee noted that, although it is a requirement for all departments to run PG SOLE lecturer/module evaluations and to report these on a termly basis, only the School of Public Health use centrally run surveys. The participation rates and results are in line with other faculties. However, those departments which have opted out of centrally run surveys have also not provided Registry with the results of their own surveys. This will be followed up in order that results can be reported to the committee.

Action: Academic Lead for Postgraduate Education

5 **External Examiners**

5.1 **Summary of External Examiners Reports for UG Programmes [MEC2016-24]**

The committee noted that, whilst external examiners continue overall to praise the quality of our assessments, there are a number of minor concerns which have been raised repeatedly, such as a dearth of practical ethics, law and prescribing, particularly in year 3. Several examiners also raise concerns about the quantum of factual knowledge required over the critical application of this knowledge. These areas will be considered as part of the curriculum review commencing this month.

The BSc receives more examiner comments than other years; the structure of the BSc is also under review.

5.2 **List of Outstanding External Examiner Appointments for 2016/17 [MEC2016-25]**

The Committee noted that there is a continuing struggle to recruit external examiners. This is partly due to the fact that we have a tendency only to recruit from other Russell Group Universities and only to invite those with prior experience to act as external examiners; these factors considerably reduce the pool of available and willing participants. There are additional rules which further restrict potential candidates, such as not using an examiner from the same university as the previous incumbent.

It was considered that the motivation for external examining is interest rather than financial reward, but the School could do more to target non-Russell Group universities. The Medical Schools Council has a model for recruiting external examiners which may be of some assistance.

**Action: Head of Undergraduate School of Medicine
Head of Programme Management**

5.3 **List of Outstanding External Examiner reports for 2015/16 [MEC2016-26]**

The Committee noted the paper and that action was being taken. The outstanding reports are now all very overdue and there is some considerable urgency to their return.

**Action: Head of Programme Management
Deputy Head of Business and Educational Development**

6 **Report from the Faculty Boards**

6.1 **Report from the Undergraduate Medicine Board [MEC2016-27]**

The committee noted that the Board had approved an extensive curriculum review in light of the announcement that a Medical Licensing Assessment is to be introduced in 2022. A consultation period on the MLA is currently open and the School is preparing its response.

The committee heard that since Oxford and Cambridge are no longer actively encouraging their students to apply for the Direct Entry course, the School is keen to find an alternative partner for such an articulation arrangement. Initial steps have been taken with St Andrews University and various financial models are being investigated, but strategic approval will be sought before any agreement is discussed.

**Action: Head of Undergraduate School of Medicine
Deputy Head of Undergraduate School of Medicine
Head of School Secretariat**

6.2 Report from the Postgraduate Education Board [MEC2016-28]

The committee noted that the harmonisation project deadline has been extended to in order to allow for curriculum reviews of some courses. The Academic Lead for Postgraduate Education and the Senior Teaching Fellow, Postgraduate Education will be working closely with Programme Directors and Education Managers to ensure that programmes all work with the new modular structure.

6.3 Update from the Lee Kong Chian School of Medicine [MEC2016-29]

The committee noted one proposed in-year (and therefore considered major) change to the curriculum; an amendment to the Student Selected block to extend the block from nine to twelve weeks in order that students have more flexibility over when to schedule their elective, selective and vacation time.

The committee noted several other minor changes; revisions to the curriculum and assessment strategy in the area of feedback and assessment moderation; some reformatting of overarching Learning Outcomes; appointment of external examiners; registration of LKCMedicine students at Imperial; the policy on oversight of students while on placement; formalisation of current practice regarding levels of approval. The committee agreed that these minor changes were noncontentious and largely semantic.

These documents would proceed to the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee and thence to Senate. The committee recommends all changes for approval.

ITEMS TO NOTE**7 LKC Medicine Second Stage Review Report and Response [MEC2016-30]**

The committee noted the report and response. The outcome of the Second Stage Report was excellent, with only a few minor comments particularly regarding the number of staff running the course and the resilience of this structure, research and scientific endeavour, and the gender disparity of successful applicants. Students at LKCMedicine showed a strong sense of belonging and seemed very satisfied with the programme.

The response to the report indicates that LKCMedicine has taken on board all recommendations and is taking sincere steps to address concerns.

8 List of Outstanding External Examiner Appointments Due to Expire [MEC2016-31]

It was noted that since the Death, Autopsy and Law module is to be subsumed into a new BSc pathway, the requirement for a new External Examiner is moot.

9 Senate Minutes**10 Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee (QAEC) Summary Report for Senate****11 FEC Reports****12 Minutes of the Postgraduate Professional Development Committee (PPDC)****ANY OTHER BUSINESS****13 Dates of Future Meetings**

24 April 2017
14:30 – 16:30
Ballroom, 58 Princes Gate

RESERVED AREA OF BUSINESS**14 Special Cases Report [MEC2016-32]**

The report was noted and no concerns were raised.