

## **Present**

Professor Simone Buitendijk – Vice Provost (Education) – Chair  
Ms Emma Caseley – Head of Strategic Projects, Education Office  
Mr Martin Lupton – Vice Dean (Education), Faculty of Medicine  
Mr Alejandro Luy – ICU Deputy President (Education)  
Professor Omar Matar – Vice Dean (Education), Faculty of Engineering  
Dr Edgar Meyer – Associate Dean (UG Programmes & Education Quality), Imperial College Business School  
Professor Alan Spivey – Assistant Provost (Learning & Teaching)  
Ms Judith Webster – Head of Academic Services  
Ms Lucy Heming – Senior Assistant Registrar (Quality Assurance and Enhancement)

## **In attendance**

Ms Hailey Smith – Project Manager (Learning and Teaching Strategy), Education Office

## **Apologies**

Mr David Ashton – Academic Registrar  
Dr Malcolm Edwards – Director of Strategic Planning  
Professor Sue Gibson – Director of the Graduate School  
Professor Martyn Kingsbury – Director of Educational Development  
Professor Emma McCoy – Vice Dean (Education), Faculty of Natural Sciences

## **1 Welcome and Apologies**

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed attendees and apologies, as listed above, were noted.

## **ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

## **2 Review Process**

- 2.1 Terms of Reference for the Learning and Teaching Strategy Review LTC.2018.64
- 2.1.1 The Committee noted the terms of reference and membership of the Review Group and welcomed the level of external and internal expertise, experience of change and similar strategic approaches.
- 2.2 Timeline for the Learning and Teaching Strategy Review LTC.2018.65
- 2.2.1 The Review Panel meeting was taking place on 18 July 2019, after which members of Panel have been asked to submit comments, suggestions and recommendations by 23 August 2019. Feedback would be circulated to Committee members by 5 September to inform the meeting on 12 September. The deadline for submission to the Provost Board responding to the Panel's comments and recommendations is on 13 September so the Committee will need to be deliberative in responding; however a long report was not expected. It was not anticipated the Panel would receive a formal response to their comments.

**2.2.2** Following consideration of the Review Panel's finding and comments on those findings by Provost Board, a final report would go to Senate in October 2019. The Committee was expected to help steer next steps in responding to the recommendations.

**2.2.3** Given the concerns about the short turnaround time, it was planned that communication of the Panel's outcomes would be circulated prior to the next Committee meeting so as to be better able to reach a group consensus.

### **3 Progress Review**

LTC.2018.66

**3.1** It was confirmed that the impetus for having the review had been consideration during the Planning Round. It was considered important to take stock of what had been achieved before moving on to next phase and to obtain internal and external expertise on the next steps. It was expected the review process would provide constructive insights on key areas such as governance issues, good practice in undertaking big change programmes, strategies for keeping people engaged in a long-term change project.

**3.2** When the Learning and Teaching Strategy was being drafted, a number of SMART targets had been included. A number of these milestones had been reached but given the time-frame, the impact of these may not be fully realised yet. It was anticipated that representatives of the Faculties needed to be prepared to answer questions on targets and impact. Initial responses to this included:

- There has been a collaborative and participative approach but more could be done on sharing and disseminating outcomes.
- Part of the impact can be seen in the level of attention on teaching and learning and in developments such as the Digital Learning Hub.
- Completing Curriculum Review for undergraduate provision has provided a good foundation on which to build future pedagogy transformation.
- There is a need to consider the ongoing benefits of a collective approach and demonstrate how the Strategy is enabling the College to deliver something greater than the sum of its parts; there were examples of this in some of the pedagogy transformation bids.
- One success measure could be transference outside local contexts.
- I-Explore was an example of a tangible cross-College endeavour. Efforts were being made to have direct input from a range of sources and collaboratively reaching consensus on the direction of travel.
- There is a need to consider the future of the Strategy now that some of its levers, namely undergraduate Curriculum Review and high initial investment are coming to an end.

**3.3** The Committee was keen to learn from Review Panel how best to create network of strategic teaching fellows. This was one of the areas of identified current weakness which needs to be addressed. More research was needed on what strategic teaching fellows feel would help support and nurture them alongside more formal career progression pathways. Also how they might engage in educational research and their relationship with other areas of the College involved in pedagogical innovation, such as the Digital Learning Hub. However, discussions around this also need to take account of departmental requirements and how this would impact on the time and space for strategic teaching fellows to engage in networks and cross-College initiatives.

- 3.4** It was important to consider the student perspective, in part because of the potential impact on future data such as in the National Student Survey but also in terms of student expectations and engagement. Was the Strategy able to deliver what students were expecting and could it continue to do so? Working on areas already mentioned such as creating broader impact through sharing of good practice would transfer benefits to students across the College and not just those in particular areas.
- 3.5** The Committee considered the challenges to creating these broader linkages and noted the tension between having central infrastructure to drive this while also relying on local goodwill, energy and enthusiasm. It was anticipated further efforts would be made to create semi-formal structures through which groups of staff with similar roles would be able to collaborate and share practice. In addition, while some levers may be lessening, there were existing levers built into ongoing project funding.
- 3.6** The report had not been able to provide much analysis on the new career pathways in teaching and learning as the first promotions round had only recently taken place. Career progression was considered as part of a two-year planning cycle so it was not possible to rush this; however, lessons learned from the first round would feed into future tweaks to the process.
- 3.7** The importance of having a parity of student experience was discussed. The development of the new single set of regulations was a big driver in working towards this. Setting and delivering on baseline expectations would be important; these would need to sit alongside local variations in student experience above and beyond based on subject-specific opportunities. The importance of focussing on the experience of postgraduate students and not just undergraduate student was reaffirmed. The development of the new Academic Strategy would be another way of defining a holistic student experience and articulate what students can expect of the College as well as what the College can expect from them. This would move beyond the existing Student Principles into a more practical Student Charter or equivalent. It was agreed that the Vice-Provost's Advisory Group (Education) would work on defining these expectations and deliverables at the first meeting of the new academic year.
- ACTION: Vice-Provost's Advisory Group (Education)**
- 3.8** Existing quality processes could be used to identify, reflect on and analyse success in the various elements of the Learning and Teaching Strategy, for example, through the annual monitoring process. The Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee could work with this Committee to identify how best to take this forward. Minimum expectations on what the College will deliver to students could also be embedded in academic policies.
- ACTION: Chair/Secretary for QAEC; Chair/Secretary for LTC**
- 3.9** Everyone in the College had a role in supporting the delivery of expectations and it would be important to develop a holistic approach to engage everyone in these endeavours. It might be helped by reframing some of these processes from being about monitoring to being about enhancement.
- 3.10** The Student Information Management Project (SIMP) would be crucial to understanding data about impact on students. It would be possible to build in

success measures to this project which would support the Learning and Teaching Strategy.

- 3.11** The Strategy could also enable staff to create visions for the future which would not and could not be realised in the present. Allowing sufficient time for staff to work locally and build up to sharing practice more broadly was important as some innovations would need considerable testing before thinking about scalability. Examples of local initiatives underway included the use of Jupyter notebooks; the development of the Chemical Kitchen; and the growing use VR/AR in learning and teaching. Central resource may be needed to grow these developments beyond their local context.
- 3.12** One area of concern about the Strategy was its sustainability, particularly in the medium-term given the need for some centrally resourced staff and projects to be embedded into departments and faculties in order to continue.
- 3.13** The Committee welcomed the impact of the Strategy in facilitating the sorts of discussions which had taken place at the meeting. Participants in the review meeting were encouraged to raise the discussion elements from today's meeting when engaging with the Review Panel.

#### **4 Review Outcomes**

- 4.1** This item had been covered in section 2.2.

#### **5 Any Other Business**

- 5.1** No additional business was raised.