# Imperial College London

**Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC)**
Confirmed Minutes from the meeting held on
Thursday 23 May 2019

**Present**
Professor Simone Buitendijk – Vice Provost (Education) – Chair
Mr David Ashton – Academic Registrar
Ms Emma Caseley – Head of Strategic Projects, Education Office
Dr Malcolm Edwards – Director of Strategic Planning
Professor Martyn Kingsbury – Director of Educational Development
Mr Martin Lupton – Vice Dean (Education), Faculty of Medicine
Mr Alejandro Luy – ICU Deputy President (Education)
Professor Emma McCoy – Vice Dean (Education), Faculty of Natural Sciences
Professor Alan Spivey – Assistant Provost (Learning & Teaching)
Ms Judith Webster – Head of Academic Services

**In attendance**
Professor Neil Alford, Associate Provost (Academic Planning) – For item 4
Ms Anna Shierson, Strategic Planning Officer – for item 5
Ms Hailey Smith – Project Manager (Learning and Teaching Strategy), Education Office
Ms Men-Yeut Wong – Assistant Registrar (Quality Assurance and Enhancement)

**Apologies**
Professor Sue Gibson – Director of the Graduate School
Professor Omar Matar – Vice Dean (Education), Faculty of Engineering
Dr Edgar Meyer – Associate Dean (UG Programmes & Education Quality), Imperial College Business School
Ms Lucy Heming – Senior Assistant Registrar (Quality Assurance and Enhancement)

| **1** | **Welcome and Apologies** | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| | | |
| **1.1** | The Chair welcomed attendees and apologies, as listed above, were noted. | |
| | | |
| **2** | **Minutes** | LTC.2018.52 |
| | | |
| **2.1** | The Committee confirmed the minutes from the meeting held on Thursday 28 March 2019. | |
| | | |
| **2.3** | There were no matters arising not covered elsewhere on the agenda. | |
| | | |
| | **ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION** | |
| | | |
| **3** | **Academic Planning** | |
| | | |
| **3.1** | The Committee received a presentation from the the Associate Provost (Academic Planning) with an update on Academic Planning with regard to the Learning and Teaching Strategy. | |
| | | |
| **3.2** | The Committee noted the five principles which informed the masterplan of the South site White City Campus development: | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | • Common spaces to support collaboration and community;<br>• A connected, permeable and open part of the city;<br>• A flexible framework for flexible buildings;<br>• Feel complete at every phase;<br>• A living environment for clean technology. | |
| | | |
| 3.3 | An example of the latter principle was provided in relation to a collaboration between Imperial College London and a start up company Arborea to develop pioneering 'BioSolar Leaf' technology would improve air quality in White City by generating breathable oxygen at a rate equivalent to a hundred trees from the surface area of just a single tree; and sequestering high amounts of carbon dioxide, a major contributor to climate change. | |
| | | |
| 3.4 | The White City Campus was noted for being well connected in terms of its transport links, including the new Crossrail and High-Speed Rail passing through a planned railway station through Old Oak Common. | |
| | | |
| 3.5 | The Autumn 2018 completion of the Molecular Sciences Research Hub would provide a new research home for the Department of Chemistry with new shared teaching spaces including a 242 capacity lecture theatre providing an interdisciplinary approach to chemistry and materials. The Michael Uren Biomedical Engineering Research Hub building is scheduled for completion late 2019. | |
| | | |
| 3.6 | School of Public Health at White City Campus is an ongoing project with a completion date of 2022. It was reported that the project currently was at a RIBA stage 3-4 design freeze with a developed design and technical design in preparation. Consultation would be taking place on how the School would prefer the design and layout of teaching spaces with the ambition to have flexible, open plan and active learning spaces. | |
| | | |
| 3.7 | One of the principles of the masterplan for the White City Campus focuses on common spaces to support collaboration and community. Imperial's ThinkSpace and Blenheim Chalcot (a private equity firm based in Hammersmith) would be collaborating to create the new business innovation space based in the White City Campus. Scale Space will be a place where business work alongside leaders in research, innovation and business developing over the next 10-15 years in three delivery phases (A,B and C). | |
| | | |
| 3.8 | The developing Academic Strategy would generate a demand for new state of the art research laboratories which would only be a feasible development at the White City Campus. The Committee were presented with a precedent study of the new 'FlexLab' at Purdue University which opened December 2018, designed to enable teams to collaborate on interdisciplinary research and innovation. | |
| | | |
| 3.9 | A proposal for the Chemistry Building to create a modern, purpose-built shared undergraduate teaching laboratory hub to accommodate undergraduate teaching across several disciplines was presented to the Committee. It was noted that the January 2019 meeting of the Provost Board had discussed the current state of the undergraduate laboratories and agreed they required improvement. The proposal provides multi-disciplinary laboratories, shared seminar and tutorial spaces; shared break-out and community spaces. The | |

| | proposed changes would free-up space in other buildings within the South Kensington Campus allowing for expansion and innovation within other departments. The proposal presented dedicated floor space for wet and dry laboratories, with a plant room which could be used as dark dry or optics laboratories. | |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| 3.10 | It was suggested that there could be space within the Chemistry Building proposal to house the Student Hub and Student Union shop, which students could visit as a 'one stop shop' similarly to the new UCL Student Centre, Bloomsbury Campus; rather than the current practice where students travel between offices within campus to access different student support and services. | |
| | | |
| 3.11 | The Committee noted that the next step with progressing the refurbishment of the Chemistry Building would be to agree the capital planning of the proposal and to agree student involvement. | |
| | | |
| **4** | **Teaching Excellence Framework** | LTC.2018.53 |
| | | |
| **4.1** | Although Imperial had not been selected for the subject-level TEF year two pilot, it still received its metrics for the exercise as with all Higher Education Providers. The Committee noted that for the TEF year one pilot, Imperial entered the 'by-exception' model which meant that departments would undergo a fuller assessment where an exception to the College level metrics had been identified. | |
| | | |
| **4.2** | It was reported that the core metrics that informed TEF year two had changed, with Longitudinal Educational Outcomes (LEO) data which had previously been classified as supplementary now part of the core metrics. Changes had been made to refine the use of employment metrics informed by the Destination of Leavers from Higher Education (DLHE) data, where the 'employment or further study' metric had been removed and the 'highly skilled or further study' metric remained. | |
| | | |
| **4.3** | The measure of teaching intensity in subject-level TEF would no longer be included as it had been agreed during the consultation period that introducing a measure of teaching intensity would not be an effective way to capture meaningful data. | |
| | | |
| **4.4** | Dame Shirley Pearce had been appointed to conduct an independent review, the outcomes of which would be expected in Summer 2019. This could mean that there may be further changes to the framework as a result of TEF year two and the review. | |
| | | |
| **4.5** | The Committee noted the initial hypotheses received from TEF year two of departments. Rather than having three ratings of silver, bronze and gold as in the previous year, TEF year two would present five different initial ratings from bronze, bronze/silver, silver, silver/gold and gold; the awards of silver/bronze and silver/gold indicated that the data informing the initial hypothesis had not been robust enough to form a strong judgement. | |
| | | |
| **4.6** | The supressed metrics for several departments across College occurred as a result of the ethnicity of oversea students not being returned in the annual | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | HESA student return as it had previously been a non-mandatory field. This suppression occurs when 50% or more of the data contributing to the benchmark is classified as unknown. This is a common factor across other Higher Education Providers, but it should be noted that Imperial had been impacted to a greater extent due to its student profile. | |
| | | |
| 4.7 | The Committee noted that the OfS had agreed to Imperial submitting the ethnicity data retrospectively. A decision by the OfS would be received by July 2019 as to whether the data would be accepted to reverse the suppression for the core and split metrics affected allowing the associated flags which drive the TEF outcome to be visible. | |
| | | |
| 4.8 | The Director of Strategic Planning reported to the Committee that the main issue for Imperial had been its non-continuation rates, as the benchmarking of peers would compare Imperial with UCL, University of Cambridge and University of Oxford, with the latter two institutions having a greater spend per student than that of Imperial allowing for an increased provision of student supervision. | |
| | | |
| 4.9 | The Committee noted that the Strategic Planning Division would be contacting Vice Deans for Education to discuss their core and split TEF metrics in more detail and to discuss next steps in terms of participation in an internal subject level TEF pilot exercise which will be conducted over the summer and autumn 2019. | |
| | | |
| **5** | **College Dashboards** | |
| | | |
| 5.1 | The Committee received a presentation from representatives of the Strategic Planning Division on the College Dashboards for student recruitment, progression and achievement data by using Microsoft Power BI. Microsoft Power BI is a self-service business analytics tool, designed for use in a number of specific scenarios which Imperial College Analytics (ICA) had been identified as not being the best tool utilised for data modelling. It was reported that ICT would be introducing Power BI to all Imperial College London staff with the intended audience being the National Student Survey (NSS) user community. | |
| | | |
| 5.2 | Power BI would be used in a number of scenarios including modelling data to inform quality processes such as the College's Annual Monitoring process, measuring non-continuation rates, degree attainment and graduate employment outcomes. The user would also be able to view filtered results by faculty, and department with an intersectional analysis by gender, disability, ethnicity, Participation of Local Areas (POLAR4) quintile and the index of multiple deprivation (IMD) quintile. | |
| | | |
| 5.3 | The Committee agreed that it would be useful to filter data by programme and modules. Programme data was available and would be added to the dashboards shortly. It was acknowledged that whilst including module data would have been desirable, module data had previously not been recorded centrally; going forward this would be made possible upon the successful implementation of the student record system Banner. | |
| | | |

| 5.4 | The Committee agreed that it would be useful to allow Admissions tutors, Directors of Undergraduate Study, senior tutors, liaison tutors and teaching fellows access to Power BI. It was also acknowledged that implementing Power BI could help modernise exam boards and highlight areas of good practice, problems and areas for enhancement. | |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| **6** | **PGT Student Engagement in Curriculum Review** | LTC.2018.54 |
| | | |
| 6.1 | A proposed framework from the Deputy President (Education), Imperial College Union for working with postgraduate taught students as partners in Curriculum Review had been presented to the Committee. The framework noted that the Undergraduate Curriculum Review had been a monumental undertaking with all departments involving and engaging with not only student representatives but entire cohorts in the redesign process. | |
| | | |
| 6.2 | The Committee acknowledged that some postgraduate programmes which had been presented to the Programmes Committee ahead of the postgraduate Curriculum Review process had either little or no student engagement as some departments were of the view that students may not understand the process of Curriculum Review. Postgraduate student representatives were consulted with a draft version of the framework and were in support of its key principles. | |
| | | |
| 6.3 | The framework presented incorporated the lessons learnt from the undergraduate Curriculum Review process, aiming to provide further guidance on how to engage postgraduate taught students in the Curriculum Review process and the reasons why students should be involved. | |
| | | |
| 6.4 | The Director of Educational Development and the Assistant Provost (Learning and Teaching) would be holding meetings with departments to reflect and receive feedback regarding the departments experience of the Undergraduate Curriculum Review process. The framework proposed would be helpful to share with departments in moving forwards and preparing for Postgraduate Curriculum Review. | |
| | | |
| 6.5 | The Committee discussed the framework and several recommendations for consideration were made including:<br>• To include students on the Curriculum Review panel meetings by reviewing the terms of reference and membership of the panels;<br>• To consider how to make departments more aware of student involvement;<br>• To refer to the UK Quality Code for Higher Education's Advice and Guidance in Student Engagement. | |
| | | |
| 6.6 | It was agreed that the Learning and Teaching Committee would endorse the framework and emphasised that every effort must be made to engage students with the Curriculum Review process and to treat students as partners and co-creators of programmes. The Vice Provost (Education) agreed that a method of maintaining the framework as a living document should be sought and that the Learning and Teaching Committee's report to Senate would include the Committee's endorsement of the framework. | |
| | | |
| 6.7 | The Vice Provost Education thanked the Deputy President (Education) for their effort in producing a well thought through framework. | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **7** | **Regulations** | |
| | | |
| **7.1** | The Committee received an update on progress with the 2019/20 single set of regulations from the Academic Registrar. It was noted that the Regulations and Policy Review Group had met earlier in the week and the following had been considered in preparation for the 2019/20 academic year:<br>• Failure, reassessment and progression - the approach to failure, reassessment and progression for undergraduate and postgraduate taught students had been agreed across all four faculties with a good rationale for the decisions made;<br>• Aegrotat regulations- amendments to the aegrotat regulations (which would also be applied to the existing undergraduate regulations) had been agreed. | |
| | | |
| **7.2** | The Committee noted that the changes agreed would be presented to the next meeting of the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee. | |
| | | |
| | **ITEMS TO NOTE** | |
| | | |
| **8** | **Learning and Teaching Strategy Implementation Plan and Risk Log** | LTC.2018.55 a & b |
| | | |
| **8.1** | The Committee noted the Learning and Teaching Strategy Implementation Plan and Risk Log. | |
| | | |
| **9** | **Educational Evaluation** | |
| | | |
| **9.1** | There had been no update to note. | |
| | | |
| **10** | **Educational Research** | |
| | | |
| **10.1** | The Committee noted that both the research associates and the associate professor had been appointed to carry out a review of educational research themes and were working on projects which would be useful to departments. The teaching toolkit developed for the Curriculum Review process would be replicated with an evaluation toolkit to provide tools to departments to collect common data and aid departments to evaluate the impact from the changes made to their curriculum. | |
| | | |
| **11** | **Online Learning Innovation Group (OLIG)** | LTC.2018.56 |
| | | |
| **11.1** | The Committee noted the latest report from OLIG. | |
| | | |
| **12** | **Any Other Business** | |
| | | |
| **12.1** | No other business was raised. | |
| | | |
| **13** | **Dates for Meetings** | |
| | | |
| **13.1** | Thursday 20 June 2019, 15.00-17.00<br>Monday 15 July 2019, 12.30-14.00 | |
| | | |
| **13.2** | **Proposed meeting dates for 2019/20** (all 15.00-17.00) | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | TBC September 2019<br>Thursday 7 November 2019<br>Thursday 12 December 2019<br>Thursday 23 January 2020<br>Thursday 5 March 2020<br>Thursday 2 April 2020<br>Thursday 7 May 2020<br>Thursday 4 June 2020<br>Thursday 9 July 2020 | |