

**STUDENTS LIAISON COMMITTEE of RICHMOND UPON THAMES COLLEGE**  
**Minutes of Meeting held on 8 March 2017 4.15 pm**

**Members Present:** Rob Pope (Chair), Rebecca Courtaux, Ezra Smith

**In attendance:**

Zoë Lawrence (Clerk), John O'Shea (Deputy Principal), Theresa Bray (Director of Quality and Student Services), Barbara Gilgallon (Chair of Governors), Cait Orton (Student Welfare Advisor).

<b>A</b>	<b>PROCEDURAL</b>
<b>1</b>	<p><b>Welcome and apologies for absence</b>  The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies had been received from Paul Leonard.</p>
<b>2</b>	<p><b>Declarations of Interest in Agenda Items</b>  There were no declarations of interests.</p>
<b>3</b>	<p><b>i. Minutes of Student Liaison Committee held on 23 November 2016</b>  The minutes were approved as an accurate record.</p> <p><b>ii. Actions and matters arising</b>  A/ A3 (ii) RC reported that there was not a list of curriculum forums as these were currently not centrally coordinated but were managed by each curriculum area. TB said that this had recently been discussed at a Curriculum and Quality meeting where the decision was taken to recentralise the forums. This would support the sharing of learning and allow issues to be co-ordinated to identify themes to be addressed. At the moment there was no record of issues being raised at curriculum forums other than those reflected in the student surveys.</p> <p>Concern was expressed that Learner Representative meetings were poorly attended despite the dates being promoted widely by email, text and on Moodle. Overall, engagement with learner voice was disappointing. This had led to a review of learner engagement with view to a plan being implemented from September 2017. Work was still in progress on what the changes would entail.</p> <p>Curriculum managers set up focus groups with students in response to issues raised through the student survey and feedback was given through various media to set out what the College had done in response to students' responses. It was acknowledged that communicating with students was difficult. Posters around the College tended not to be effective.</p> <p>B/A3 (ii) This had been actioned and the Student Weekly News would be relaunched shortly.</p> <p>B/B1 – The first meeting of the Enrolment Working Party would be taking place on Friday 10 March and students had been invited.</p> <p>D/B2 – This was in progress and would be handed over to the newly elected SU representative.</p> <p>E/B2 – Various events had been arranged including a Think Well workshop, presentation from the FE Officer from the NUS and a LGBT workshop.</p>

<b>B</b>	<b>FOR DISCUSSION</b>
<b>4</b>	<p><b>Student Engagement Strategy</b>  RC provided an update on the implementation of the Student Engagement Strategy. It was recognised that the representation and feedback system was not working well and this was currently being addressed and would likely form a separate strategy. In addition to the activities in the strategy, it was currently Progression Month (March), focussing on next steps for all students. The recent student survey had included new questions on values to assess how the work undertaken in this area in the college was impacting students. There was a discussion concerning the language used to represent the British Values and whether these should be more specific and used verbatim in the College. It was acknowledged that this was a difficult issue, and the decision had been taken in the College to date to represent the meaning of the British Values and how they were demonstrated, rather than their direct use. This was intended to support all levels of student understanding. It was understood that the specific use of British Values was not an Ofsted requirement. However, the Chair questioned whether this was the most educationally beneficial interpretation of Ofsted requirements on this.</p> <p><b>Student Union Annual Report</b>  CO spoke to the report as the SU representatives were not able to attend. CO raised concerns about the lengthy process currently in place to approve expenditure which had been a hindrance to students attending a recent conference as the payment could not be processed in time for the registration cut off. Alternative payment options may be considered for next year.</p> <p>Other challenges the SU had experienced were the profile and understanding of the SU within the College community. Many students, though were automatically members on enrolment, were unaware of the SU's existence and what it did. The SU was mostly promoted at the beginning of the academic year. Thought would be given to spreading these communications throughout the year to ensure the messages were absorbed by students. There were general concerns with engaging students in the wider values of democracy.</p> <p><b>SU Constitution with Amendments</b>  CO reported that the main changes to the Constitution concern the updating of job titles and some changes to the executive roles to better reflect the changes in the College. The procedure to submit items to the Union Forum had also been simplified to encourage more items to be put forward. Members suggested the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that the name Union Forum be amended to Union Council or Parliament.</li> <li>• Para 2.5 to be amended to read 'all protected characteristics as defined by the Equalities Act'.</li> <li>• For the section on student governors to be separated from the constitution in an annex</li> <li>• For sections 3.2/3.3 to remove the word 'full' in relation to members as this was potentially misleading.</li> </ul> <p><b>Results of Student Survey</b>  JOS presented a paper setting out the survey results. This recent survey had attracted a 61% response rate which was an increase on the previous survey. It was encouraging that all aspects in regard to Teaching and Learning and Assessment had improved by a minimum of 3 %.</p> <p>Black/ black British/ Caribbean students in the College were the least satisfied, together with Media/PA and Visual Arts being curriculum areas with the lowest satisfaction. These areas would be looked at in more detail and work will be undertaken to make improvements. Overall, student</p>

	satisfaction was not reduced in any area though there were areas that had not improved as much as the College would have liked.
<b>5</b>	<b>Discussion Topics</b> There was limited time for this item so the focus was given to the recent mock exams. ES reported that the exams had been better organised than last year. He had been provided with his results but had not been given much advice on what areas he needed to work on to improve his grades for the Summer. Maths was better in regard to this than physics. ES reported that the class had not gone through the exam paper; he didn't feel that he would get the help he needed from asking his teacher; and a marking scheme had not been provided. Members were disappointed by these remarks. There were issues with the changes to the physics syllabus in that there were limited specimen papers to be used. JOS said he would look into these issues.

<b>C</b>	<b>FOR INFORMATION / OTHER</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Any other business</b> None.
<b>7</b>	<b>Future Student Liaison Committee Meetings</b> Wednesday 7 <sup>th</sup> June 2017 at 4.15pm  The meeting closed at 5.30pm.

Minutes taken by Zoë Lawrence (Clerk to the Corporation)

**SIGNED:** ..... **Date:**

**Action Points**

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Who?</b>
4	To incorporate the members comments into the SU Constitution.	CO
5	JOS to look into support given to student following their mock exams	JOS