



University of East Anglia Students' Union
Education Sub-Committee
03/12/2025 - 16:00-17:00
Online and in Bookable Room 2
Minutes

Useful Information

Quorum

Quoracy for the Committee sits at 50% plus 1 of present core and guest members.

Agenda

Author:	Beth Plant
Status:	Pending Approval
In attendance:	Beth Plant (UEASU Staff), Ayane Hida-Stringer (UEASU Staff), Elsa Mounayer (UEASU Staff), Turaiya Lemard (UG Education Officer), Bhaskar Bukkanalli Shivanna (Postgraduate Officer), RS, GB, NC, VS, FM, TN, NL, BJ, and SH

- 001 Welcome!**
As Chair, UC begins the meeting, leads intros, and thanks everyone for attending.

- 002 UEA50 motions to approve or make note on**
None submitted.

- 003 General Discussion**
UC asks convenors if there are issues or inefficiencies in the educational experience. He asks for feedback from the committee

GB notes that in MLC a lot of the courses don't have great communication and that decisions about modules aren't being shared. GB notes that the head of school recently informed him, but not the wider course, about changes to a module.

Question: UC asks when module choices take place.

Answer: GB replies that it is typically at the beginning of the semester, and that changes need to be communicated clearly.

Question: UC asks when the changes were communicated.

Answer: GB responds that some people were told this week, but not all.

Question: UC asks if the decision was recent.

Answer: GB responds that he isn't sure, and it seems like there was no formal communication.

UC notes that this seems like a planning issue.

CF states that they've had a similar experience where expected modules just disappeared with no communication.

GB notes that module clashes are fairly common.

CF notes that the course is very focused on modern history in practice, but that is not what was advertised to them initially.

UC responds that things being advertised but not delivered on seems to be a common theme and that it may be related to UEA's finances.

TN raises that their whole course has been cut, and that they came to UEA for this course so can empathise with CF and GB.

TN raises separately that there are concerns around MS Outlook classification for multidisciplinary schools, for example Natural Sciences students will be classified as ENV on Outlook. TN notes that this could make student/staff communication challenging, and wonders if the sub discipline could be used on Outlook instead.

UC clarifies that this is a barrier to understanding and asks if perhaps the sub discipline would become clear in the email itself. UC asks if TN can provide a specific example.

TN responds that they don't have a specific example, but that students in their cohort would like to keep NAT.

Question: UC asks GB if they know why the module referred to earlier was scrapped.

Answer: GB responds that they believe it was something to do with the availability of technicians, and timings of the event they were supposed to film wouldn't line up which could not be adjusted. GB notes that it's reasonable that the school cut it, but the decision could have been communicated more clearly.

Question: TL asks if there is flexibility to take modules from other courses.

Answers: GB responds that they don't believe they had that option. CF responds that History students take modules from Art History, but that they aren't sure about taking modules from other schools.

SH raises that they have spoken to a lecturer who mentioned that seminar leaders are marking their own students work. SH notes that unconscious bias might be present in these situations.

Question: UC asks if the concern is that some seminar leaders could be more or less lenient towards their own students.

Answer: SH responds that there could be an unconscious bias.

TL raises that module cuts are common and asks if employability modules could be a solution for this.

GB asks if there could be a contact for that as there's been minimal support around placements.

Question: UC asks how that would bypass the financial obstacle.

Answer: TL responds that you won't be as reliant on staff time, but notes that she can raise the question around costs through the appropriate channels, and that convenors can bring it up in FLTQCs.

004 Undergraduate Education Officer discussion

TL notes that she is reviewing the Academic Representation system and states that they are looking at the We're Listening platform. TL asks for feedback on this platform.

NL states that We're Listening was introduced last year but that HSC didn't receive any feedback from it, so they used the NSS data instead. NL also states that they are currently setting up Padlets instead and that these are so far proving more successful internally as students are finding it easier to engage.

NL notes that less complaints are being received from courses that used the Padlet feedback system.

Question: TL asks if SEP feedback is actioned

Answer: GB responds that he feels that it is, as SEP members have an action log shared.

NL notes that they have started a school wide newsletter.

TL responds that other schools could adopt this initiative.

BBS notes that some PGs are ending up on modules that they have no background in as their introductory modules have been scrapped.

BJ notes that many students are struggling due to scrapped modules.

BBS asks if anyone else has experienced this.

No other postgraduate convenors appear to be having this issue.

TL raises that SPOs don't like the terms 'convenor' or 'SEP', and notes that these terms are quite vague.

Convenors agree that the terminology could be more specific.

From a hand raise poll, seven of the thirteen convenors agree that the term 'convenor' should change.

Six of the thirteen convenors agree that the term 'SEP' should change.

TN notes that 'Reps' is a more familiar term.

CF notes that SSLCs had more name recognition

Postgraduate Officer update

005

BBS notes that he facilitated the PG Poetry Night, and that he hopes to organise more events similar to this in future

AOB

006

SH notes that engagement is low and SEPs have poor attendance

Question: UC asks how SEPs can be better advertised.

Answer: SH notes that it's well communicated but possibly too broad and people don't understand their purpose.

BP thanks everyone for attending and concludes meeting.