



**University of East Anglia Students' Union  
Education Sub-Committee**

08/10/2025 - 16:00-17:00

Online

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:	<b>Beth Plant (UEASU Staff), Turaiya Lemard (UG Education Officer), Bhaskar Shivanna (Postgraduate Officer), Robyn Srikandan, Catherine Flint, Vishnu Keeriyanimackal Shaji, Rajvi Vinodbhai Panchal, Bhoomika Manjunath Jain, Umar Chowdhury, Taylor Niblett, Aura Mondal, Gregory Blake, Nneoma Nwakamma, Amy Joseph,</b>

**001 Welcome!**

BP begins the meeting, and invites everybody to introduce themselves, and give any updates they have from the month.

CF, VKS, RVP, BMJ, and TL all give introductions.

RS gives an introduction and notes that has been a lot of discussion on AI in their school.

UC introduces himself and notes that he shared that there's a gap in communication between people arranging placements and those who coordinate with the students when they arrive on placement. This means that the learning facilitator doesn't know who the student is, and that there must be a break in communication somewhere. He has raised this at the MED FLTQC.

UC also notes that some lecturers contracts have been terminated prematurely, affecting student education and experience as most study has become self-directed for his course and others.

BBS notes that action points have been taken from that meeting.

BBS introduces himself.

TN gives an introduction and notes that they were in the role last year.

AM, GB, and NN give introductions.

AJ introduces herself and mentions that the PGs in her school are setting up their own SEP.

**Question:** BP asks about placements if anyone else has heard about issues with placements.

**Answer:** TL notes that CPP are really struggling with placements as students are expected to complete more placement hours, and the placements being found are not always appropriate as students are not being given enough notice to find travel and accommodation. She notes that this has been raised in the Student Experience Partnership and that it was discussed in an internal meeting. She will get feedback once the minutes are complete.

**Question:** BBS asks what the specific issue is with UC's course.

**Answer:** UC says he isn't sure what the specific route of the issue is, but notes that things like absence or sick leave of staff at the placement organisation can hugely affect the students' experience.

**Question:** BBS asks what happens when this occurs.

**Answer:** UC notes that the placement becomes self-directed, or that students have to find someone to support them as there is no specific plan in place, and the rotation may be useless.

BBS notes that he can have a wider conversation about the issue at university meetings.

## **002 Election of a Chair**

BP notes that is the meeting is quorate a Chair can be elected.

Nominations are taken for the role of Chair. One nomination is received.

UC is elected as Chair of Education Committee.

## **003 UEA50 motions to approve or make note on**

None submitted.

## **004 Convenor discussion**

UC notes that he needs a means of communication with convenors that he looks after.

BP notes that she can set up mini meetings with reps from each faculty.

TL notes that she has been working with the Dean for MED and HSC about discrimination on placement.

She has been in touch with the team behind Speak Up, Speak Out, and is gathering data and feedback and will be hosting focus groups on why students aren't reporting discrimination though they are experiencing it.

TL notes that students are generally unhappy with their academic advisors, and that she has suggested using staff performance reviews to ensure a consistent quality in academic advisors. She is also collaborating with uea(su)'s Advice team on ensuring there is a way for students to complain about their advisor.

TL notes that she is in the process of meeting with every SPO to work into the review of the academic rep system, as well as incentive schemes for convenors.

BBS notes that he has been to a few FLTQCs to receive updates about the PGT community and working on increasing PG engagement, specifically in SSF. He notes that there has been a change in marking for SSF, and FAH have a few course cancellations. He notes that he plans to attend the SCI FLTQCs shortly.

BBS states that he is planning on introducing PG Community Champions to help enhance community amongst postgraduates.

He also notes that he is planning on restructuring the convenor system, as the elections currently take place in March, which is not inclusive for postgrads, and that the system needs to be restructured to either adjust the timelines of the election or move to selection rather than election for convenors.

He notes that PG researcher pay has risen by 8% nationally but only 3% for UEA postgrads. He notes that he has raised this in council but that he has been told that the financial aspects have already been agreed for this year. He notes that students are feeling that they are not being treated equally. BBS notes that he has presented to the UEA council and that some stakeholders were positive.

BBS notes that he has some updates about CareerCentral for postgraduates, stating that they are looking at employability from a PG perspective specifically.

Member notes that some AI software should be specifically designated for students to use.

BBS agrees to raise this with stakeholders.

TL asks about how the election went for new convenors, and if they feel an interview would have worked better.

AJ notes that she thought elections was an interesting way to do it, as students didn't seem aware that her competitor was running, and it becomes a popularity contest. She notes that perhaps an interview could come first, followed by an election. Alternatively, she notes that elections could be a more public thing in each school with a higher profile.

UC agrees that the election set up is not the most visible and that that influences who signs up and who engages. UC notes that he had no competition for his role and that there is no way of discerning whether someone is capable of carrying out the role.

UC notes that there is sometimes only one candidate, and that could be due to visibility, or it could be due to disengagement, and that interviews might further disengage people if the role is not paid. He notes that he understands that finances may be a barrier to paying convenors.

TL notes that a lot of universities are moving away from elections as a way of nominating convenors, and that if we could find a source funding to pay the convenors, this could help towards bridging the gap between the university and the students' union. If engagement is so low, it may be necessary to find a source of funding.

TL notes that she is reiterating this to SPOs and pulling together feedback from the convenors' peers would be helpful.

BBS notes that we have school convenors, which are open to everyone, and asks if UG school convenors get feedback from PGTs or PGRs and asks for feedback.

VKS notes that as a postgraduate it's tricky to meet undergraduate students and discuss issues with them.

CF notes that they are trying to talk to postgraduates but is finding it hard to access them outside of society events.

BBS asks if CF thinks that having a postgraduate school convenor would be helpful.

CF agrees that it could be.

UC notes that there isn't loads of support around collecting data from students, and if there could be some guidelines on collecting good and representative data. UC asks for clarity around that.

BBS notes that if we are using data in university spaces, then it has to go through ethics approval, but notes that in the past students have gathered written feedback, or feedback through forms. He notes that We Are Listening is the official system for data collection.

**Question:** UC asks how convenors can access the pool of students.

**Answer:** BBS responds that you can ask your SPO and that they have access to a wider group.

TL notes that creating an MS form is the most efficient way of gathering data, but that MLC have a WhatsApp group that it varies school by school.

TL notes that ethics approval would be TL and BBS's role.

NN notes via the meeting chat that perhaps a vetting process could work as opposed to an interview. That way quality is being ensured without putting off too many people.

UC asks if it's in his remit to have an incentive to complete a survey and notes that physical methods maybe would be more effective.

TL notes that there are a few incentives that she has developed, including gift cards aimed at SEP members. TL notes that she is happy to speak to UC outside of the meeting.

BBS notes that the elections for convenors are in March, but that lots of PGs cannot engage as their role has not yet started. BBS asks if it would make sense to have an election/selection in Sept rather than March.

BBS asks what time is right to have the election/selection process.

UC notes that you could have two separate election cycles.

CF agrees that separate would work but agrees that PG specific school convenor roles should be introduced.

TN notes that this is putting postgraduates at a disadvantage and that two separate cycles would be beneficial, and that NATSCI has no PGs, but that PG and UG convenors would be beneficial and have different thoughts and opinions.

GB notes that doing an election in September might be difficult for new first years.

CF agrees

TL asks what year everyone is in.

CF notes that they are third year but wouldn't have been confident enough to run in their first year.

TL notes that 2nd and 3rd years are more likely to engage anyway.

UC follows up with what CF said, noting that first years maybe aren't best placed to run as they don't have a grounding in what university is, and therefore are not in the best position to flag issues, and that second years onwards should be involved.

TL notes that this is a benefit of interviews.

BBS agrees that interviews will have questions related to undergraduate and postgraduate representation, and the candidate that answers most competently will be awarded their role, and there will be equal representation.

CF mentions that they were talking to some people about dissertations, and that they feel that there is not much support as they only have one timetabled class a week, and that advisors are not uniform. CF notes that people have suggested setting up informal dissertation groups so that everyone has somebody to talk to as lots feel that they don't get support, and that peer support could work.

TL notes that lots of schools are introducing study cafes, sometimes attended by the LET. TL recommends raising this at SEP.

CF notes that some advisors have been more receptive to feedback, or that advisors are going on study leave.

TL asks if this has been raised to the SPO.

CF responds that they will.

AJ notes that they've had some comments from commuter students about the price of parking before 10am.

TN agrees that this is an issue.

CF notes that they have heard this too, and that they are aware of the commuter breakfast, but that lots of commuters are feeling disconnected.

TL notes that she will raise it with academic services and see if there is anything that can be done about subsidies for parking.

CF notes that travel is complicated and students can't spend time on campus outside of campus.

TL asks if it's about cost or bus times.

CF notes that it's mostly about bus timings as they aren't frequent enough.

BBS notes that if the convenors come across anything urgent, they are welcome to put PG issues to him and UG issues to Turaiya.

UC asks how frequent these meetings are.

BP says they are once a month.

TL notes her and BBS's office hours.

Meeting concludes.