

**School of Environment, Education and
Development**

Faculty of Humanities

SEED Programme Committee: [MA International Education]

Date: Wednesday 12th November 2025

Time: 1:30pm – 3:00pm

Location: Online Via Teams

Please send any queries to seed.hub@manchester.ac.uk

MINUTES

Staff Attendees:

Heather Cockayne (Programme Director/Chair),
Amy Matthews (IAG Administrator, Secretary)
Iris Lopez Garcia (ILG)
Lise Hopwood (LH)
Sylvie Lomer (SL)
Chichi Ming (CM) – Project Leader for Student Reps
Alex Baratta (AB)
Ignacio Wyman San Martin (IWSM)
Huran Mirolo (HM)
Helen Hanna (HH)
Jessica Gagnon (JG)
Zhuomin Huang (ZH)
Andrew Gunn (AG)
Miguel LIM (ML)
Chiachi Ming(CM)
Paul Smith (PS)
Jessica Gagon (JG)
Andrew Gun (AG)
Umit Vidiz (UV)

Staff Apologies: Name (role)

Loretta Anothy-Okeke (Senior Lecturer in Education)

Miriam Firth (Senior Lecturer in Education)

2 Reps in attendance:

Shuhui Sun (SS)

Deliah Trotter (DT)

1. Welcome and Apologies for Absence

HC welcome all attendees to the online meeting and noted apologies for LA-O and MF.

2. Introductions

HC confirmed they are the programme director the programme and LH introduced themselves as deputy. All attendees introduced themselves. HC thanked everyone for their introduction and attendance. HC noted CM is working as the project lead for a project with student reps to obtain feedback. CM noted they used feedback surveys and journey map to obtain feedback and is interested to see how this has been used

3. Minutes/Actions of the last meeting

HC noted that these have been circulated and if people have any queries or concerned to speak to HC directly.

4. Rep Consultation

HC noted they have a large amount of student reps this year – a total of 9 so far and a possible tenth rep joining. HC asked the reps present if they ask students for feedback on specific areas. Reps DT and SS confirmed they have shared the journey maps with the students with the assistance of CM. DT noted the sample of responses was 45.

DT noted general areas of satisfaction from students, noting that students were extremely satisfied with areas of course, they found lecturers to be notable and enthusiastic and students also noted they were not overwhelmed by programme.

DT noted that students expressed confidence with AI tool with over 92% of students feeling confident in using AI.

DT noted that students reported that they were pleased with the offering events offered by the department so far. Some students expressed a want for more social events e.g. to get to know peers in their specific programme. DT confirmed that many of the respondents were happy so far.

DT provided students survey comments regarding safety and wellbeing. DT noted that students felt overall they were respected and happy and safe. DT mentioned that one respondent felt they were in danger in the city, due to an

accident that occurred in the centre, but noted that this did occur at the university e.g. on campus. DT emphasised that student would appreciate tips and support on how to stay safe whilst at Manchester.

DT noted students' responses regarding – student confidence in terms of sharing contributing and safety in seminars. DT mentioned that the majority of students who responded felt safe and comfortable to contribute with seminars. DT commented that 1 respondent noted that they felt bullied in a seminar group. DT highlighted they followed up with this particular student and interviewed them anonymously separately regarding this. DT noted that would be speaking to HC about this.

DT emphasised that students first major assignment was due the day after the programme committee. DT mentioned that some students had expressed concerns about the structure of assignment, ability to manage own time and refereeing. DT suggested that after this submission students may feel more comfortable in future assignment submissions.

DT noted that they asked respondents for comments regarding - concept depths and course coverage and that if students wanted concepts covered in detail. DT mentioned that many respondents said yes, they did. DT suggested that at this point, they are still early into the academic year so students have got into as many classes/ concepts yet.

DT thanked CM for their help with the survey collection/journal mapping and noted that they could use the journal mapping tool further to investigate with respondents about what is going well and what isn't with their course experiences.

DT asked SS for their comment. SS noted most of the feedback they obtained from students was regarding further progression and wanting to go onto PhD programme.

SS noted feedback think that some content was mainly theoretical and would like to add additional teaching. SS noted that some students think traditional teaching is sufficient in some cases is and would like to have more methods of teaching if possible and that this would be appreciated. E.g. guest lecturers, international speakers etc. SS mentioned that some comments from students suggested that a combination of in person in online and in person teaching would be welcomed. Some students noted that they were unsure of content and what to master within the course.

Assessment methods – SS noted that the measures focus on writing and research – assessment suggestions more objectives – most assessments make it is important to make corrections from early assessment – maybe introduce divided assessment – different assessment – maybe an annual service review

should be done to allow students to submit problems to make corrections and then correct and submit.

HC thanked SS and DT for their comments. HC noted that certain aspects of the programme become clearer later on, and suggested that staff could make these points clearer earlier for students — for example, explaining that Semester 1 provides a general overview, while Semester 2 focuses on chosen pathways.

HC also spoke about the assignments, noting that additional research support may be useful, as SS suggested. However, HC indicated that students may currently be unsure about what is expected of them. HC referred to Jenna's point about the research methods component, noting that introducing this at the beginning of the programme — along with submitting a smaller Engaging Education research task earlier — could help students develop their final module assessments.

HC noted that information is currently shared via email and Canvas. LH shared that, from their experience with their tutor group, the My Learning Essentials (MLE) contains a large amount of available resource information, but students may find it difficult to navigate due to the volume of content. HC suggested that this issue could be explored further, potentially through journey mapping. LP agreed. HO noted that they could look into this.

DT reported that survey findings indicate students have access to a wide range of resources addressing areas of confusion, but many are unaware that these resources exist. DT clarified that this is not a criticism of staff, as information is made available, but students may not always know where to find it or how to access it easily. DT suggested this as an area for further review.

HC noted the activities mentioned by SS relating to PhD opportunities and guest speakers. HC asked whether this was something students had requested through the survey. SS suggested that students could be introduced to this information in September, with further exploration in October or November. SS noted that while students can find information independently, additional guidance would be helpful - potentially with support from faculty.

HC reflected that during Welcome Week, information focused primarily on the master's programme rather than PhD pathways, as students may consider this later in their studies. HC asked SS for their thoughts on this approach.

JG noted that they are currently supporting two tutees with PhD applications. LH echoed this experience. HC thanked them and noted that this topic had not previously arisen in discussions.

JG suggested that September would be too early for such guidance, but that a session in November (or next semester) could be developed for students interested in PhD pathways. Suggested content could include drafting research proposals, PhD funding opportunities, general guidance, and eligibility

considerations for international students. JM noted that a similar session had been delivered previously and that they could provide the slides. SL noted that Kirsty Finn would be a key contact in relation to this topic.

HC asked whether anyone would be interested in facilitating such a session. JG confirmed they would be happy to assist and reiterated their willingness to be involved. AB also noted they would be happy to be involved, adding that one of their students has already received interest from the University of Southampton and requested a reference, despite it still being early in the academic year. AB reiterated their enthusiasm to contribute.

JG emphasised that providing this guidance would be very valuable and suggested that delivering sessions in both semesters could be beneficial.

HC asked LP whether anything further had emerged from their tutor group regarding MLE. LP noted nothing additional at this stage, but that a follow-up session could be developed to explore this further.

A. Student wellbeing and welfare.

HC noted recent issues relating to student wellbeing, including a meeting with a student following an incident of bullying. HC emphasised the importance of fostering kindness and respect among students and noted that programme leaders have produced slides on classroom etiquette to support this.

HC asked colleagues for their views on possible actions or support in this area.

JG noted that there have been no issues within her classes. However, she suggested it may be helpful to clearly signpost available resources, including clarifying what staff can and cannot support with (for example, careers advice and job-seeking support, which are provided by the Careers Service rather than academic staff).

LP noted that the SEED Student Hub is an excellent first point of contact for students seeking wellbeing or support services.

5. Academic Advising

LP shared feedback from students regarding Welcome Week and the first week of teaching. Students reported that it was very useful to have the opportunity to speak to someone individually, and that the first-week meeting with AA was particularly helpful. LP noted that students had made friends within their groups, which aligns with the intended plan.

LH asked that, over the next few weeks, staff continue to keep an eye on student engagement, particularly noting any students who are not attending sessions.

LP noted that at the start of Semester 2, questions could be raised in tutor meetings, and that further guidance for staff would be circulated.

JG suggested that an online FAQ resource could be developed for students, outlining key information and “dos and don’ts” relating to the programme and available guidance.

HC asked where such a resource should be stored. JG suggested using Canvas, while HC noted that a Padlet could also be created. LP added that Padlets are already used within their course. HC noted that this could be set up.

6. MA International Education Teams Space

HC noted that a shared storage space has been implemented for staff to use, where items such as agendas and minutes will be stored. HC explained that while the space will not be used constantly, it will be utilised for programme-level materials and information.

Feedback on using Canvas

HC noted that this item arose from discussions with the e-Learning team regarding common frustrations with Canvas. HC explained that the team is working to understand how Canvas is being used and where issues are arising. HC invited colleagues to share any feedback on what is working well or not working well and noted that a Padlet has been created to capture comments as issues arise.

UY noted that there have been multiple issues with Canvas and suggested that the University was not fully ready for its implementation. UY highlighted difficulties such as locating recorded videos and emphasised that these issues should be raised with the e-Learning team. HC noted that some colleagues have been importing recordings and codes from the video portal into Canvas so that content is accessible within modules. UY emphasised that this is an additional task that was not previously required.

HC reiterated that the Padlet has been useful for collecting feedback and that contributions from colleagues are appreciated. Once collated, HC will share the feedback with the e-Learning team so that issues can be escalated appropriately.

JG suggested that best practice could be shared among colleagues. JG also noted that videos are working correctly in their modules. JM noted that they have had to reformat videos by uploading them as individual files, as merged files were not functioning correctly. HC clarified that UY was referring specifically to live session recordings rather than pre-recorded videos, which are currently not available.

LP noted general teething issues, particularly with dissertation submission on Canvas, as this was the first time staff had used Canvas for submissions. HC emphasised the importance of colleagues adding relevant information to Canvas to support students.

HC asked whether staff were aware of the marking process within Canvas. HC noted that the e-Learning team have suggested a training session and asked colleagues what support or information they would find most helpful.

SL suggested that a concise one-page PDF guide would be preferable to a longer training guide. HC thanked SL and agreed that a “top five tips” document, with links to further guidance, would be useful.

JG noted they would be happy to contribute, particularly regarding accessible design practices such as appropriate font choices, background colours, and inclusive formatting. HC also noted the importance of captions for accessibility and offered to put JG in touch with Jo Williams from the e-Learning team.

7. Inclusive teaching

N/A.

8. Marking and Moderation

LP noted that a document with unit and internal information for Semesters 1 and 2, including tutor pairings, is available on the MA IE Teams space. LP requested that staff add relevant student information as needed.

A. Moderation Pairs

N/A.

B. Mitigating Circumstances and Extensions

LP noted that the process for extension requests has changed, and that students are now required to give 48 hours' notice. LP added that Gary Squires will be following this up and will report back.

C. Rubrics on Canvas

HC noted that if staff use any rubric other than the standard programme rubric, they are required to upload it to Canvas themselves. SL noted that this process is not straightforward; previously an Excel spreadsheet was used, but this is not compatible with Canvas, meaning additional time is required to upload tailored rubrics. HC noted that they have not yet undertaken this process.

JM asked why rubrics need to be uploaded to Canvas and what purpose this serves. JG noted that uploading the rubric for the Research Methods unit is vital for staff, and LH confirmed that JG was correct, adding that specific skills are listed within a specially designed rubric.

JM asked where this rubric is located. LH explained that Blackboard previously had a dedicated rubric area, but in Canvas this function is less user-friendly, and asked whether other colleagues had attempted to use it. UY agreed with LH's comments.

ML noted that for their unit they had been asked by colleagues to update their own rubric and wished to clarify the process, adding that their moderator requested this at the beginning of the academic year. ML asked whether others had experienced the same. HC concluded that if a specific rubric is to be provided to students, it should be uploaded to Canvas.

HC emphasised that providing marking rubrics is extremely important, particularly where multiple markers are involved, as noted by JG. HC added that rubrics are also important for students to refer to and that it is essential to clearly identify where the marking rubric is located in Canvas.

SL noted that they were unsure whether all units require specific rubrics or bespoke assessment criteria. HC confirmed that rubrics are required and important, and asked that any requests or issues raised by moderators be reported back. HC asked ML whether they had received any queries from moderators, for example, pushback regarding the provision or use of criteria. ML noted that they had not experienced any issues.

HC asked whether staff had been provided with specific rubrics to refer to. ML confirmed that they had.

SL noted, from a staffing perspective, that there is increasing pressure relating to the external teaching budget, particularly concerning large marking loads. SL highlighted that staff will be undertaking full marking loads this year and expressed concern that this approach is not driven by pedagogical considerations.

HM asked SL to expand on this point. SL noted that they and IWSM would follow up with colleagues, particularly where staff are marking across multiple modules.

9. Any other business

HC noted they put the meeting online today and wanted to get feedback, staff agreed with this and that the meeting taking place online with continue for next semester. An agenda will be put together in due course.

HC also noted to attendees that were currently working on the dissertation handbook, and this would be shared in due course.

10. Date of next meeting

Next meeting to take place on 11th March 2026 13:30pm – 15:00pm

Summary of Actions List

| Action Number | Agenda Item | Action | Lead | Deadline | Status/Notes |
|----------------------|--------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| 1 | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | |