

Officer Review Panel Report

Name:	Jack Kitchen
Office:	Education Officer
Review period:	19/11/2018 to 19/02/2019

Effective Behaviours framework (Self-Evaluation)

MANAGING SELF

- Kept digital 'to-do' lists: this has enabled me to prioritise work and ensure I deliver on what I agree to do and ensure I am well prepared for meetings I attend (e.g. Council, Senate).
- Responsive to change: recently, I've discovered significant issues in exam question setting. Pursuing this has required me to be adaptive and flexible, altering presentations and messages and changing priorities.
- Good at work/life balance and not replying to social media messages when not urgent.
- I've not been great at turning down meetings, although have been more proactive in querying the reason I attend meetings and ensuring there is an avenue for student input.

WORKING WITH OTHERS

- Strong collaboration with relevant University staff, particularly on Academic Framework and recently discovered exam issues.
- Equally strong relationship with SU staff.
- Engaged with stakeholders when relevant (paper-writing, TAC, surveys distributed to students)
- Usually up to date with SU Officer team although conflicting priorities often make it difficult to keep up with others' work, especially when team meetings are cancelled.
- Not engaged heavily with Doctoral students or their issues, partially due to blurring of roles with Postgraduate Officer (Jiani takes the initiative on this).

ACHIEVING CHANGE

- Proactive in identifying issues (e.g. exam errors)
 - Proposed solutions to issues following discussions with stakeholders and chasing on their actions.
 - Work with SU Staff to ensure available resource to undertake tasks – e.g. making use of student-staff
 - Planning review of SU Academic governance in Q2 of 2019.
- Built on the work of previous Officers
 - Scaling: full transparency into the process will be available from June 2019 following continued pressure.
- Resilient under pressure, especially from students who disagree with changes.
- Often don't take time to celebrate successes due to fast-paced nature of SU work.

BIG PICTURE

- Upheld student policy at key meetings, flagging concerns around TEF and NSS, regardless of my own opinions.
- Engaged with governance referendum and the NCP work.
- Less focused/interested on the wider sector beyond key headlines (e.g. Augar Review) due to time pressures on role and conflicting priorities.

COMMUNICATIONS AND VISIBILITY

- SU team aware of meeting discussions, and students better aware of key projects I'm working on (through TAC/AE).
 - Often challenging to keep the wider student body aware of my work (and those who don't attend TAC/AE), as emails can border on 'spamming' and many are disinterested.
 - Staff always aware where I am.
- Attend weekly SU Staff meetings to learn about other areas/update on my work, regularly eat lunch with SU Staff.
- Not a huge fan of social media, although use it when necessary to update students and gather feedback.

Effective Behaviours framework (Peer-Evaluation)

Positive Behaviours

Well-prepared

Jack is always ready and well-prepared for whatever he does. Whether it be meetings with faculty reps, or events such as the Academic reps' conference, Jack has never failed in any form to not lead and discuss ideas and issues which are important to students. In doing so, Jack has fortified his preparedness through often creating presentations and writing documents on upcoming issues which will affect students, thus also ensuring clarity.

Sets out clear priorities and goals

Jack mentioned at the end of semester two that he wanted to cut down on the number of meetings he attended day in, day out. This was so he could focus on more pressing issues such as communicating with more students, which he strongly values. In addition, he has set out clearly his manifesto objectives, which he seeks to achieve by the end of the year, once again providing transparency to the students he represents.

Professional

Jack is consistently, at all times, professional in his personality and his work. Never has Jack given the impression that he doesn't care about the work he does or the students he represents. Jack knows exactly he is in the role, Jack has, ever since starting university, worked hard in representing students, whether that be as faculty rep, or senate rep.

Helpful and pro-active

Jack is always willing to help with people's problems and scepticisms from across the SU and university, ultimately showing his dedication to do his role well, and stay committed to delivering for students.

Behaviours that could be improved (Max 500 words)

Too busy

At the start of the year, Jack began with conducting one to one sessions with faculty reps, but that only occurred on one occasion, despite us being told it would be a regular event. Therefore, it makes me question whether Jack is failing to balance his time effectively, or is taking on too much responsibility.

Communication via email

Again, similar to last semester, Jack, according to some reps, struggles to reply within a week period. However, I recognise that Jack is continuously trying to rectify this.

Targets set at the Previous Review Panel Meeting (19/11/2018)

1. Improve awareness of the work of the Education Officer

- Updates given at Taught Academic Council (TAC) and Academic Executive (AE), more email communications.
- Encouraged involvement of AE members in University meetings (AE Chair on Student Systems group)

2. Faster email response times

- Replying to student enquiries on a much faster basis and check social media more regularly.

Review Panel Meeting (19/02/2019)

QUESTION: The Review Panel asked Jack how they had been doing since the last review panel meeting in November?

ANSWER: Jack reported that all work on projects were going really well. They noted the issue with exam script errors was currently a big focus for them at the moment which they working with the University to address.

QUESTION: The Review Panel asked for more details on what exam script errors were?

ANSWER: Jack explained that there had been questions included within exam papers which could not be answered because key information such as data tables was missing information.

QUESTION: The Review Panel asked what else Jack had been involved with?

ANSWER: Jack reported on a few other areas of work. They in particular noted the work they were doing around trying to get University to take more direct action to stop company writing essay advertisements getting through to students on their email accounts.

QUESTION: The Review Panel asked Jack if they felt they were good at being able to balance their time across all areas under their role?

ANSWER: Jack explained that they felt their time management skills were very good. They noted that they always prepared in advance for meetings and submitted reports before deadlines.

QUESTION: The Review Panel asked if there was more work that the Executive committee members could do on the behalf of the Sport Officer?

ANSWER: Jack explained that within the academic area they can't really delegate work to Executive committee members because many academic issues are of a confidential nature.

Jack highlighted that they disagreed with the improvement point 'too busy' noted within their report. They explained that they had offered one to one sessions for faculty representatives within the first semester but that out of 17 only 4 had attended. A lot of work had been done to try to ensure that these sessions were at times when people could attend.

The Review Panel suggested that one to one sessions would get varying pickup at different times of the year. They encouraged Jack to continue to try and offer this option.

QUESTION: The Review Panel asked how Jack advertised these one to one sessions?

ANSWER: Jack reported that they booked time out each month to allow people to meet with them and that they continue to advertise these to faculty representatives.

QUESTION: The Review Panel asked about the improvement point concerning 'communication via email'?

ANSWER: Jack reported that they respond to all emails from students usually on the day they receive the email. They agreed that as an improvement point brought up November in November it was relevant but they now feel this is no longer a point on which they need to improve on.

The Review Panel suggested the improvement point could have been brought up by a single student who may have raised it previously in November.

QUESTION: The Review Panel asked how Jack communicates their work/successes to students?

ANSWER: Jack noted that most of their work was focused on the student academic community and would only be of interest to them. They explained that they regularly give feedback through weekly updates and academic councils meetings.

QUESTION: The Review Panel asked Jack if they felt that the responsibilities between the Education Officer and Postgraduate Officer were now clearly defined?

ANSWER: Jack reported that they felt that they were.

QUESTION: The Review Panel asked if they had any pushback on changes made?

ANSWER: Jack noted that exam results coming out earlier was one area where they had received pushback. They explained that this was down to the University not communicating

clearly in advance that this was going to happen to students. An important lesson had been learnt from this.

Targets for the next Review Panel Meeting

- 1) To get a commitment from the University to address exam script errors and to ensure that the next Education Officer is well informed to be able to follow this up when they start.
- 2) To trial using social media on a semi-weekly basis to communicate the work/successes of the Education Officer to students.