# BOURNEMOUTH UNIVERSITY Confirmed

**ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 1ST FEBRUARY 2017**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Present:**Prof Tim McIntyre-Bhatty (Chair)Prof Vanora Hundley (Deputy Chair)Dr Barbara DyerDavid FootAlan JamesJacky Mack (Secretary)Dr Andrew MainProf Alison McConnellAssoc Prof Kevin McGheeDr Corrina Lailla OsborneProf Keith PhalpProf Elizabeth RosserJamie SwansonArvid Thorkeldsen | Deputy Vice-ChancellorDeputy Dean - Research And Professional Practice (FHSS)Deputy Dean – Education & Professional Practice (FMC)Market Research Manager (M&C)General Manager of the Students’ Union (SUBU)Head of Academic Services (AS)Deputy Dean – Education & Professional Practice (FM)Professoriate Representative (FHSS)Professoriate Representative (FST)Head of Academic Operations (OVC)Deputy Dean – Education & Professional Practice (FST)Deputy Dean – Education & Professional Practice (FHSS)SU VP (Education) 2016/17, Students’ Union (SUBU)Director of Undergraduate Programmes, Anglo European College of Chiropractic (AECC) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **In Attendance:**Jack Guymer (Clerk)Dr Julie Robson [Agenda Item 4.5.1]**Observers:**Wing ChowJules Forrest Maxine Frampton | Academic Quality Officer (AS) Senior Principal Academic (FM)Academic Quality Manager (AS)Academic Quality Manager (AS)Academic Quality Officer (AS) |

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Daniel Asaya Mandi BarronDr Milena BobevaProf Tiantian Zhang | President 2016/17, Students’ Union (SUBU)Senate Representative – Head of Student Services (SS)Senate Representative – Principal Academic (FM)Head of the Graduate School (GS) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **2** | **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 7TH DECEMBER 2016** (ASC-1617-50) |
|  |  |
| **2.1** | **Accuracy** |
|  |  |
| 2.1.1 | The Deputy Chair welcomed members to the meeting and introductions were made. Apologies were noted as above.  |
|  |  |
| 2.1.2 | The minutes of 7th December 2016 were approved as an accurate record with the exception of the following:* Prof McIntyre queried point 3.1.3 and noted that an increased level of detail in the Graduate School Annual Report was required this academic year, not ‘moving forward’ as recorded in the minutes. The Committee agreed that the minute be amended to reflect this. As a result, Prof Zhang would be required to make appropriate amendments to the Graduate School Annual Report for resubmission at the next meeting.

**Action: Clerk****Action: TZ** * Mr Thorkeldsen requested that further clarity was provided to point 3.3.2.5. Specifically, the section should make clear that, although, Skills Active could no longer provide REPs assessment, students on the BSc (Hons) Clinical Science programme were still able to receive recognition for REPs assessments.

**Action: Clerk*** Mr Swanson queried point 4.5.3.2 and suggested that the section was reworded to make clear that students were not always guaranteed a placement.

**Action: Clerk** |
|  |  |
| **2.2** | **Matters Arising** |
|  |  |
| 2.2.1 | Minute 2.2.4 (3Oct 2016) – Degree Apprenticeships*Members were requested to send Ms Mack any names of those who wished to attend an information session and general awareness session regarding degree apprenticeships which was to be presented by Bournemouth & Poole College. Ms Mack would also advise members of the session dates in due course.* **Action completed:** Members were reminded to advise Ms Mack of any names of those who wished to attend an information session/general awareness session regarding degree apprenticeships. A date had been set for 30th January 2017. Faculty contacts and other colleagues had been invited.  |
|  |  |
| 2.2.2 | Minute 3.1.7 (3 Oct 2016) – Marketing & Communications Annual Report*Each Faculty account management team had been adding in academic profiles to course entries under the ‘Your lecturers slice’. Approximately 80% now have profiles for (at least) programme leaders and the activity continues as the information is received from Faculties.***Action ongoing:** Approximately 95% now had these profiles for at least programme leaders, and activity would continue as information was provided by the Faculties. Ms Fernandez and Dr Bobeva would continue to discuss this offline. Ms Mack would liaise with Ms Fernandez to query whether academic profiles would be created for the whole programme team, and to clarify when this action was anticipated to be completed. **Action: JM**  |
|  |  |
| 2.2.3 | Item 3.1.9 (3 Oct 2016) – Marketing & Communications Annual Report*Prof McIntyre-Bhatty also highlighted Section 4.13 with regards to partner websites where 15 sites included incorrect information regarding accommodation details, mobility co-ordinator details and incorrect links. At the time of the re-audit, three of the sites had been corrected, which therefore meant that 12 websites had not been corrected. Dr Morrison provided an update. The remaining issues to be completed were:* * *Skovde had not responded regarding the updating of the subject areas on offer for exchange.*
* *Universita degli Studi di Roma Tor Vergata still had a broken link.*
* *Universiti Malaysia Sarawak now had information on BU on its list of student exchange partners. This information would be updated again due to recent staff changes in the Mobility Team. This would be followed by the Mobility Team to ensure all issues were addressed.*

**Action completed:** * Skovde had responded stating that they had collaborated for many years with BU in Industrial Design, and had agreed to exchange two students per academic year in that area. They had used the new ISCED codes on their MoveOn online system, which was 0212 for the area "Fashion, interior and industrial design". This was the only code covering Industrial Design.
* The Universita degli Studi di Roma Tor Vergata website was working correctly.
* Universiti Sarawak Malaysia confirmed that they would update the address of the BU mobility team from Melbury House to the EBC.
 |
|  |  |
| 2.2.4 | Item 3.1.3 – Graduate School Annual Report 2015/16*The Committee requested an increased level of detail in the report moving forward which was taken from FQR activities in order members could see the improvements being made within the Graduate School. The Committee would also like to see summaries from each of the Faculty Quality Reports in future reports as well as further information regarding Progression Monitoring and Supervisory Development Training.***Action ongoing:** Based on amendments agreed to point 3.1.3 from the meeting held on 7 December 2016,Prof Zhang would be required to add an increased level of detail to the Graduate School Annual Report before the next meeting. This would be taken from Faculty Quality Report (FQR) activities in order for members to see what improvements were being made within the Graduate School.**Action: TZ** |
|  |  |
| 2.2.5 | Item 3.1.4 – Graduate School Annual Report 2015/16*Within Section 3.1.3 of the report, and with reference to the UKVI audit in July 2016, the report advised that the paperwork required for PGR Admissions was 100% complete and correct. Members suggested that the sentence should be amended to read ‘PGR Admissions were found to be 100% complete and accurate for those admissions dealt with by the Graduate School.***Action completed:** The sentence was amended as suggested.  |
|  |  |
| 2.2.6 | Item 3.1.5 – Graduate School Annual Report 2015/16*The report referred to issues flagged in the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES) and some communication issues with Faculty and other departments. The Committee suggested that future reports should include some detail regarding how issues would be monitored moving forward.***Action ongoing:** Based on amendments agreed to point 3.1.3 from the meeting held on 7 December 2016, Prof Zhang would be required to include some detail to the Graduate School Annual Report about how PRES issues would be monitored before the next meeting.**Action: TZ**  |
|  |  |
| 2.2.7 | Item 3.2.3 – FASC Review of Programme Structure in light of PG Loan Eligibility*The data provided to the Fees Board from various sources was incorrect. The data had been corrected and cleansed to ensure the issue would not reoccur. Dr Osborne would double-check that all data was entirely accurate and cleansed.***Action completed:** Dr Osborne confirmed the quality of the data presented as part of her summary report to the Committee on programmes eligible for postgraduate loans as part of paper ASC-1617-52.  |
|  |  |
| 2.2.8 | Item 3.2.4 – FASC Review of Programme Structure in light of PG Loan Eligibility*Members agreed that all documentation should be very clear for marketing purposes, and if a placement was included in a programme there should be a statement advising that if the placement was not undertaken the programme was eligible for a postgraduate loan. Dr Osborne and Dr Main agreed to meet to discuss the rules of the loan when a placement was involved, and to clarify whether a placement could be excluded from the course duration in order that candidates would be eligible for a postgraduate loan.***Action completed:** Optional placements would be excluded from the duration. |
|  |  |
| 2.2.9 | Item 3.2.7 – FASC Review of Programme Structure in light of PG Loan Eligibility*DDEPPs were requested to revisit their postgraduate programmes and to understand the reasoning behind the structure of each of the programmes and to establish whether the duration of the programme could be reduced. DDEPPs were also requested to be very clear as to whether candidates could be eligible for postgraduate loans. All revisited information should be sent to Dr Osborne in order that updated information could be circulated to members in mid-January 2017 before the next ASC meeting.***Action completed:** Dr Osbourne confirmed that the requested information had been received. This was reported to the Committee as part of paper ASC-1617-52.  |
|  |  |
| 2.2.10 | Item 3.3.1.2 – AECC Faculty Quality Report*Following an investigation into the issue of incorrect unit marks being recorded for two units at Level 6 on the BSc Human Sciences programme, an action plan had been developed and this would continue to be monitored by the AECC Academic Development & Quality Committee (ADQC). The issue would also be included on the FQR action plan for 2016/17.***Action completed:** The recording of incorrect marks had been included within the FQR Action Plan.  |
|  |  |
| 2.2.11 | Item 3.3.1.3 – AECC Faculty Quality Report*The External Examiner for the MSc Advanced Professional Practice programme had noted that both External Examiners lacked UK HE experience. An additional External Examiner with appropriate UK HE experience would be appointed for this coming year. This would also be included in the FQR action plan for 2016/17.***Action completed:** An additional External Examiner for MSc Advanced Professional Practice had been included within the FQR Action Plan.  |
|  |  |
| 2.2.12 | Item 3.3.1.6 – AECC Faculty Quality Report*Moving forward, all units with high failure rates should be identified, regardless of whether there was previous data available or not.***Action completed:** All units with high failure had been identified and commentary included within the FQR. This information would be recorded in future FQRs.  |
|  |  |
| 2.2.13 | Item 3.3.1.9 – AECC Faculty Quality Report*Mr Thorkeldsen was reminded that it was each Unit Leader’s responsibility to provide correct marks that had been thoroughly checked and signed off. Mr Thorkeldsen was requested to disseminate this information to AECC Unit Leaders.***Action completed:** Unit Leaders had been informed of their responsibilities.  |
|  |  |
| 2.2.14 | Item 3.3.1.10 – AECC Faculty Quality Report*AECC Unit Leaders should take full responsibility for the marks and they should continue work closely with those submitting the marks to ensure the marks were accurate at assessment boards prior to ratification and approval.***Action completed:** Unit Leaders had been informed of their responsibilities. |
|  |  |
| 2.2.15 | Item 3.3.5.3 – Faculty of Science & Technology Faculty Quality Report*Within the ‘New Item’ section of the report, the Committee suggested that Item 8 and Item 9 should remain as ‘Ongoing’.***Action completed:** The report was updated as suggested.  |
|  |  |
| 2.2.16 | Item 3.3.5.5 – Faculty Quality Reports – Summary*Anonymous marking had not been specifically commented on in the Faculty of Management, and the Faculty of Science and Technology FQRs. Dr Main and Prof Phalp agreed to include anonymous marking in their FQR. It was important that anonymous marking be included in the reports alongside the generic assessment criteria and how it was to be driven.***Action completed:** Prof Phalp confirmed that anonymous marking had been added to the FST FQR Action Plan, and had commented on the ongoing pilot within Psychology. Dr Main confirmed that anonymous marking had been included within their FQR. Staff who had previously been involved in the anonymous marking exercise had been asked to repeat the exercise again.  |
|  |  |
| 2.2.17 | Item 3.3.5.8 – Faculty Quality Reports – Summary*Prof Rosser advised the Committee that the University’s academic year did not reflect the financial year for the NHS and therefore the information provided for three years of failure rates of units was not a true picture. Ms Mack agreed to revisit the PQR template.***Action ongoing:** This action would be progressed with the Deputy Deans Education & Professional Practice (DDEPPs) by the end of March 2017. |
|  |  |
| 2.2.18 | Item 3.4.1.2 – Partner Quality Report – Bournemouth & Poole College*Members agreed it would be helpful to know which programmes had been included in the NSS. The College would be requested to update the report with this information.***Action ongoing:** Ms Mack reported that the query was currently with the College.  |
|  |  |
| 2.2.19 | Item 3.4.1.4 – Partner Quality Report – Bournemouth & Poole College*Ms Mack would send the queries on to BPC for further clarification.***Action ongoing:** Ms Mack reported that the query was currently with the College. |
|  |  |
| 2.2.20 | Item 4.3.7 – Pending External Examiner Appointments*DDEPPs were reminded that all outstanding and overdue External Examiner appointments should be completed before the end of 2016.* **Action ongoing:** This was discussed in Item 4.3 *Pending External Examiner Appointments*  |
|  |  |
| **2.3** | **Summary of Programmes Eligible for Postgraduate Loans** (ASC-1617-52) |
|  |  |
| 2.3.1 | A paper to summarise the Postgraduate (PG) loan status of University programmes had been presented to the Committee at the December 2016 meeting. The Deputy Deans Education & Professional Practice (DDEPPs) were asked to undertake further refinements and ensure data were cleaned with a clear rationale for all programmes ineligible for PG loans.  |
|  |  |
| 2.3.2 | Dr Osborne reported that the original guidance provided by Finance was no longer correct. Student Finance England (SFE) were consulted and the following eligibility criteria were confirmed:* Programmes must be 180 credits with 150 credits at Level 7;
* Full Time (FT) programmes must be 1 or 2 years in duration;
* Part Time (PT) programmes, where there was a FT equivalent, must be at most 50% of the FT study intensity;
* PT programmes, for which there was no FT equivalent, may be up to 3 years in duration.
 |
|  |  |
| 2.3.3 | In summary, of the 172 PG programmes the University offered, 27 programmes were of too few credits to be eligible for a loan leaving 145 programmes that met the minimum credit requirement. Of those 145 programmes, 121 met all of the eligibility criteria required for a PG loan. The remaining 24 PG programmes were of the required credits; however, due to their study intensity structure they were not in an eligible format. These included 12 CPD programmes; 8 ‘pay as you go per unit’; 3 contract programmes; and 1 programme that was not accepting new intakes during 2017/18.  |
|  |  |
| 2.3.4 | **Noted:** The Committee noted the summary of programmes eligible for PG loans.  |
|  |  |
| **2.4** | **Debate Topics** |
|  |  |
| 2.4.1 | Prof Hundley proposed that regular debate topics were included as part of the structure for future meetings. The Committee supported the proposal and agreed that the debates would be an excellent opportunity for engagement on a regular basis.  |
|  |  |
| 2.4.2 | Members discussed some possible topics and were asked to send their suggestions for future debate items to the Committee Clerk by 28 February 2017. **Action: All members**  |
|  |  |
| **3** | **PART ONE: FOR DISCUSSION – INSTITUTIONAL MONITORING** |
|  |  |
| **3.1** | **Faculty of Science and Technology (FST) – Faculty Quality Audit Follow Up Report** (ASC-1617-53) |
|  |  |
| 3.1.1 | The follow-up report revisited the recommendations of the Faculty Quality Audit (FQA) conducted in February 2016. The report had been requested as evidence to demonstrate that all quality and enhancement initiatives had been fully embedded within the Faculty.  |
|  |  |
| 3.1.2 | The audit had identified a significant amount of good practice; however, there was a need for work to ensure this was embedded and bring further consistency and efficiency to processes across the Faculty. Prof Phalp reported that he had been working closely with the Heads of Education and Professional Practice (HoE) and Associate Dean Student Experience (ADSE) to help encourage stronger collaboration and the sharing of good practice at all levels across the Faculty. |
|  |  |
| 3.1.3 | There had been a drive in a change of culture and practice to help facilitate improvements in postgraduate research (PGR) completion rates. This involved a review of the processes throughout the PGR lifecycle; including an analysis of the approach towards initial review, as well as transfer, to help ensure that unnecessary barriers to student achievements were reduced.  |
|  |  |
| 3.1.4 | There had been ongoing discussions about how to best foster inter-disciplinary engagement for students across the Faculty. Although there were regular projects for research and public engagement, there had been little activity for curriculum development. Prof Phalp considered that this was partly due to individual programmes going through the approval and review processes at different times. Prof Phalp was asked to continue considering possible opportunities to best enhance inter-disciplinary learning, such as the suggestion to appoint a lead academic who was responsible for inter-disciplinary developments. ASC were satisfied that this would be monitored at Faculty level.  |
|  |  |
| 3.1.5 | The Committee noted that a particular strength had been the Faculty’s use of the Mid-Unit Student Evaluation (MUSE). Analysis of the MUSE data over each semester suggested that there was a strong correlation between unit size and student satisfaction; i.e. student satisfaction decreased as student numbers increased. Prof Phalp noted that the trend only related to undergraduate study, as student satisfaction at Level 7 appeared to be unaffected by unit size.  |
|  |  |
| 3.1.5.1 | Dr Main reported that the Faculty of Management (FM) had conducted a similar analysis and had found comparable results. There was some discussion about whether the correlation between unit size and student satisfaction could be improved by dividing large units into smaller groups for delivery. It was suggested that dividing large units into smaller groups could help to improve the student experience by promoting student identity. However, the implications for physical and staffing resources would require further consideration. Prof Rosser reported that staff within the FHSS were in the process of completing a project that investigated how teaching in large groups impacted the student experience. Prof McIntyre suggested that the factors which enabled good satisfaction scores in units with large student numbers could be a possible topic of future debate. |
|  |  |
| 3.1.6 | **Approved:** The Committee approved the FST Faculty Quality Audit follow-up report.  |
|  |  |
| **4** | **PART TWO – FOR APPROVAL AND ENDORSEMENT**  |
|  |  |
| **4.1** | **Trailing Fails** (ASC-1617-54) |
|  |  |
| 4.1.1 | The Committee noted that Senate had already approved the underlying principles of ‘carrying credit’ in February 2016, with a view to implementing this from 2017/18 onwards. As a consequence of this decision, in May 2016 the Committee had agreed broad principles to guide necessary developments for implementation. The paper now sought consideration and approval on further proposed recommendations regarding the introduction of carrying credit.  |
|  |  |
| 4.1.2 | Recommendation (a) – Approve a more flexible credit and award framework for undergraduate awards.Recommendation (b) – Approve proposed revisions to relevant University regulations. The Committee was asked to consider a proposal for a new credit and award framework for undergraduate awards. Ms Forrest explained that the current standard assessment regulations for Non-Honours degrees had a relatively inflexible structure, and the introduction of carrying credit had revealed issues relating to intermediate awards and progression. The proposed structure would enable assessment boards to grant intermediate awards that more accurately reflected an individual student’s academic achievement. The proposal complied with the Framework for Higher Education Qualification (FHEQ) requirements by following the minimum requirements of credit for the level and award. |
|  |  |
| 4.1.3 | The new credit and award framework proposed a reduction in the minimum credits required at each qualification level for students to be eligible for an exit award whilst remaining compliant with FHEQ. Under the existing regulations, an Honours student who failed a Level 5 unit carried over to Level 6 would not accumulate sufficient credits to obtain a final degree award. As a result, they would exit with a Certificate of Higher Education and a selection of credit from Levels 5 and 6. There was some discussion regarding options available to students for making good Credit shortfall as a consequence of reducing the minimum credits required at qualification level. One suggestion was to allow students to replace one or more failed units with a unit of equivalent value at a higher level. Prof McIntyre requested that the implications for such options be debated in more detail at the next Quality Assurance Standing Group (QASG) meeting. |
|  |  |
| 4.1.3.1 | **Action:** QASG to discuss the implications for allowing students to replace one or more failed units with a unit of equivalent value at a higher level at the next meeting. Revisit this action at ASC on 5 April 2017. **Action: JM** |
|  |  |
| 4.1.4 | Dr Main queried the possibility of permitting students to study more than 120 credits for a particular level to make good any lapses for preceding levels of study. For example, it was suggested that students might wish to study a language unit in preparation for a placement based in another country. There were no concerns with the principles of studying additional units; however, it was considered that the award of additional credit was a further topic of discussion. Prof McIntyre suggested that another debate topic could be to discuss the merits and risks of an award structure that permitted limited or complete flexibility, in terms of optional units which could contribute to an exit award.  |
|  |  |
| 4.1.5 | Recommendation (c) – Remove the policy allowing students to ‘repeat’ up to 40 credits whilst on placement *(Clause 6.9.22 of 6L – Assessment Board Decision Making, including the Implementation of Assessment Regulations: Procedure).*Ms Forrest noted that the University’s placement policy *(Clause 6.9.22 of 6L – Assessment Board Decision Making, including the Implementation of Assessment Regulations: Procedure)* permitted students to repeat up to 40 credits whilst on placement. In light of the proposed recommendation to carry credit across all stages, the Committee agreed that clause 6.9.22 would become obsolete as a result of the implementation of carrying credit. It was requested that any Regulations and Policies that would be impacted by the implementation of carrying credit were updated accordingly for approval.  |
|  |  |
| 4.1.5.1 | **Approved:** The Committee approved the recommendation to remove clause 6.9.22 from 6L – Assessment Board Decision Making, including the Implementation of Assessment Regulations: Procedure.  |
|  |  |
| 4.1.5.2 | **Action:** To update any Regulations and Policies that would be impacted by the implementation of carrying credit for approval at the next Committee meeting. **Action: JM** |
|  |  |
| 4.1.6 | Recommendation (d) – Agree definitions for what was meant by ‘repeating with attendance’ and ‘repeating without attendance’, and whether carrying credit required a separate definition.There was some discussion about the support available for students who carried credit over different levels of study. In particular, clarity was required to identify what was meant by ‘repeating with attendance’ and ‘repeating without attendance’, and whether carrying credit required a separate definition. Prof McIntyre requested that these definitions were discussed at the next meeting of QASG.  |
|  |  |
| 4.1.6.1 | **Action:** QASG to discuss what was meant by ‘repeating with attendance’ and ‘repeating without attendance’, and whether carrying credit required a separate definition at the next meeting. Revisit this action at ASC on 5 April 2017. **Action: JM** |
|  |  |
| 4.1.7 | The Committee had previously agreed that, as with repetition, students who carried credit would be permitted an additional opportunity to retrieve any failed credit before being withdrawn from a programme of study. Prof McIntyre requested that point 2.2 e) of ASC-1617-54 was reworded to make clear that students who carried credit would effectively be permitted four attempts in total to retrieve credit before being withdrawn.  |
|  |  |
| 4.1.7.1 | **Action:** Revisit ASC-1617-54 to ensure that point 2.2 e) made clear that students who carried credit would effectively be permitted four attempts in total to retrieve credit before being withdrawn. This would be resubmitted at the next ASC meeting on 5 April 2017.  **Action: JM** |
|  |  |
| 4.1.8 | Recommendation (e) – All partners affected by the implementation of carrying credit were informed and training provided for partner staff. The Committee noted that partner providers (franchised and validated) would be impacted by the introduction of carrying credit. It was recommended that all partners who were affected by the change were informed and training was provided for partner staff who operated and attended Exam Boards.  |
|  |  |
| 4.1.8.1 | **Approved:** The Committee approved the recommendation to develop a communication strategy and provide training for all partner providers who were affected by the implementation of carrying credit.  |
|  |  |
| 4.1.9 | Recommendation (f) – Students studying on the Integrated Masters programmes were also eligible for carrying credit from Level 6 to Level 7. Prof McIntyre asked that further consideration was given to the proposal for permitting students to carry credit from Level 6 to Level 7 of an Integrated Masters programme, particularly with regards to the FHEQ requirements for Level 7 study. There were concerns that it would not be academically appropriate to allow students to attempt units at Level 7 if they had failed any Level 6 units.  |
|  |  |
| 4.1.10 | **Action:** The revised proposal for carrying credit would need to be submitted to QASG for further consideration before being presented at the next Academic Standards Committee meeting for approval. **Action: JM** |
|  |  |
| **4.2** | **Faculty of Media and Communication – Faculty Quality Audit Report and Action Plan** (ASC-1617-55) |
|  |  |
| 4.2.1 | Ms Mack presented the report and explained that the Faculty had undergone a Quality Audit in May 2015. Whilst the panel concluded that confidence could be placed in the likely future management of academic standards, it was requested that a follow-up Audit was conducted in 2016 to provide an opportunity for the Faculty to demonstrate that it was fulfilling its quality enhancement functions and responsibilities.  |
|  |  |
| 4.2.2 | Dr Dyer provided an overview of the action plan that had been developed in response to the Audit Report. She reported that the development of the Departmental Education and Student Experience Plans (ESEP) had been very successful. The ESEPs would continue at Departmental level and would be submitted periodically to the Faculty Education and Student Experience Committee (FESEC) for peer review. Dr Dyer confirmed that she would continue to meet on a regular basis with the HoE and Education Service Manager (ESM) to help strengthen the ESEP for the Department of Law, which would be presented at the next meeting of FESEC. |
|  |  |
| 4.2.3 | The action to ensure that academics were utilising the full range of marks available for assessment was in progress. Dr Dyer considered that this was an issue of confidence. The External Examiner reports had highlighted that progress was being made; however, further work was required to ensure that this was translated across the Faculty. Guidelines on marking criteria had been re-issued to academics to help address this issue. Progress would be raised at the next meeting of the Faculty Academic Standards Committee (FASC) as this matter required further monitoring and discussion.  |
|  |  |
| 4.2.4 | Prof McIntyre commended the use of the Departmental student experience forums. Noting the disappointing MUSE uptake, it was suggested that useful information could be extracted from these forums to evidence the quality of the student experience. Dr Dyer confirmed that the incoming ADSE would be working in close collaboration to ensure that the forums were implemented across each department. |
|  |  |
| 4.2.5 | Dr Dyer reported that a timetabling workshop had taken place between the Faculty Executive Team, Department HoE and the central Timetabling Team. The purpose of the workshop was to discuss the ways of ensuring that key timetable deadlines were met. One agreement was to ensure that the Independent Marking Plans (IMP) were available in draft by no later than July of each academic year. This process would begin in February of each year to ensure close alignment with the timetable build, and to avoid any subsequent changes being made to the final IMP.  |
|  |  |
| 4.2.6 | **Approved:** The Committee approved the Faculty Quality Audit Report and Action Plan.  |
|  |  |
| **4.3** | **Pending External Examiner Appointments** (ASC-1617-56) |
|  |  |
| 4.3.1 | Ms Mack provided an update on the pending External Examiner appointments. The Committee noted that were a number of nominations that were still with the Faculty or Partner College. In particular, the completed nomination forms for MSc Medical Ultrasound, MA Radio Production and the suite of LLB (Hons) programmes needed to be sent to Academic Quality (AQ) for approval.**Action: AT****Action: BD** |
|  |  |
| 4.3.2 | Dr Main reported that an External Examiner had been approached for the FdA Business and Management programmes. The nominee had failed to return the completed paperwork as they had been concerned with the large number of units that needed to be covered. The Faculty had contacted the nominee to confirm that an additional External Examiner would be appointed for this provision. Dr Main was confident that the nominee would accept the post and complete the required paperwork. Work was in progress to identify an additional External Examiner.  |
|  |  |
| 4.3.3 | AQ had received a non-academic External Examiner nomination for the MA Digital Effects, MA 3D Computer Animation and MSc Computer Animation and Visual Effects programmes. AQ were unable to process the nomination, as the Faculty was required to nominate an academic External Examiner to work alongside a non-academic candidate. Prof McIntyre asked AQ to check whether the non-academic nomination could be processed whilst a candidate for the academic External Examiner vacancy was being sought from the existing pool of External Examiners. **Action: JM** |
|  |  |
| 4.3.4 | Prof Rosser reported that the nominee to replace the examiner for BSc (Hons) Adult Nursing had withdrawn at the last moment. The programme had two remaining examiners who agreed to pick up any outstanding units whilst a nomination was being sought. |
|  |  |
| 4.3.5 | The Committee noted that the nominations for MA Corporate Communication and MSc Public Health had been approved. |
|  |  |
| 4.3.6 | **Noted**: The Committee noted the pending External Examiner appointments.  |
|  |  |
| **4.4** | **External Examiner Nominations and Examination Teams for Research Degrees** (ASC-1617-57) |
|  |  |
| 4.4.1 | **Ratified:** The Committee ratified the recently appointed External Examiners and Examination Teams for Research Degrees.  |
|  |  |
| **4.5** | **New Programme/Framework Developments Proposals** |
|  |  |
| **4.5.1** | **Faculty of Management: Change of Title – MSc Professional Development (Loss Adjusting) to MSc Claims Management** (ASC-1617-58) |
|  |  |
| 4.5.1.1 | The Committee received the programme development proposal to change the title of MSc Professional Development (Loss Adjusting) to MSc Claims Management. The programme was a Level 7 top-up and had been developed in close collaboration with the Chartered Institute of Loss Adjusting (CILA), as the programme was a route for CILA membership. The Programme Leader explained that CILA was a small to mid-sized professional body with approximately 3000 members. Although the number of CILA members was growing, cohort sizes for the programme would not achieve sustainability for the programme. Based on feedback from current and prospective students, it was considered that the introduction of ‘Claims’ in the title would help make the programme more attractive to a wider market of potential applicants.  |
|  |  |
| 4.5.1.2 | There was some discussion about whether the change in title would result in a change of programme focus, which would need to be reflected in the Learning Outcomes (LOs). The Programme Leader considered that any changes to LOs would relate to nomenclature rather than actual content as loss adjusting was a chartered profession that often covered claims management. The Committee noted that the nature of the programme was such that there was heavy reliance on negotiated content and advised that if there were any changes to LOs, even in nomenclature, then the application for development would need to be represented as a programme approval rather than change of title.  |
|  |  |
| 4.5.1.3 | **Action:** The Programme Leader was asked to revisit the proposal for resubmission at the next Academic Standards Committee meeting on 5 April 2017.  |
|  |  |
| **5** | **PART THREE – FOR NOTE** |
|  |  |
| **5.1** | **Completed Framework/Programme Reviews, Validations and Reviews for Closure** (ASC-1617-59) |
|  |  |
| 5.1.1 | **Noted:** The Committee noted the report.  |
|  |  |
| **6** | **REPORTING COMMITTEES**  |
|  |  |
| **6.1** | **International & UK Partnerships Committee Minutes** (ASC-1617-60) |
|  |  |
| 6.1.1 | **Noted:** The Committee noted the reports.  |
|  |  |
| **6.2** | **AECC Partnership Board Minutes** (ASC-1617-61) |
|  |  |
| 6.2.1 | **Noted:** The Committee noted the report.  |
|  |  |
| **6.3** | **Faculty Academic Standards Committee Minutes** (ASC-1617-62) |
|  |  |
| 6.3.1 | **Noted:** The Committee noted the report.  |
|  |  |
| **7** | **Joint Academic Board Minutes** (ASC-1617-63) |
|  |  |
| 7.1 | **Noted:** The Committee noted the report.  |
|  |  |
| **8** | **AECC Academic Development and Quality Committee Minutes** (ASC-1617-64) |
|  |  |
| 8.1 | The appropriateness of AECC representation at future University Committee meetings was queried as the College now had their own Degree Awarding Powers. Prof McIntyre confirmed that AECC would continue to have representation at ASC for the remainder of the academic year. It was expected that some students would transfer to an award of AECC in due course. Once this had been confirmed AECC would relinquish its Associate College status with the University and cease to have representation on any University Committees under its current status. However, there would still be a requirement for a Partnership Board, reporting to ASC, as long as students undertaking a BU award were completing studies with AECC.  |
|  |  |
| 8.2 | **Noted:** The Committee noted the report.  |
|  |  |
| **9** | **Any Other Business** |
|  |  |
| 9.1 | The Committee discussed the entry requirements for the undergraduate student research projects. It was considered that restricting applications to students who were averaging a first class classification was unfair on those students who were averaging an upper second-class classification and were academically suited for participating in research projects. Prof McIntyre reported that the entry criteria had been set at that level to ensure that students and staff met the intended outcome of producing published papers. It was confirmed that the entry requirements would not be amended this academic year; however, they would be considered as part of the end of year operations review.  |
|  |  |
| 9.2 | Dr Dyer reported that FMC would be seeking deferral of review for the suite of LLB (Hons) programmes due to changes in the associated Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB).  |
|  |  |
| 9.3 | The transition to SITS had highlighted some errors in the way students had been registered onto units within FM. Instead of compiling spreadsheets manually for this academic year, the Faculty had been inputting student marks onto Grade Centre and using the generated reports to monitor student progress. As a result, the Committee noted concerns that students who were continuing at risk might not be identified and matched with Academic Advisers for further support this year. |
|  |  |
| 9.4 | Prof McIntyre reminded the Committee to send possible topics of debate to the Committee Clerk by 28 February 2017. Possible suggestions for debate included:1. The factors that influenced good student satisfaction scores in units with large student numbers;
2. To consider if the merits and risks of an award structure which permitted limited or complete flexibility in terms of optional units which would contribute to an exit award;
3. Approaches for enhancing opportunities for inter-disciplinary learning and engagement.
 |
|  |  |
| 9.5 | Prof Hundley suggested that an action moving forward should be the provision of concise summaries as part of the cover paper so that the Committee’s attention would be drawn to key points and required actions for each item of business. Ms Mack noted that this suggestion would be considered as part of the feedback and recommendations from the recent external review of Senate by the Good Governance Institute.  |
|  |  |
| **10** | **Date and Time of Next Meeting** |
|  |  |
| 10.1 | Wednesday 5th April 2017 at 1.00 pm in the Board Room |