# BOURNEMOUTH UNIVERSITY Confirmed

**ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 5TH APRIL 2017**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Present:**  Prof Tim McIntyre-Bhatty (Chair)  Prof Vanora Hundley (Deputy Chair)  Daniel Asaya  Mandi Barron  Dr Milena Bobeva  Prof Jenni Bolton  Dr Barbara Dyer  David Foot  Alan James  Jacky Mack (Secretary)  Dr Andrew Main  Prof Alison McConnell  Assoc Prof Kevin McGhee  Dr Corrina Lailla Osborne  Prof Keith Phalp  Prof Elizabeth Rosser  Jamie Swanson | Deputy Vice-Chancellor  Deputy Dean - Research And Professional Practice (FHSS)  President 2016/17, Students’ Union (SUBU)  Senate Representative – Head of Student Services (SS)  Senate Representative – Principal Academic (FM)  AECC Representative  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) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **In Attendance:**  Jack Guymer (Clerk)  Wing Chow  Jules Forrest  Dr Panos Amelidis [Agenda Item 5.7.4]  Prof Dimitrios Buhalis [Agenda Item 5.7.1 & 5.7.2]  Dr Tom Davis [Agenda Item 5.7.4]  Dr Duncan Light [Agenda Item 5.7.1 & 5.7.2]  Dr Philip Sewell [Agenda Item 5.7.4]  Dr Liam Sheridan [Agenda Item 4.1]  Dr Shelley Thompson [Agenda Item 5.7.3  Sue Warnock [Agenda Item 5.8.2] | Academic Quality Officer (AS)  Academic Quality Manager (AS)  Academic Quality Manager (AS)  Lecturer (FST)  Head of Department, Tourism and Hospitality (FM)  Senior Lecturer (FST)  Senior Lecturer (FM)  Head of Department, Design and Engineering (FST)  Academic Business Intelligence Manager  Senior Lecturer (FMC)  Head of Education & Professional Practice, Law (FMC) |

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Arvid Thorkeldsen  Prof Tiantian Zhang | Director of Undergraduate Programmes, Anglo European  College of Chiropractic (AECC)  Head of the Graduate School (GS) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **2** | **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 1ST FEBRUARY 2017** |
|  |  |
| **2.1** | **Accuracy** |
|  |  |
| 2.1.1 | The Chair welcomed members to the meeting and introductions were made. Apologies were noted as above. |
|  |  |
| 2.1.2 | The minutes of 1st February 2017 were approved as an accurate record |
|  |  |
| **2.2** | **Matters Arising** |
|  |  |
| 2.2.1 | 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 95% now have profiles for (at least) programme leaders and the activity continues as the information is received from Faculties. Ms Fernandez and Dr Bobeva would continue to discuss 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 ongoing:** 100% of courses now included at least a short biography of the Programme Leader, plus a link through to their BRIAN profile.  The next stage was to expand the details to include core members of the teaching team working in liaison with the HoDs and Programme Leaders. This additional content would be added by 31May 2017. During this process we would also take note of further guidance from the new CMA report on what exactly should be added with regards to staff expertise. |
|  |  |
| 2.2.2 | Minute 3.1.3 (7 Dec 2016) - 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.*  *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 ongoing:** The revised report was to be presented at May’s meeting of ASC. A Graduate School Academic Manager would be in attendance to present the report. |
|  |  |
| 2.2.3 | Minute 3.1.5 (7 Dec 2016) 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.*  *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 ongoing:** The revised report was to be presented at May’s meeting of ASC. A Graduate School Academic Manager would be in attendance to present the report. |
|  |  |
| 2.2.4 | Minute 3.3.5.8 (7 Dec 2016) 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 FQR template.*  *This action will be progressed with the Deputy Deans Education & Professional Practice (DDEPPs) by the end of March 2017.*  **Action ongoing:** This item was superseded by Agenda item ASC-1617-71. |
|  |  |
| 2.2.5 | Minute 3.4.1.2 (7 Dec 2016) Partner Quality Report – Bournemouth & Poole College  *Members agreed it would be helpful to know which programmes had been included in the NSS. The College had been requested to update the report with this information.*  *Ms Mack reported that the query was currently with the College.*  **Action completed:** The programmes included in the 2015/16 NSS survey were as follows; FdA Business & Management, FdSc Business Computing, FdSc Computing with Networking, FdSc CGI, BSc CGI, FdA Professional Culinary Arts and FdA Tourism & Events Management. |
|  |  |
| 2.2.6 | Minute 3.4.1.4 (7 Dec 2016) Partner Quality Report – Bournemouth & Poole College  *Queries about attrition rates had been sent to BPC for further clarification.*  *Ms Mack reported that the query was currently with the College.*  **Action completed:** The attrition rates for the stated programmes were identified in the SED and ensuing Action Plan.  These actions were monitored regularly and the current retention rates for these programmes were as follows; FdA Business & Management - 91%, FdA Computing (previously Business Computing and Computing with Networking) 96%, FdA Tourism & Events Management - Not applicable - Year 1 intake suspended. |
|  |  |
| 2.2.7 | Minute 2.4.2 (1 Feb 2017) – Debate Topics  *Members were asked to send their suggestions for future debate items to the Committee Clerk by 28 February 2017.*  **Action completed:** Agenda item ASC-1617-68 |
|  |  |
| 2.2.8 | Minute 4.1.3.1 (1 Feb 2017) – Trailing Fails  *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 completed:** Agenda item ASC-1617-72 |
|  |  |
| 2.2.9 | Minute 4.1.5.2 (1 Feb 2017) – Trailing Fails  *To update any Regulations and Policies that would be impacted by the implementation of carrying credit for approval at the next Committee meeting.*  **Action completed:** Agenda item ASC-1617-72 |
|  |  |
| 2.2.10 | Minute 4.1.6.1 (1 Feb 2017) – Trailing Fails  *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 completed:** Agenda item ASC-1617-72 |
|  |  |
| 2.2.11 | Minute 4.1.7.1 (1 Feb 2017) – Trailing Fails  *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 completed:** Agenda item ASC-1617-72 |
|  |  |
| 2.2.12 | Minute 4.1.10.1 (1 Feb 2017) – Trailing Fails  *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 completed:** Agenda item ASC-1617-72 |
|  |  |
| 2.2.13 | Minute 4.3.1 (1 Feb 2017) – Pending External Examiner Appointments  *The completed nomination forms for MSc Medical Ultrasound, MA Radio Production and the suite of LLB (Hons) programmes to be sent to Academic Quality (AQ) for approval.*  **Action completed:**  AECC:Completed nomination form for MSc Medical Ultrasound sent to AQ 16.2.17.  FMC:The nomination form for MA Radio Production had been received by AQ and was being reviewed by two members of QAEG.    Law - Clare Jones was approved as an examiner for LLB Law. The current examiner was covering additional units in Law to cover the gap for 2017; however, a new examiner would need to be nominated as their appointment expired in September 2017. |
|  |  |
| 2.2.14 | Minute 4.3.3 (1 Feb 2017) – Pending External Examiner Appointments  *AQ to check whether the non-academic nomination for MA Digital Effects, MA 3D Computer Animation and MSc Computer Animation and Visual Effects programmes could be processed whilst a candidate for the academic External Examiner vacancy was being sought from the existing pool of External Examiners.*  **Action completed:** Academic and non-academic External Examiner nominations had been received by AQ. A mentor for the academic nomination was requested and had been submitted to AQ for approval. |
|  |  |
| **2.3** | **Declarations of Interest** |
|  |  |
| 2.3.1 | No declarations of interest were received. |
|  |  |
| **3** | **PART ONE: FOR DEBATE AND DISCUSSION** |
|  |  |
| **3.1** | **Debate Item: Approaches to inter-disciplinary learning and engagement** (ASC-1617-68) |
|  |  |
| 3.1.1 | The Committee received a presentation on the approaches to inter-disciplinary learning and engagement. The presentation included an example of an inter-professional education project delivered at the University from 2005 for social work, nursing, midwifery, operating department practice, occupational therapy, physiotherapy, community work, and paramedic science students. The aims of the project were to break down stereotypes and integrate each of the healthcare professions together. A particular challenge of the project was to ensure the facilitation of meaningful inter-professional learning, whilst managing the structural complexities associated with large student numbers and multi-site teaching. A simulated community was created, known as ‘Wessex Bay’, as a learning resource to enable inter-professional learning around real-life case studies. Evaluation of the project showed a mixed reaction from staff and students. The project had since been developed into a more uni-professional focussed approach. |
|  |  |
| 3.1.2. | Professor Rosser noted that healthcare professions were very hierarchal, so encouraging inter-professional learning was a positive way for students to learn about the different professions on an equal basis instead of the hierarchal setting they would experience in practice. |
|  |  |
| 3.1.3 | The Committee debated the various reasons for and against inter-disciplinary learning approaches. Professor McConnell considered that offering students the opportunity to develop knowledge and application of different disciplines would help to prepare graduates for employment as there was a growing requirement for employees to work within inter-disciplinary teams. Ms Barron noted that the possibility of developing soft skills through inter-disciplinary learning was equally as important for graduates as subject specific skills. Whilst acknowledging that inter-disciplinary learning could be positive for graduates, Professor Phalp considered that there was still a requirement for single-discipline degrees, especially where PSRBs were involved with accreditation. There was a perception that opening a single-discipline degree to incorporate components from other disciplines was inhibiting the knowledge base that students required for employment within certain disciplines, such as Computer Science. |
|  |  |
| 3.1.4 | There was some discussion about whether inter-disciplinary learning should be discipline-specific so students could learn how to respond to challenges that directly transcended from their discipline of study. Professor Rosser noted that certain professions did not always naturally align to a discipline of study. For example, Social Workers did not perceive themselves as aligning to healthcare professions, but rather to professions such as the Police and Social Services. Professor Hundley considered that it would be restrictive to suggest inter-disciplinary opportunities should only be limited to disciplines of study or areas of natural alignment. She added that there were a number of excellent examples of innovative collaboration between different disciplines at the University. For example, an engineering student working with both engineering and health care supervisors had developed an epidural simulator. |
|  |  |
| 3.1.5 | It was considered that there were a number of ways to enable inter-disciplinary learning without the need to require radical structural changes, such as the option of embedding collaborative projects within single-discipline degrees. However, it was agreed that structural change could be facilitated to foster inter and multi-disciplinary programme development that would allow flexibility in programmes should the University wish to pursue this route. |
|  |  |
| 3.1.6 | The Chair noted that as part of the Teaching Excellence (TEF) Year 2 narrative there was a requirement to better track the employment destination of students after they graduated from the University, in their careers both within and outwith of the discipline in which they had studied. It was suggested that a better understanding of employment routes was important to indicate how successful the University was in providing flexible learning opportunities, and agile careers, for students since employment the evidence and studies including those from UKCES illustrated that the careers of those now graduating from the University sector would have careers that encompassed a larger number of jobs/roles, and perhaps directions, than previous generations. |
|  |  |
| **4** | **Institutional Monitoring** |
|  |  |
| 4.1 | **Student Population Statistics** (ASC-1617-69) |
|  |  |
| 4.1.1 | The Committee noted that there was a marked difference between Continue/Qualify rates based on entry qualification type. For 2015/16, the Continue/Qualify rate for students with A/AS Level Qualification was 90.8%, whilst it was 82.1% for other Level 3 Diplomas, which were primarily dominated by BTEC qualifications. By the time students reached Final Outcomes, the gap had widened considerably with the average Continue/Qualify rate being 85% for AS/A Level students and 68% for other Level 3 Diplomas. Dr Sheridan reported that Continue/Qualify and Final Outcome rates varied little by Tariff points with an almost flat 3-year trend line. It was considered that troughs in the trend were influenced by large proportions of BTEC students. The Chair suggested that the results could be attributed to the University’s mode of pedagogy delivery, which was not facilitating learning as well for students who entered with other Level 3 Diplomas. This warranted further reflection and attention by colleagues throughout the University. |
|  |  |
| 4.1.2 | Analysis of degree classification indicated a loose correlation between Tariff points and entry qualification type, with an approximate gap of 50 Tariff points across each classification for A/AS Level qualifications and other Level 3 Diplomas. Professor Phalp considered that the learning experiences between these students was different and could have contributed to these results. For example, it was noted that the majority of BTEC programmes did not offer examinations. It was considered that the University should focus on better preparing students for changes in learning styles, whilst being aware of the need to cater for a more diverse selection of entrants. |
|  |  |
| 4.1.3 | Ms Barron suggested that it would be beneficial to investigate the demographics of students entering with other Level 3 Diplomas as there might be a number of students that required additional general and academic support. In particular, Dr Sheridan was asked to provide a further analysis of the performance data against Widening Participation Flags and BME categories.  **Action: LS** |
|  |  |
| 4.1.4 | Although the overall average Tariff points on entry for students being awarded a First Class degree had risen by 8.5 points, the Committee noted that the proportion of First and Upper Second Class degrees being awarded had fallen slightly for the first time in 10 years from 77.6% in 2014/15 to 77.0% in 2015/16. There were concerns that the decrease was the result of academics not utilising the full range of marks available for assessment. Although the proportion of First and Upper Second Class degrees being awarded had decreased for 2015/16, Dr Sheridan considered that it would be difficult to determine whether stringent marking was the reason for the decrease until an additional year’s worth of data had been collected. The Chair requested that this matter be kept under a watching brief. |
|  |  |
| 4.1.5 | The report indicated that the proportion of students gaining a Merit or Distinction for MSc and MA programmes had increased since 2014/15. However, it was noted that the proportion of students who were awarded a Distinction on an MSc programme had decreased from 24.3% in 2014/15 to 21.8% in 2015/16, whereas the proportion of students awarded a Distinction on an MA programme had risen from 21.7% in 2014/15 to 23.7% in 2015/16. Dr Sheridan reported that numbers were small for each award type and did not include data for January starts. It was considered that it would be more beneficial to analyse postgraduate classification by Department rather than award type as this would provide a larger data-set and help to smooth some of the issues with smaller numbers. It was noted that programmes were not currently linked to Departments in SITS which was causing issues in generating data. Dr Osborne confirmed that Departmental data were being quality checked in a test environment and would be available once the SITS upgrade was complete. Dr Sheridan was asked to expand the postgraduate classification data to include January starts and amalgamate data from the different award types.  **Action: LS** |
|  |  |
| 4.1.6 | The Chair asked the Deputy Deans Education and Professional Practice (DDEPP) to disseminate the findings of the report within their Faculty.  **Action: DDEPPs** |
|  |  |
| 4.2 | **Academic Quality Annual Report 2015/16** (ASC-1617-70) |
|  |  |
| 4.2.1 | The Committee noted that there had been a decrease in concerns raised by External Examiners compared to data recorded for 2014/15. It was considered that the report suggested that a large number of issues had been raised by External Examiners for 2014/15, whereas numbers were actually low (27 in 2014/15) and had reduced further to 4 in 2015/16. Also, the issues raised were not of a significant nature, i.e. they were not related to the academic standards of awards. It was requested that the decrease in concerns was more clearly expressed within the report.  **Action: WC** |
|  |  |
| 4.2.2 | It was further noted that the analysis of External Examiners reports indicated that the assessment process had been well managed in 2015/16 and that the outputs from this process aligned with sector expectations. In addition, External Examiners had confirmed that issues and recommendations reported in the previous round had been appropriately addressed by academic teams. |
|  |  |
| 4.2.3 | The Committee was pleased to note the conclusions of the report; that academic standards had been maintained for the University’s academic provision during the reporting period, and the University had exercised its degree awarding powers appropriately. The Chair noted that these results were as expected and any areas of concerns would have indicated failures in the effectiveness of the University’s quality assurance processes. |
|  |  |
| 4.2.4 | **Approved:** In order to provide added assurance, the Committee approved the report’s recommendations and requested that an update was provided at Academic Standards Committee (ASC) on 31 May 2017.  **Action: WC** |
|  |  |
| 4.3 | **Annual Monitoring and Enhancement Review** (ASC-1617-71) |
|  |  |
| 4.3.1 | The paper sought approval for the underlying principles relating to a revised model for annual programme monitoring which would replace the existing processes set out in *5C – Continuous Monitoring of Taught Academic Provision: Policy and Procedure*. |
|  |  |
| 4.3.2 | Ms Mack reported that there had been an increased emphasis on the effective use of data to better evidence impact and outcomes. The proposed model was an opportunity to reconsider the existing annual programme monitoring processes by developing a more holistic approach whereby quality and enhancement monitoring, review, and action planning were fully integrated, based on clearly defined and agreed thresholds and targets. It also presented an opportunity to address some of the data gaps identified through the University’s work to develop the TEF Year 2 narrative. |
|  |  |
| 4.3.3 | Based on refinements to the existing annual programme monitoring processes, the proposed model would adopt a similar data-driven approach to annual monitoring through the development of a Programme Dashboard. The Dashboard would build upon existing KPIs and PIs, whilst incorporating an agreed set of core metrics and other metrics which could change on a periodic basis depending on institutional priorities. The Dashboard would be RAG rated based on agreed thresholds and targets, with Programme Teams developing an Action Plan based on these ratings. There would be a greater emphasis on Heads of Department (HoD) to oversee the proposed model. In particular, HoDs would be responsible for approving the programme level Actions Plans, and developing a concise Department Summary and Action Plan. A Faculty level review would continue to be conducted by the DDEPPs, leading to a succinct Faculty Summary and Action Plan. The proposed model would fully integrate the existing Faculty Quality Report (FQR) and Education and Student Experience Plan (ESEP) into one holistic, succinct plan. It was hoped that the proposed model would bring a greater focus and clarity of purpose to annual monitoring; reduce the potential for duplication and ensure that Faculty level targets explicitly aligned to each other; and reduce the administrative burden for Programme Teams and Senior Management. |
|  |  |
| 4.3.4 | The Committee was in support of the proposal for HoDs to have a greater role and responsibility for overseeing the revised monitoring model, and considered that it would be an excellent opportunity to ensure a sense of ownership at Departmental level, which had not fully been embedded through the existing annual monitoring process. |
|  |  |
| 4.3.5 | Professor Rosser queried what data-sets would be used to facilitate the Programme Dashboard, as it was considered that a high level understanding of the areas of risk at Departmental level would be required to ensure a succinct Faculty Summary and Action Plan. Ms Mack reported that the proposed model would focus on data-sets that could be used to evidence impact and outcomes as it was difficult to evaluate and measure the impact of action taken on key data measures with the existing process. She added that the Dashboard would continue to include the measurement of established KPIs and PIs, whilst identifying new measures which could be changed depending on their effectiveness of measuring impact. |
|  |  |
| 4.3.6 | There was some discussion about whether the revised monitoring model should continue to apply to both undergraduate (UG) and postgraduate taught (PGT) provision. Dr Dyer noted that the existing annual monitoring process did not align with PGT provision. Specifically, the existing timeline meant that results from the Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES) were not available before the ESEPs were produced. As a result, ESEPs were reflecting on data from the previous year. Dr Main considered that PTES could be administered at different times to align with the UG timeline, and raised concerns that the monitoring of PGT provision on a different timeline could result in further issues. The Chair requested that further consideration was given to whether PGT should be based on the same timeline as UG provision, or whether this should be modified to allow key data, such as outcomes, to be reviewed in a more timely way.  **Action: JM** |
|  |  |
| 4.3.7 | Ms Mack reported that she would have further discussions with the DDEPPs to help progress the revised monitoring model to ensure that the model was in place for the 2016/17 cycle. It was requested that a more detailed proposal was submitted at ASC on 31 May 2017.  **Action: JM** |
|  |  |
| 4.3.8 | **Approved:** The Committee approved the underlying principles relating to a revised model for annual programme monitoring. |
|  |  |
| **5** | **PART TWO – FOR APPROVAL AND ENDORSEMENT** |
|  |  |
| **5.1** | **Carrying Credit** (ASC-1617-72) |
|  |  |
| 5.1.1 | Following the approval of the underlying principles of ‘carrying credit’ by Senate in February 2016 a more detailed proposal was taken to ASC in May 2016 and again in February 2017. At the February 2017 meeting, the Committee requested that a number of recommendations were revisited in consultation with the Quality Assurance Standing Group (QASG). The paper sought consideration and approval on proposed recommendations regarding the introduction of ‘carrying credit’ with a view for implementation from 2017/18 onwards. |
|  |  |
| 5.1.2 | Recommendation (a) – Failed units should be replaced with units of an equivalent value at a higher level to enable certain intermediate awards, but where this occurred a classification was not awarded.  Members of QASG were in support of the recommendation for failed units to be replaced with units of an equivalent value at a higher level to enable certain intermediate awards. Ms Forrest reported that there was little currency across the sector in awarding a classification for an intermediate award, and students would benefit from being able to gain an intermediate award under a more flexible credit structure which they were currently not able to do. |
|  |  |
| 5.1.2.1 | **Approved:** The Committee approved the recommendation to replace failed units with units of an equivalent value at a higher level to enable certain intermediate awards, but to remove classification where this occurred. |
|  |  |
| 5.1.3 | Recommendation (b) – To approve institutional definitions for ‘repeating with attendance’ and ‘carrying credit’.  The paper noted that the University did not have agreed definitions for what was meant to repeat ‘with’ or ‘without attendance’. The introduction of ‘carrying credit’ required these terms to be clearly defined to ensure the consistency in relation to the fee applied for a repeated unit, access to support and resources, and the student experience. Members of QASG considered that a separate definition was not required. Instead, it was suggested that it would be beneficial to have separate definitions for ‘Repeating’ and ‘Carrying Credit’. |
|  |  |
| 5.1.3.1 | Under the proposed definitions, students who were ‘Repeating’ would be required to attend all lectures and seminars, whereas students ‘Carrying Credit’ would not be given the option to attend lectures or seminars. The Committee considered that students should be given the option to attend lecturers or seminars if they wished to do so, regardless of whether they were ‘Repeating’ or ‘Carrying Credit’. This would help to ensure that all students received the support required to retrieve failed credit. In addition, it was also considered that it would be a greater cost in terms of time and effort to academic support if students who were ‘Carrying Credit’ were unable to attend lecturers or seminars. It was requested that the statements regarding students’ attendance for ‘Repeating’ and ‘Carrying Credit' were revisited to make clear that students had the option to attend lectures or seminars. It was noted that this would be dependent on timetable commitments for those students who were ‘Carrying Credit’. |
|  |  |
| 5.1.3.2 | **Action:** To revisit the statements regarding students’ attendance for ‘Repeating’ and ‘Carrying Credit' to make clear that students had the option to attend lectures or seminars, depending on timetable commitments for those students who were ‘Carrying Credit’.  **Action: JF** |
|  |  |
| 5.1.4 | Recommendation (c) – To approve updates to *6A – Standard Assessment Regulations: Undergraduate Programmes* to clarify that students were allowed four attempts to retrieve credit.  Ms Forrest reported that 6A - *Standard Assessment Regulations: Undergraduate Programmes* had been updated to make clear that following any subsequent failure of trailed units, students would be allowed one further opportunity to be reassessed, enabling four attempts in total. |
|  |  |
| 5.1.4.1 | **Approved:** The Committee approved the updates to 6A - *Standard Assessment Regulations: Undergraduate Programmes.* |
|  |  |
| 5.1.5 | Recommendation (d) – Credit cannot be carried into the final stage (Level 7) of an Integrated Masters programme in line with existing progression requirements.  Members of QASG were broadly in favour with the principle to allow credit to be carried from Level 6 to Level 7 of an Integrated Masters programme, as indicated by sector research. However, Ms Forrest explained that the University’s Standard Regulations for Integrated Masters awards precluded the option to allow credit to be carried between levels, with specific rules around the requirement for students to achieve 120 credits at each level of study with an overall aggregate mark of 50% in order to progress to Level 7. Given the additional academic requirements for Learning Outcomes (LO) at Level 7 and the need to ensure students’ preparedness to successfully complete the final year of an Integrated Master’s programme, the Committee approved the recommendation that progression to Level 7 for an Integrated Masters should not allow credit to be carried from Level 6 into Level 7. However, in order to ensure consistency in applying the new policy for ‘Carrying Credit’, it was agreed that credit could be carried only between Levels 4 and 5 and Levels 5 and 6 of an Integrated Masters award. |
|  |  |
| 5.1.5.1 | **Approved:** The Committee approved the recommendation that credit could not be carried into Level 7 of an Integrated Masters programme. |
|  |  |
| 5.1.6 | Recommendation (e) – Updates to Regulations and Policies that would be impacted by the implementation of ‘Carrying Credit’ were approved, and recommended to Senate for full approval.  The Committee noted that the following University regulations had been updated to make reference to carrying credit and revised award structures:   * *2A – Awards of Bournemouth University: Policy* * *2B – Programme Structure and Curriculum Design Characteristics: Procedure* * *6A – Standard Assessment Regulations: Undergraduate Programmes* * *6A - Standard Assessment Regulations: Integrated Masters Programmes* * *6L – Assessment Board Decision-Making, Including the Implementation of Assessment Regulations Procedure* |
|  |  |
| 5.1.6.1 | **Approved:** The Committee approved updates to Regulations and Policies that were impacted by the implementation of ‘Carrying Credit’, and recommended to Senate for full approval. |
|  |  |
| 5.2 | **Partner Quality Report – Yeovil College** (ASC-1617-73) |
|  |  |
| 5.2.1 | The Committee noted the Yeovil College Partner Quality Report. No significant issues were identified. |
|  |  |
| 5.2.2 | **Approved**: The Committee approved the Yeovil College Partner Quality Report. |
|  |  |
| **5.3** | **Quality Assurance & Enhancement Group (QAEG) – New nominations Received** (ASC-1617-74) |
|  |  |
| 5.3.1 | **Approved:** The Committee approved the following nominations for QAEG membership:   * Anneyce Knight (FHSS) * Dr Georgiana Grigore (FMC) * Dr Evi Karathanasopoulou (FMC) * Philip Mathews (FMC) * Dr Jamie Matthews (FMC) * Dr Kate Murphy (FMC) * Dr Shelley Thompson (FMC) * Dr Ashley Woodfall (FMC) |
|  |  |
| **5.4** | **Pending External Examiner Appointments** (ASC-1617-75) |
|  |  |
| 5.4.1 | The Committee noted that Academic Quality (AQ) had been unable to process the academic and non-academic External Examiner nominations for the MA Digital Effects, MA 3D Computer Animation, MSc Computer Animation and Visual Effects, Dprof Digital Media and EngD Digital Media programmes as the Faculty had been required to nominate a mentor to support the academic nomination. Dr Dyer reported that a mentor had been identified and had been submitted to AQ for approval. |
|  |  |
| 5.4.2 | Ms Forrest reported that the academic External Examiner nomination for MA Radio Production was in the process of being reviewed by two members of QAEG. |
|  |  |
| 5.4.3 | It was also reported that AQ were still awaiting an External Examiner nomination from the Faculty of Health and Social Sciences (FHSS) for BSc (Hons) Adult Nursing.  **Action: ER** |
|  |  |
| 5.4.4 | The Chair noted that it was imperative for External Examiner nominations to be progressed as a matter of urgency to ensure that all programmes had Examiners appropriately in place for the 2016/17 academic cycle. |
|  |  |
| 5.5 | **External Examiner Nominations and Examination Teams for Research Degrees** (ASC-1617-76) |
|  |  |
| 5.5.1 | **Ratified:** The Committee ratified the recently appointed External Examiners and Examination Teams for Research Degrees. |
|  |  |
| 5.6 | **Faculty Quality Audit** (ASC-1617-77) |
|  |  |
| 5.6.1 | Ms Chow reported that the University was in the second cycle of the Faculty Quality Audit (FQA) process. The Committee had already received audit reports and associated Action  Plans for the Faculty of Management (FM), Faculty of Media and Communication (FMC) and Faculty of Science and Technology (FST). |
|  |  |
| 5.6.2 | Given that there was a greater emphasis on the analysis and evaluation of data outputs for the purposes of meeting external reporting requirements, the paper recommended that Academic Services reviewed the existing FQA methodology for consideration by ASC. As there were no issues arising from the FHSS annual monitoring data, it was also recommended that the FHSS FQA be postponed until Semester 1 2017/18 so this could be subject to the revised FQA methodology. |
|  |  |
| 5.6.3 | **Approved:** The Committee approved the recommendation to develop a revised FQA methodology for implementation in 2017/18.  **Action: WC** |
|  |  |
| 5.6.4 | **Approved:** The Committee approved the recommendation to postpone the FHSS FQA until Semester 1 2017/18, so this could be subject to the revised FQA methodology. |
|  |  |
| **5.7** | **New Programme/Framework Development Proposals** |
|  |  |
| 5.7.1 | **Faculty of Management: New Programme Proposal: MSc Tourism Marketing Management** (ASC-1617-78) |
|  |  |
| 5.7.1.1 | The proposal was to close the existing MSc Tourism Management and Marketing programme and introduce MSc Tourism Marketing Management. The proposal was part of the Department’s strategic reorganisation of UG and PGT provision to improve position, marketability and appeal. |
|  |  |
| 5.7.1.2 | Mr Foot noted that the Market Research demonstrated that the proposed programme title would be well understood and appeal to prospective students as it was the most typical title used in combined marketing-management programmes. |
|  |  |
| 5.7.1.3 | Dr Bobeva queried how the proposed programme would compete with the existing MSc Marketing Management programme offered within the Faculty. The Team noted that the MSc Marketing Management programme had a generic curriculum, whereas the proposed programme would have a greater emphasis on tourism marketing management. Dr Main reported that the Faculty Executive was in support of two similar programmes being delivered within the Faculty. |
|  |  |
| 5.7.1.4 | The Chair noted that there was a risk in changing the programme title as the Market Research indicated that the existing programme was the highest recruiting full-time PGT tourism marketing programme in 2014/15 and the second highest recruiting programme in 2013/14. The Team queried these figures as their latest admission data indicated that enrolment was in consistent decline. The Team considered that the proposed programme title would help to increase enrolment as the new title would help to differentiate the programme from competitors. |
|  |  |
| 5.7.1.5 | **Approved:** The Committee approved the proposed MSc Tourism Marketing and Management programme for development. |
|  |  |
| 5.7.2 | **Faculty of Management: New Programme Proposal: MSc Food and Hospitality Innovations Management** (ASC-1617-79) |
|  |  |
| 5.7.2.1 | The proposal was to close the existing MSc Hotel and Food Services Management programme and introduce MSc Food and Hospitality Innovations Management. The proposal was part of the Department’s strategic reorganisation of UG and PGT provision to improve position, marketability and appeal. |
|  |  |
| 5.7.2.2 | The Team reported that the existing programme had a history of low recruitment as the title did not make it clear whether the programme was offering hotel management studies with a food service element, or whether the programme was intended for students with an interest in food services management. The new programme was designed to address the needs of market demand and offered a stronger focus on food services management, which had experienced a significant growth and resilience. |
|  |  |
| 5.7.2.3 | The Committee raised concerns with the proposed programme title. In particular, the title suggested that the focus of the programme was about managing innovation in food and hospitality. However, this was not reflected within the programme content, with only one unit title relating to ‘Innovation Management’. |
|  |  |
| 5.7.2.4 | Ms Mack queried why the proposed programme title did not include ‘international’ as the Market Research indicated that this term was used in the majority of competitor titles to emphasise the applicability of the programme to international students. The Team reported that internationalism was core to the programme content and ‘international’ was not included as it was hoped that having ‘Food’ as the first word in the title would encourage applicants searching for food-related programmes. |
|  |  |
| 5.7.2.5 | Mr Foot reported that the programme proposal had been circulated to regional marketing managers as standard practice. He continued to add that an unusually large number of responses had been received with regards to the proposed programme title. Specifically, it was considered that the title would not resonate, and in a number of cases applicants would not understand the meaning of ‘Innovation’. |
|  |  |
| 5.7.2.6 | **Not approved:** The Committee did not approve the proposed MSc Food and Hospitality Innovations Management programme. The Chair noted that there were a number of concerns with the programme title and Market Research that would require further consideration. |
|  |  |
| 5.7.3 | **Faculty of Media and Communication: New Programme Proposal: BSc (Hons) Politics and Economics** (ASC-1617-80) |
|  |  |
| 5.7.3.1 | The proposal for the BA (Hons) Politics and Economics programme was part of the strategic, planned expansion of the existing politics provision. The proposal was the first of several designed to complement the existing UG politics portfolio. |
|  |  |
| 5.7.3.2 | Market research demonstrated a healthy market for UG politics programmes, with a consistently growing market. It was reported that 75% of the University’s competitors also offered a similar politics and economic combination. |
|  |  |
| 5.7.3.3 | There had been two graduating cohorts from the existing politics programme. Although numbers were small, it was reported that the majority of graduates had either progressed on to further study or research, or had been employed within politics related professions. |
|  |  |
| 5.7.3.4 | **Approved:** The Committee approved the proposed BA (Hons) Politics and Economics for development. |
|  |  |
| 5.7.4 | **Faculty of Science and Technology: New Programme Proposal: BEng (Hons) Mechanical Engineering; BEng (Hons) Engineering**  (ASC-1617-81) |
|  |  |
| 5.7.4.1 | The proposal was to approve standalone BEng (Hons) Mechanical Engineering and BEng (Hons) Engineering awards as these titles were only available as intermediate awards from the MEng (Hons) programmes. The Programme Leader reported that the development of these programmes was expected to widen the pool of applicants for the engineering degrees, whilst having little impact on resources as the BEng and MEng (Hons) programmes were identical between Levels 4 and Level 6. As part of the development, it was intended that the part-time BEng (Hons) programme would form the academic element of a degree apprenticeship. |
|  |  |
| 5.7.4.2 | **Approved:** The Committee approved the proposed BEng (Hons) Mechanical Engineering and BEng (Hons) Engineering programmes for development. |
|  |  |
| 5.7.4.3 | **Approved:** The Committee approved the request for a shortened approval process. Specifically, the proposals would be considered for approval at Faculty level through an extended Internal Faculty Consideration event. |
|  |  |
| 5.7.5 | **Faculty of Science and Technology: New Programme Proposal: BA (Hons) Music Production; BSc (Hons) Music and Sound Engineering** (ASC-1617-82) |
|  |  |
| 5.7.5.1 | The proposal was to close the existing Music Technology provision within FST and introduce two new programmes: BA (Hons) Music Production and BSc (Hons) Music and Sound Engineering. The rationale for the new programmes was to increase recruitment and graduate employability through delineating the existing provision into two clearer distinct markets, whilst developing a degree that supported the planned new facilities in the Poole Gateway building. |
|  |  |
| 5.7.5.2 | The Market Research indicated that it was difficult to distinguish between the most relevant titles as a range of terminology was used across sound/music technology programmes. ‘Sound design/Sound arts’ was the most common term used, with half of the closest competitors using this term. Mr Foot queried why the term ‘Sound’ was omitted from the title of the BA (Hons) Music Production programme as the content was music and media focussed. It was considered that including ‘Sound’ in the title would align closely with the proposed BSc (Hons) Music and Sound Engineering programme, and would help to attract students from music and media production contexts. The Team reported that the programme titles would be reconsidered through the approval process. |
|  |  |
| 5.7.5.3 | Data from the Destinations of Leavers from Higher Education (DLHE) survey for the Department indicated that graduate employment was below benchmark figures. The Team reported that the new provision would help to improve graduate employability as students would be required to develop a skillset across a wider context than the existing programmes. |
|  |  |
| 5.7.5.4 | **Approved:** The Committee approved the proposed BA (Hons) Music Production and BSc (Hons) Music and Sound Engineering programme for development. |
|  |  |
| 5.8 | **Programme/Framework Review Deferral Requests** |
|  |  |
| 5.8.1 | **Faculty of Health and Social Sciences Deferral: Learning and Assessing units** (ASC-1617-83) |
|  |  |
| 5.8.1.1 | The Learning and Assessing units were due for periodic review by the University and the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) by August 2017. The NMC had advised that it was currently at the early stages of reviewing their learning and assessing standards. An automatic extension had been granted to the University’s existing Learning and Assessing units until 31st August 2019. As a result, the Faculty requested that the date for review was deferred to align with the NMC timescales. |
|  |  |
| 5.8.1.2 | **Approved:** The Committee approved the deferral of review for a further two years from 31st August 2017 to 31st August 2019. |
|  |  |
| 5.8.2 | **Faculty of Media and Communication Deferral: LLB Pathways, LPC and CPE** (ASC-1617-84) |
|  |  |
| 5.8.2.1 | The LLB Pathways, LPC and CPE programmes were due for periodic review during 2016/17. The Committee noted that the Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA) and Bar Standards Board were compiling a new assessment framework that was due to be implemented from September 2018. As a result, the Faculty requested that the date for review was deferred by one year to align with the SRA and Bar Standards Board timescales. |
|  |  |
| 5.8.2.2 | **Approved:** The Committee approved the deferral of review for a further one year from 2016/17 to 2017/18. |
|  |  |
| **6** | **PART THREE – FOR NOTE** |
|  |  |
| 6.1 | **Sector Consultations Update** (ASC-1617-85) |
|  |  |
| 6.2 | The Committee noted key items from the update. Ms Chow reported that a particular area of interest that might impact the University was the ongoing work in the sector to promote accelerated degrees. It was also reported that Ofsted would be responsible for inspecting the quality of degree apprenticeships from Level 2 to Level 5. |
|  |  |
| **7** | **Noted:** The Committee noted the update. |
|  |  |
| **7.1** | **International & UK Partnerships Committee Minutes** (ASC-1617-87) |
|  |  |
| 7.1.1 | **Noted:** The Committee noted the report. |
|  |  |
| **7.2** | **Partnership Board Minutes** (ASC-1617-88) |
|  |  |
| 7.2.1 | **Noted:** The Committee noted the reports. |
|  |  |
| **7.3** | **Quality Assurance Standing Group Minutes** (ASC-1617-89) |
|  |  |
| 7.3.1 | **Noted:** The Committee noted the reports. |
|  |  |
| **7.4** | **Faculty Academic Standards Committee Minutes** (ASC-1617-90) |
|  |  |
| 7.4.1 | **Noted:** The Committee noted the reports. |
|  |  |
| **8** | **Graduate School Academic Board Minutes of 18 January 2017** (ASC-1617-91) |
|  |  |
| 8.1 | **Noted:** The Committee noted the report. |
|  |  |
| **9** | **AECC Academic Development & Quality Committee Minutes of 1 March 2017** (ASC-1617-92) |
|  |  |
| 9.1 | **Noted:** The Committee noted the report. |
|  |  |
| **10** | **ANY OTHER BUSINESS** |
|  |  |
| **11** | **DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING** |
|  |  |
| 11.1 | Wednesday 31st May 2017 at 1.00pm in the Board Room |