**Minutes of the meeting held on 16 November 2011 in PG10**

**Present:** Professor T McIntyre-Bhatty (Chair) Deputy Vice Chancellor (Student Experience,

Education and Professional Practice

Ms A Allerston School Student Experience Champion (BS)

Ms M Barron (Secretary) Head of Student Services

Ms F Cownie School Student Experience Champion (MS)

Dr B Dyer School Student Experience Champion (HSC)

Dr S Eccles Head of Education (MS)

Mr F Gerber Student Representative (Level H, ApSci)

Mr J Gusman Student Representative (Level I, MS)

Dr R Hill Acting Associate Dean Education (ApSci)

Mr T Horner SUBU President

Mr A Ireland Chair of Student Voice Committee

Mr A James SUBU General Manager

Ms J Jenkin Director of Student and Academic Services

Ms K Jones SUBU Vice President (Education)

Ms J Mack Academic Partnerships Manager

Dr K McGhee School Student Experience Champion (ApSci)

Ms J Taylor Educational Development and Quality Manager

Dr X Velay Deputy Dean (Education), DEC

Mr K Williamson Student Representative, Level H, DEC

**Observers:** Ms J Dawson, Nominated by the Chair of the Board

Ms M Mayer Nominated by the Chair of the Board

Ms C Wilkinson Platform Development Manager (attending in lieu of the Director of Estates and IT Services)

**In attendance:** Ms S Fereday (Clerk) Quality and Enhancement Officer

**Apologies:** Professor D Buhalis Senate Member

Dr M Humphreys Director of Estates and IT Services

Dr A Main School Student Experience Champion (DEC)

Ms J Quest Senate Member

Mr P Ryland Deputy Dean (Education), ST

Ms C Symonds School Student Experience Champion), ST
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1. **Welcome:** The Chair welcomed all attendees to the inaugural meeting of the Education

and Student Experience Committee (ESEC) which had been formed to replace the Education Enhancement Committee and Student Experience Committee.

1. **Terms of Reference:** ESEC’s Terms of Reference, as approved by Senate and circulated as Paper ESE/1112/01, were noted.
2. **Minutes of the last meeting of the Education Enhancement Committee (EEC):**

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 July 2011 were approved as an accurate record.

1. **Matters arising from the EEC minutes**

4.1 *(Minute 3):* A sub-group to be set up to review the set of graduate attributes and agree

agree the criteria to recruit and select students.

The Educational Development and Quality (EDQ) Manager reported that the sub-group had been convened and carried out the required work.

4.2 (*Minute 3):* A sub-group to be set up toreview School approaches to employer sponsorship and to plan for further developments such as professional body involvement during 2011-12.

**ACTION:** This action had yet to be completed. It was agreed that ESEC should be updated on progress at its July 2012 meeting.

4.3 *(Minute 3):* Review the requirements for an effective e-portfolio to support lifelong learning

The EDQ Manager reported that the Mahara system has been chosen for this use and its effectiveness would be reviewed later in the year.

**ACTION:** It was agreed that ESEC should be updated on the system’s effectiveness at its July 2012 meeting.

4.4 *(Minute 4):* Each School to confirm its chosen scheme of Peer Reflection of Education Practice (PREP) scheme and its leader at the next meeting.

Paper ESE/1112/04, which contained details of PREP schemes and their leaders for each School, was noted. Concern was raised that it was not clear in the paper that all PREP schemes would involve all staff, which had been the intention. Further information presented verbally at the meeting, however, clarified that all schemes would result in all staff sharing good practice across subject areas.

4.5 *(Minute 4):* EDQ to amend the PREP Policy and Procedure document to reflect the change in responsibility for the oversight of enhancement-related activities within Schools from the School Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee to the School Academic Board.

The EDQ Manager confirmed that this action had been completed.

4.6 *(Minute 5):* EDQ to circulate the key criteria of the National Teaching Fellowship Scheme to Schools.

The EDQ Manager confirmed that this action had been completed.
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4.7 *(Minute 5):* Schools to identify staff who met the National Teaching Fellowship Scheme criteria so that their nomination could be considered.

The EDQ Manager reported that Schools had responded and that two members of staff were being supported in their applications to the scheme in the current academic year.

4.8 *(Minute 5):* EDQ to review the University’s current position regarding the required teaching qualifications for staff who taught students.

The EDQ Manager stated that a report on the review would be ready to present at

the next meeting.

**ACTION:** It was agreed that the report should be submitted to the next meeting and a discussion item on the University’s position on teaching qualifications for staff should be added to the next Agenda.

4.9 *(Minute 5):* Graham Gibbs’s paper, “Dimensions of quality” to be circulated to committee members and the subject of teaching excellence to be placed on the next agenda.

The paper had been circulated to members of ESEC as Paper ESE/11/1213 and teaching excellence would be considered under Agenda Item 3.1 (See Minute 7).

4.10 *(Minute 5):* EDQ to develop a database of existing HEA Fellows, identify possible Fellows with the aim of increasing numbers, and to ensure all staff members registered for the Education Excellence programme were Fellows or would be by the end of the first year of the programme.

The EDQ Manager reported that further information from the Higher Education Academy was awaited in order to complete the actions although progress had been made.

**ACTION:** It was agreed that the EDQ Manager would update the Committee at the next meeting.

4.11 *(Minute 6):* Professor G Thomas and the EDQ Manager to discuss the format of the 2012 Education Enhancement Conference.

The EDQ Manager directed the meeting to Agenda Item 3.3 (Minute 10) where the conference would be discussed in more detail.

1. **Minutes of the last meeting of the Student Experience Committee (SEC)**

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 May 2011 were confirmed as a true record.

1. **Matters arising from the SEC minutes**

6.1*(Minute 1.1):* Use of the Executive Business Centre (EBC) by undergraduate students to be considered by the new Dean of the Business School following his appointment

The Dean of the Business School had sent a written response to the Committee, Paper ESE/1112/07. This emphasised the Executive Education nature of the building, whilst acknowledging that it was currently under-utilised and consideration could thus be given to allowing limited access by undergraduates until Executive Education use increased. The relatively poor teaching and learning accommodation offered in Bournemouth House, close to the EBC, was felt to exacerbate undergraduate
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dissatisfaction at the under-utilisation of EBC’s excellent facilities. The Committee felt that a timetable for introducing undergraduate use, at least in the short term, should be considered, based on an accurate picture of current usage. It was felt further support for increased undergraduate use might be forthcoming from postgraduate students who used the EBC and who might prefer a livelier atmosphere.

**ACTION:** It was agreed that the SUBU President would obtain the views of current postgraduate students who used the EBC in respect of expanding its use, in the short term, to undergraduate students.

**ACTION:** It was agreed that the Head of Estates and IT Services would review the current use of EBC and forward a report to the Chair.

**ACTION:** It was agreed that the Chair would forward the report of EBC usage to the Dean of the Business School and arrange for undergraduate use of the EBC to be discussed at ULT.

6.2*(Minute 2.2):* The Committee agreed to recommend to Senate that, in future years, PAL was a feature of all first year undergraduate provision.

The School Student Experience Champions had been asked to submit the PAL arrangements for 2011/2012 to the Committee and this had been circulated as Paper ESE/1112/08. It was noted that PAL was already well established in all Schools for Level C undergraduate students.

6.3 *(Minute 4.1):* Recommendation to Senate for approval of the Terms of Reference for the Student Voice Steering Group

Since the SEC meeting, it had been agreed that the Student Voice Steering Group should become a Committee, reporting to ESEC. The proposed new terms of reference would be discussed as Item 4.1 of the Agenda (See Minute 12).

6.4*(Minute 6.1):* A student petition proposing the introduction of receipts for all assignments was referred to the Project Team involved with online submission.

A written response had been submitted to the Committee as Paper ESE/1112/09. The response confirmed that for those assignments included in the on-line submission project in 2011/2012, automatic receipts would be provided. The SUBU representatives were concerned that this meant that most hand-ins were not receipted and could result in difficulties in cases of disputed non-submissions. While it was generally understood that such challenges were rare, it was an important issue for the students concerned. The Head of Student Services reported that receipting processes had been investigated in the past but rejected because of the loss of flexibility students would suffer in losing the ability to hand in work out of office hours, and the level of manpower required.

**ACTION:** It was agreed that the Head of Student Services would review assignment receipting practices in other universities.

**ACTION:** It was agreed that the SUBU President and School Student Experience Champions would report at the next meeting on the scale of the problem of disputed hand-ins.

6.5*(Minute 8.2):* The Head of Student Services to provide a summary of the Fitness to Study Procedure as a flow diagram.

The Committee noted the flow chart which had been circulated as Paper ESE/1112/10.

6.6*(Minute 9.4):* Consideration of using student names rather than number identifiers in student email addresses*.*

A written response from the Director of Estates and IT Services had been circulated as Paper ESE/1112/11. The Committee noted that, following a feasibility study, it was proposed that a range of options would be presented to ESEC at a later date. The solution was more complex than simply replacing the number with names as the identifier was linked to other Unit-e processes such as registration and would therefore likely be expensive to implement. Student members of the Committee did not consider name email addresses to be a high priority for students. It was agreed that no further action on this specific issue needed to be taken by the Committee but might form part of a wider debate on personalisation.

6.7 *(Minute 9.9):*Informal task group to be set up to prepare a paper describing the personalisation concept and offering a menu of options for action, to be submitted to the Committee and, following any approved amendment, submitted to the June 2011 meeting of Senate.

The Head of Student Services reported that the paper had been submitted to ULT. The paper covered a range of possible initiatives that would inform ongoing projects. It was agreed that no further action was required by the Committee at this time.

6.8 *(Minute 10.1):* The SUBU President’s suggestion of a University Newspaper to be forwarded to ULT for consideration.

The Head of Student Services reported that the idea was being pursued by ULT. It was agreed that no further action was required by the Committee.

1. **BU2018 Vision and Values**

Paper ESE/1112/12 was considered. This outlined the strategic planning which would support and underpin the BU 2018 Vision and Values. The Chair gave an oversight of the document and what it aimed to achieve and a discussion ensued. The Committee was asked to identify issues/emphases that could be incorporated into the document to strengthen it, and the following were put forward (not in any order):

1. More reference to the importance of “deep” learning, as identified in Graham

Gibbs’s paper (ESE/1112/13).

1. Personalisation of the student experience, including contact strategies
2. Possible mapping of the underpinning strategies against the identified values
3. KPIs reflecting fusion while making actions clearly identifiable and distinct
4. Expand reference to collaboration and sharing – across groups of staff, students and staff/students
5. More specific mention of “learning”
6. Interaction with the local and regional community as well as global community, eg, charities. Involvement currently relies on the actions of individuals; consideration of remission or secondment
7. Inclusion of reference to “high quality academic standards”
8. Recognition of the importance of Programme Coordinators
9. “Fused academics” might be better expressed and explained
10. Academic citizenship
11. Mention of the role of Student Experience Champions within Schools
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The Chair thanked the committee for its input. Its ideas, together with those of the wider university community collated following a series of open meetings, would be taken into consideration when redrafting the paper for further consultation.

A query was raised regarding the proposed target of teaching staff with a teaching and learning qualification (50% by 2015 and 80% by 2018) and whether the target should be 100%. The Chair explained that an achievable target had been set but the percentage target might increase over time.

1. **School 100 Day Plans**

All Schools reported that their 100 Day Plans had been implemented. School Executives would meet with ULT on 30 November 2011 to report progress in detail.

**ACTION:** It was agreed that the 100 Day plans should appear on the Agenda for the January 2012 meeting.

1. **Institutional Review of Higher Education Institutions in England and Northern Ireland by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA Review)**

Bournemouth University’s QAA review would take place in 2012/2013 with the main visit in June 2013. The EDQ Manager reported that the process was significantly different from earlier QAA reviews with a bigger focus on assuring quality and standards and with a greater number of judgments. The reviewers would be looking at evidence from 2011/2012 as well as 2012/2013 and therefore preparation for the review was already underway and raising awareness within Schools was ongoing.

**ACTION:** It was agreed that progress on the preparation for the QAA Review should appear on the agenda of future committee meetings.

1. **Fusion Seminar and Conference Programme**

The EDQ Manager reported that ULT had agreed a Fusion theme for a series of seminars and conference in 2011/2012. The series of events would start with a half-day seminar in December 2011, followed by a series of shorter seminars in January, February and March 2012, with an all day conference on 18 April 2012. A working group had been formed and would publicise further information as it became available.

1. **Recommendations from Academic Standards Committee (ASC)**

A recommendation from ASC’s meeting held on 19 October 2011 (circulated as Paper ESE/1112/14), was that the committee “consider programme cohort identity as part of any consideration of the Schools’ enhancement plans”. It was noted that the Schools’ 100 day plans included ways of re-positioning student identity at cohort level. Some members of the committee felt there was a connection between cohort or programme identity and the effectiveness of the Programme Coordinator. The importance of the Programme Coordinator role had been commented upon in Minute 7. The view was expressed that the status of Programme Coordinator had been put

under pressure of late by and the use of the word “Coordinator” rather than “Leader” and the introduction of Framework Leaders. The student representatives pointed to evidence that student identity with a programme did not exclude identity with the university, or with a School. It was agreed that ASC’s recommendation could be addressed by oversight of the 100 day plans and refinement of the Fusion document.

1. **Student Voice Committee Terms of Reference**

It was proposed that the Student Voice Steering Group be replaced by the Student Voice Committee which would report directly to the Education and Student Experience Committee. The proposed Terms of Reference had been circulated as Paper ESE/1112/15.

**ACTION:** It was agreed that the SUBU Sabbatical Officer for the Lansdowne site should be added to the list of members prior to recommending the terms of reference to Senate for approval.

1. **Professional Standards Framework**

The EDQ Manager reported that the Higher Education Academy’s new framework was now available with minor changes noted from the previous version. Work would be undertaken to map the framework against the Postgraduate Certificate in Education Practice currently offered by the university and against academic staff development more generally.

1. **Student Voice Steering Group Report**

The report had been circulated as Paper ESE/1112/19. Four recommendations were noted:

That PAL should be introduced and supported in all UG programmes. This had already been considered under Item 6.2.

1. That a core induction brief be produced to inform all Schools of the basic information to be provided during induction. It was noted that an Induction Project was underway for consideration by ULT. SUBU would be involved.
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1. Establish a protocol for Schools to respond to student emailed queries. Several Schools already had such protocols in place.

**ACTION:** It was agreed that the Chair of the Student Voice Committee (formerly Student Voice Steering Group), at the next meeting, would propose a protocol for all Schools to adopt.

1. Each School to consider introduction of a “you said, we did” / “listening to you” page on the students’ myBU community page for each School – where such a page existed.

**ACTION:** The Chair would discuss the proposal with Schools at the meetings to review the 100 Day Plans on 30 November 2011.

**KJ**

1. **Papers noted**

The following papers were accepted without comment:

1. SUBU President’s Report
2. Student Experience KPI update November 2011
3. Student Experience Programme Report
4. 2011 ISOP Evaluation Summary
5. 2010/2011 Student Counselling Service Report
6. Student Voice Steering Group minutes

**16. Any Other Business**

16.1The SUBU President raised his concern that the time scheduled for ESEC meetings would be insufficient to allow discussion in sufficient depth. The Chair responded that if committee members read all supporting papers prior the meetings, debate could be focused on those issues that required discussion, thereby using the time effectively and efficiently.

16.2 One of the Student Representatives asked if a Student Experience Survey (SES) would be implemented in 2011/1012. The Chair of the Student Voice Committee reported that it was proposed that an SES survey would take place around the same time as the NSS survey. The Student Voice Committee was aiming to increase the response rate and had discussed ways of doing so with SUBU.

16.3 The Committee Secretary reminded the Committee that all Committee papers should be submitted at least 10 days in advance of the meetings to allow Committee paper production far enough in advance to allow sufficient time for proper consideration.

16.4 It was noted that the Student Representatives present at the meeting did not include one from any of the Partner Institutions.

**ACTION:** The SUBU Vice President (Education) agreed to ensure that there was representation from a Partner Institution at the next and subsequent meetings.

**17. Date of Next Meeting:** 18 January 2012, 1430-1630 hours, the Boardroom.