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Apologies:

Apologies had been received from:
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1. **Welcome and Introductions**

The Chair welcomed the group to the meeting and introductions were made. Apologies were

noted as above.
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|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **2.** | **Minutes of Previous Meeting held on 27 March 2017** |
| 2.1 | Accuracy |
|  |  |
| 2.1.22.1.32.1.4 | The Committee received a statement from Dr Osborne to provide clarification for paragraph 3.2.10: Dr Osborne confirmed that there was an action from the agreed plan circulated previously at ESEC that timetabling in relation to placements should be modelled in 2016/17 to inform understanding of the implications for scheduling in 2017/18 when the new deadline would be in place. At the meeting on 27 March 2017, Ms Barron queried how the placement update given by Mr Jones related to timetabling and in her statement Dr Osborne confirmed that the update provided covered a different body of work and not the action requested. Mr Jones agreed to provide an update on the required action at the next ESEC. Ms Barron and Mr Jones agreed to discuss the content of the other activities highlighted by Mr Jones outside the meeting. Also under the action log update for this, it is stated that Dr Osborne had worked with Ms Barron and Ms Sarah Green on this, however Ms Barron had not had any further involvement.With this amendment, the minutes were **approved** as an accurate record of the meeting.  |
| 2.2 | Matters Arising |
| 2.2.1 | Minute 2.2.4 - Virtual Mobility |
| 2.2.2 | *It was noted that it would be useful to have guidance on types of virtual mobility that improve employability. The mobility team was currently undertaking work in collaboration with stakeholders internally and externally to agree a definition for virtual mobility and an international experience without travelling abroad. Although a further update was to be provided when the information has been collated, no-one from the Team attended the March or May ESEC meetings and there was no update supplied.* |
|  | **Action Ongoing:** As the deadline for the publication of Induction Guidance had been set for 1 August 2017, the Chair requested an update to be sent to him expediently in order to give Academic staff the opportunity to be involved. **Action: J Kuncova** |
| 2.2.3 | Minute 3.1.8 Annual Report - Appeals and Complaints*Ms Chow and Ms Peckham would re-examine any discrepancies in the data outside of the meeting and the impact these may have on the conclusions and recommendations of the Annual Report on Appeals and Complaints for 2016.* |
|  | **Action Completed:** The 2015 data for academic appeals has been reviewed. It has emerged that in 2015, 28 FST academic appeal cases had been recorded locally but not reported for central record keeping (i.e. via Unit-e). ESEC noted that the corrected number of academic appeals cases for FST in 2015 should be 68 (66 UG and 2 PG). This now indicated that academic appeals for FST has increased by 3% between 2015 (68) and 2016 (70). The Committee noted also that the total number of academic appeals lodged with the University in 2015 should be corrected to 225. In light of this, the number of appeals received by the University has increased by 10% between 2015 and 2016, not 40% as reported at the previous meeting. It was recommended that the Annual Report for Appeals & Complaints (2016) be updated to reflect this.  |
| 2.2.4 | Minute 3.1.9 Annual Report - Appeals and Complaints |
|  | *Ms Barron highlighted Section 6.2 of the report regarding the increase in the number of students applying for parking permits. Ms Barron reported that Student Services was not responsible for issuing parking permits, therefore Ms Barron would provide a suggested form of words for inclusion in the report.* |
|  | **Action Completed:** Suggest rewording of Section 6.2 in the report to: “In the 2015 reporting period ‘car parking’ appeals were included in the data for non-academic appeals. The renaming of these cases from an appeal to ‘Car Parking Reviews’ means that car parking appeals are no longer subject to an appeal process and have been removed from this document. However, for clarity, there has been an increase in the number of students applying for permits”. |
| 2.2.5 | Minute 3.1.11 Annual Report - Appeals and Complaints |
|  | *With regards to the recommendations 1-4, Ms Chow advised that where data was already available these would be actioned in time for reporting to the next meeting of ESEC. This would take into account any data discrepancies in relation to FST academic appeals in 2015.* |
|  | **Action Completed:** The NSS scores for the Assessment & Feedback section were reviewed for programmes. The comparison undertaken of NSS scores for the Assessment & Feedback section for programmes which had attracted a high number of appeals (i.e. ≥ 10 academic appeals in 2016) did not provide conclusive indication that there was a direct correlation between a high number of appeals and low NSS scores at programme level. This was based on a sample size of three programmes:* BA (Hons) Accounting/Finance Framework
* BSc (Hons) Computing Framework
* BSc (Hons) Psychology

It should be noted that, across the majority of programmes, student satisfaction with the promptness of feedback and the quality of that feedback tended to be lower than other areas tested by the NSS. Taking the BA (Hons) Accounting/Finance Framework as an example; this programme recorded 13 academic appeals in 2016. The overall student satisfaction score was 80 but the satisfaction in relation to feedback ranged from 41 to 56. The poor student satisfaction for feedback may not be linked with academic appeals as, 7 of the 13 appeals received for this programmes were based on mitigating circumstances rather than factors which may indicate that there had been systemic issues with the assessment process. The appeals data for 2015 was re-examined to capture details regarding outcomes. The updated summary of statistical data for appeals was received by ESEC for information. (See Appendix 1).Of the 53 academic appeals received by FM in 2016, 22 (42%) of these related to two programmes of study; BA (Hons) Accounting/Finance Framework (13) and BA (Hons) Business Studies (9). The majority of these appeals were based on mitigating circumstances. Of the 70 academic appeals received by FST in 2016, 24 (34%) of these related to two programmes of study; BSc (Hons) Computing Framework (10) and BSc (Hons) Psychology (14). 17 of these appeals related to mitigating circumstances. The review of AECC appeals data for 2016 was ongoing and would be reported to the next meeting of ESEC.The data discrepancies in relation to FST academic appeals in 2015 has been addressed as part of the response to item 3.1.8 above. It was recommended that the Annual Report for Appeals & Complaints (2016) be updated to take into account this information. Prof Rosser added that FHSS were working closely with AECC and making considerable efforts to improve the student experience. |
|  |  |
| 2.2.6 | Minute 3.1.12 - Annual Report: Appeals and Complaints |
|  | I*t was noted that next most cited reason for appeals was Material Irregularities. Ms Chow confirmed that Material Irregularities related to procedural errors which had a material impact on the student. The Chair requested that Ms Chow should revisit this category and see how many of the academic appeals citing this ground had been upheld in 2016.* |
|  | **Action Completed**: The distribution of appeals upheld on the grounds that there has been a Material Irregularity or significant administrative error in the assessment process (G1) is detailed in the table below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number of appeals upheld or partially upheld on grounds relating to material irregularity or significant administrative error (G1) | Number of appeals on the grounds of ‘G1’  |
|  | UG | PG |
| FHSS | 1 | 0 | 5 |
| FM | 1 | 0 | 9 |
| FMC | 5 | 1 upheld2 partially upheld | 20 |
| FST | 4  | 2 upheld1 partially upheld | 8 |
| BU | 11 | 3 upheld 3 partially upheld | 42 |

The University received 42 academic appeals on the grounds of ‘G1’ in 2016 and upheld or partially upheld 17 of these. This represents 7% of the total number of academic appeals received by the University in 2016. For this same reporting period, 86 academic appeals had been upheld or partially upheld; therefore 20% of the academic appeals upheld or partially upheld in 2016 had been due to a procedural or administrative error on the part of the University. It was recommended that the Annual Report for Appeals & Complaints (2016) be updated to take into account this information and that performance data of this kind be examined for academic appeals in 2017.  |
| 2.2.7 | 3.3.13 Annual Report - Appeals & Complaints |
|  | *It was noted that the University had met the published timescales for providing responses to students within 20 days for Central Review Stage for 72.4% of the academic appeals received in 2016. The Chair requested further information regarding the 27.6% of academic appeals where the University had taken more than 20 days to respond to the student at Central Review Stage. Ms Chow agreed to revisit the data and provide more detailed analysis of this area to the next meeting of ESEC.* |
|  | **Action Completed:** ESEC noted a correction to this data. 46 (79%) academic appeals took 20 days or less to complete at Central Review Stage in 2016. Of the 12 (21%) academic appeals which took more than 20 days to complete at Central Review Stage, 8 were resolved between 20-25 days; the remaining four were resolved between 25–30 days. It was recommended that the Annual Report for Appeals & Complaints (2016) be updated to take into account this information.  |
| 2.2.8 | Minute 3.1.14 - Annual Report: Appeals & Complaints |
|  | *The Chair requested clarification on instances where the OIA had asked the University to reconsider its decision making. Ms Chow explained that no decisions arising from the University’s mechanisms for considering appeals and complaints had been formally overturned by the OIA. The OIA had invited the University to consider settling with the student on three occasions. The Chair was interested in seeing a comparison with the previous year’s information.*  |
|  | **Action Completed:** It was confirmed that the OIA had invited the University to settle on one occasion in 2015. |
|  |  |
| 2.2.9 | Minute 3.2.6 - Unified Calendar |
|  | *Ms Peckham referred to the course validation process listed under ‘Issues’ within the paper and advised that a Faculty Executive Consideration Form and a Briefing and Resources document both included sections for resource consideration during course development. Mr Jones agreed to look into this.* |
|  | **Action Completed:** Discussion opened up with Ms Peckham and the Project BA. The issue was raised by Faculty staff during stakeholder workshops. The issue would be addressed outside of the scope of the project (as it is not in the Project scope) and would be removed from the Project RAIDs analysis.  |
| 2.2.10 | Minute 3.2.7 – Unified Calendar |
|  | *Ms Mack questioned the Dependencies List and the reference made to an EDQ project. Ms Mack requested some clarification the details of this project, especially as EDQ no longer existed. It was expected that this may refer to the SITs work stream. Mr Jones agreed to follow this question up and to also amend EDQ to read Academic Quality.*  |
|  | **Action Completed:** Clarification from the UC project business analyst sent to Ms Mack (31 March). During the UC Stakeholder Workshops it was noted that currently, unit information that was produced for Academic Quality was not stored in a database. The AQ team were exploring options for where this information could be stored, and this information be passed to facilitate timetabling, as this has different attributes than that which is held in SITS. It might also be that this information can be enhanced in SITS, but that has yet to be determined. This is an emergent theme that was not being addressed within the scope of the Unified Calendar Project.  |
| 2.2.11 | Minute 3.2.10 - Placements |
|  | *Ms Barron queried how this relates to timetables and Dr Osborne explained it was a timetable action that was outstanding; to look at giving students longer to decide on their timetable when considering their placement attendance. Ms Barron and Mr Jones agreed to discuss this further outside the meeting. It was anticipated this action would be completed by April 2017. Mr Jones would check with Sarah Green on the progress of action completion by January 2018.* |
|  | **Action Ongoing:** Action co-ordinated with Ms Barron, Ms Green and (originally) Dr Osborne. Following the implementation of the automated option choice selection process via SITS and the confirmation of planned release periods for students’ timetables, opportunities and limitations relating to confirmation or extension of the Placements Decision date (currently 31 August 2017) will be considered and reported on by the end of July 2017.  |
|  |   |
|  | **PART 1: FOR DISCUSSION** |
| 3.1 | Debate Item: Student Involvement in the Assignment Development Process |
|  |  |
| 3.1.13.1.23.1.33.1.43.1.53.1.63.1.73.1.83.1.93.1.103.1.11 | Mr Swanson started the debate with a presentation which proposed that student engagement should be sought in assessment design wherever possible. Prof Rosser shared her experience of involving first year students in a discussion of whether their assignment had been appropriately designed to assess their learning. Initially, this had generated positive feedback and useful input to the process for developing assignments. However, subsequent cohorts had queried whether they were best placed to comment on the appropriateness of an assignment as it was considered to be the responsibility of academic staff to make that evaluation based on their experience and academic judgement. Prof Rosser questioned whether co-creation activities of this kind would have worked better with second year students rather than first year.Dr Ryland commented that he had involved second year PALS with an assignment for first year students. Although only a small proportion of the second years engaged with this, it was considered to be a good approach as it had provided opportunity to have the discussion with students. Dr Dyer advised FMC had similar experiences; it was noted that there had been a PREP exercise within the Faculty involving academics and FHSS confirmed they still involve someone outside the unit. Dr Curtis commented that it could be a chance to develop skills as academics led the discussion and providing direction in this way can be valuable to both students and academics. Ms Barron recognised the potential of student input for the structure of assignment as the ALS team found that students with learning difficulties can struggle with academic and convoluted language when assessment requirements are not specified in clear terms.Dr Stillman asked if students were designing their own assignments rather than for the next cohort. Prof Rosser advised when designing a new assignment, there is an assumption that requirements are clear and it is fit for purpose however, it can be the case that students are better at defining assignments in ways that will be understood by a student audience, whereas academics could phrase and structure assignments in ways that could be open to interpretation. It was argued that there was an advantage to asking students to shape assignments. Dr Stillman asked if there were any general principles students find valuable, for example, was there a difference for the areas they enjoyed when given a range of topics with the same ILOs. Mr Swanson gave the example of a cohort advocating handing work in on Fridays rather than Mondays and that students can assist with the design of assignments. The Chair referred to feedback via SimOn and Mr Swanson commented that, with reduced criteria and specification, assignments can be better scheduled and include more concise assignment briefs.Dr Porter asked if the quality of feedback is of more importance to students that the wording of any assignment. The Chair advised evidence suggests that it was both the wording of assignments, the number of assignments, and that students wanted good quality feedback.Dr Roushan advised timing can be an issue, as at the time the assignment is set, students often have not done all that was needed to engage with the assignment, e.g. the MUSE survey timing where students should have covered enough but actually have not. However, re-iterating aspects of the assignment weekly, as part of delivery of the unit material, students can learn more about terminology and overcome any ambiguity in the way that assessment requirements are phrased.Prof Rosser advised that FHSS have fewer exams and experienced academics share the ideology of students reaching their potential rather than simply being right or wrong. Students were considered to be creators of excellence and academics were in place to provide encouragement and support. She reported the view that where assignment wording was too specific it could limit/narrow students in demonstrating their level of achievement for that subject area. There was a danger of being too prescriptive. Dr Ryland commented that there could be an issue with timing when students were struggling with reviews and deadlines. With regards to the quality of the briefing, students say staff do not always go through the assignment but may simply refer students to “P6 of the handbook” when they should invest more time and effort into explaining the brief, perhaps through innovative means such as a Podcast. The value of taking more time to better prepare students was recognised and in doing so may create greater understanding. It also provided students with the opportunity to become a full partner in their learning, as described in the Student Charter.The Chair commented that learning is a process which assessments form a part of. It appeared that the assessment part of this process, as encapsulated by the issuing and marking of assignments, was sometimes over-emphasised at the expense of learning process. The boundary of knowledge is to show what students can achieve using learning as a process, and to allow space for creative excellence.From her experience of working within CPD, Prof Rosser commented that the learning experience from this area was very different from experiences for traditional undergraduate students. For younger undergraduate students to develop experience, to challenge, inspire and read, academic programmes and assignments need to be designed to encourage and support these activities which represents the learning opportunities we wish to provide. Employment on the other hand represented the chance to use the skills that have been learnt. Dr Curtis commented that there may be a need to remind students how they learn i.e. as an audio or visual learner.The Chair suggested we would come back to this later in the academic cycle as some of this debate will help and inform further discussion. In order for the learning process to be effective, it was apparent that there was a need to find a happy pedagogic medium for staff and students. Feedback has been that students often do not understand the assessment vehicle and it represents a burden that has not been effectively addressed yet. In order to achieve the University’s ambition to deliver excellence for the student learning experience, there was a need to increase the quality of the learning process. The Chair concluded that there would be further discussion on this theme, particularly with regards to how improvements can be achieved within 12-18 months.The Chair thanked the presenters. |
| 3.2 | Widening Participation Annual Report |
| 3.2.13.2.2 | The Committee received the annual report and noted the following in particular:* Funds allocated to HE were being spent within schools and it was questioned whether this was cross funding of government monies. It was confirmed a letter had been issued by the Government confirming such funding was permissible.
* The role of Student Ambassadors and the value this brings not only to the community and University but also the students too.
* The landscape was changing and metrics were being used more.
* The Chair advised that we are on the cusp of change with the Fair Access Agreement 2017-18 awaiting final approval from the Office of Fair Access on 31 July. The 2018-19 version would be more specific; at present we generally met the criteria for section 1.6 but now at least four additional items will be included compared to two years ago (2016/17 FAA). This is increasingly complex and a new way of thinking was needed with regard to how to meet milestones with the new targets focussing on groups within the institution and possible changes to procedures. The Chair was happy to provide more information on the outcome of any changes to the procedures in due course. Given the necessity for a new approach to this area of work, the University was looking to replace FAAMG with a strategic group.
* Low Participation Neighbourhood – it was questioned if the marketing was based on the school or the students’ home address and it is believed to be home address.
* Support for disabled students –the conundrum was if people did not submit a bid, payment cannot be made. However, Ms Barron confirmed there is a lot of core funding available for disabled students which is for projects and additional money; therefore needs are met for these students.

**Endorsed:** The report was endorsed by the Committee. |
| 3.3 | Annual Review: Postgraduate Taught (PGT) Framework Review |
| 3.3.13.3.23.3.3 | Dr Knight explained that responsibility for the PGT Framework had now moved to the Global Engagement Team, and that it had been renamed as the Global Talent Programme. Dr Knight reported on completed engagement figures which showed a reduction from the previous year. She confirmed that the establishment of the new Doctoral College took effect from 1 May 2017.The Chair thanked Dr Knight for the previous years’ contribution to this area of work and in particular the supporting of students. **Noted:** The report was noted by the Committee. |
|  |  |
| 3.43.4.1 | Review of Education & Student Experience Plans (ESEPs)The Chair introduced this section of the meeting as a chance to review and reflect on achievements and delivery against plans that had been formed at the beginning of the academic cycle. |
|  | Faculty of Management ESEP |
| 3.4.23.4.33.4.43.4.53.4.6 | Dr Main summarised that the ESEP had changed during the year, in part due to completing activities. FM have been adapting their quality processes and staff have participated in the “i-Innovate” scheme with a high take up although data collection difficulties were experienced with repeated requests for the same information. There has been an extra innovation to increase staff engagement in AACSB Assessment of Learning (AOL) by introducing monthly ‘Orange Wednesdays’ for all Departments. In terms of Curriculum Development, work has taken place but the Faculty would like to propose postponement of some programme reviews scheduled for next year due to the need for stability in the portfolio due to the AACSB review. In terms of supporting students, there had been changes driven in part by fewer people wanting assistance and the need for suitable mentors. In response to the Chair’s concerns that students who needed support were able to access this, Dr Main assured the Committee that everyone who needed support did receive it but the Faculty was looking to address this situation going forward.Whilst work had been undertaken for every student, at some point, to be taught by a Professor and FESEC suggests they are nearly at 100% for this target, it was commented that a Professor may not always necessarily be the best person to teach first year students. Mr Ryland advised they are aware of some staff not receiving high MUSE scores and are working with them for improvements.Mr Cooke confirmed PALs and Student Reps are different roles and not interchangeable. Dr Main explained that on one particular occasion, they had asked Student Reps to attend seminar groups to share what had been achieved whilst the second year PAL Leader met with the first year students. Mr Cooke explained there was potential for confusion if both PALs and Student Reps attend the same meetings. It was noted PALs can apply to become Student Reps if they stand down from their PAL role. Dr Main advised there would be a review over the summer to improve the channel of feedback because often students were not aware issues had been resolved so continued to raise them. Mr Cooke advised there was a new tool currently in development with Dr Osborne to address this kind of concern and he was happy to work with Dr Main to resolve issues for FM. Dr White advised that previously there had been multiple platforms from which students could get feedback on issues they have raised but with this tool starting in September, students should have a ‘one stop shop’ for receiving news and updates.The Chair commented that the report was a good honest reflection of the challenges FM had encountered and the progress it had made with addressing these.  |
|  | Faculty of Health & Social Sciences ESEP |
| 3.4.7 | Prof Rosser summarised their achievements at the end of the first year as embedding new Departments with ESEPs embedded into “business as usual” activities. The focus had been on enhanced communication, developing a cultural/sense of belonging at BU and of empowering Programme Leaders to work through any programme issues. MUSE scores are very good, some exceptional; there have been institutional factors which have impacted students such as IT issues and organisational restructures across the University. The Faculty has worked closely to address and overcome major changes as they have been embedded in the University. Programme Leaders are working through issues identified to ensure future success. |
|  | Faculty of Media & Communications ESEP |
| 3.4.83.4.93.4.10 | Dr Dyer focused on the work for HEA Fellowship with a lot of mentoring involved and work in progress on curriculum development. NSS scores had been largely the same as the previous year with ongoing work including MUSE and involving academics and HoDs to ensure that enhancements were made and NSS scores rose. PTES results had been good and areas have been identified for action.In terms of student mental health and well-being, there was a real need for staff development in supporting students and she highly recommended the training available, especially for new staff. Ms Barron had provided a Faculty training session and Ms Morgan was working to pull all the parts of the jigsaw together to deliver improvements.Ms Morgan spoke to their work on the student experience including restructuring orientation to really support students; working with students at transition points - the Faculty Student Transition Group would meet throughout the year and were considering, for example, the Placement Handbook, “Your Role, Your Career”; working with other teams such as CEL and SUBU and targeting training for Student Reps to encourage learning in different ways. |
|  | Faculty of Science and Technology ESEP |
| 3.4.113.4.12 | Dr McGhee summarised the Faculty’s achievements including work to share best practice across Departments; improved communications whilst looking at assignments, assessments and improving the Three Week Assessment Turnaround. FST had planned to extend the successful attendance monitoring approach (of students logging in via their phones) to other Departments, but have technical issues which are delaying the ability to roll this out. Ms Barron advised caution of only focussing on attendance when exploring issues relating to students’ engagement with their learning. Dr Main advised they had found the best use of attendance data was to share this with students to help them make informed decisions about their level of engagement with their studies. Committee members discussed how data is used and in other universities. Dr Roushan commented that students, often Level 4, have fed back they feel they are cared for if their absence is noted whilst other students feel their attendance is recognised and noted rather than absence. On this basis, attendance data, when viewed alongside performance data, could be used to encourage better engagement from students at Level 4. One of the Student Representatives advised that if students were aware lectures cost £160.00 (based on tuition fees) perhaps they would be more willing to attend. Ms Morgan stated that the University should also consider poor delivery in lectures as a factor influencing student attendance and engagement. The Chair recognised both aspects of this discussion for improving delivery and student attendance in this well-informed discussion.  |
|  | Doctoral College (DC) ESEP |
| 3.4.133.4.14 | Dr Knight advised the DC was running the PTES this year and response rates are currently low; and they are seeking Faculty support although PRES results appeared satisfactory. Quality Assurance is being reviewed to see what can be done better or streamlined and they are looking to improve the experience of the PGR community, in particular how this can be better celebrated. Work is underway to help Faculties improve PGR numbers and data will be provided quarterly (e.g. recruitment, admissions etc.).In response to Prof Porter’s question concerning supervisory teams, Dr Knight advised work was in hand for how to improve supervisor up-skilling including CPD. |
|  | Professional Services ESEPs |
| 3.4.15 | Academic Services: Ms Mack advised there was still a lot of work going on during this academic year; the ESEP was a good summary of achievements and areas of focus. |
| 3.4.16 | CEL: Prof Holley summarised CEL’s achievements, future projects and asked Committee members to advise CEL on what it can do to support the work of the Faculties. The Committee noted commendations for Mr Swanson on the way he had worked with CEL and his valued contribution to its projects. |
| 3.4.17 | Estates: Mr Jones summarised the highlights as being: the Fusion Building coming online and the teaching that was being undertaken within it; no negative feedback regarding the bus contract; in terms of sustainability, the University has achieved ISO 14001 and is in the top band of universities; there has been good work with SUBU and to improve communications, information boards were put up around campus giving updates about building works.An issue for next year was whether the bus service was sustainable and the bus company wanted the University to purchase another bus; this may not be affordable. |
| 3.4.18 | IT Services: Mr Ward summarised that in addition to the work already delivered this year, there were currently 114 IT projects some of which were quite large. He confirmed that all were progressing. Mr Ward advised approval has just been given to increase the number of computers in the Library and they will be working with Estates for the associated needs to implement this. There were also plans to extend the student laptop scheme to Lansdowne. |
| 3.4.19 | Marketing & Communication: Ms Fernandez summarised four key areas:* The number of students receiving the placement newsletter had risen to 1400 and evaluation work will be conducted to ensure it was meeting audience needs;
* Focus Groups for both Postgraduate and Undergraduate students took place in May to better understand preferred channels of communication, given the volume of information students receive. This would be a theme of work for the coming year;
* NSS had closed and the response rate this year was 74.6%
* Graduation Ceremony costs – the contract for gowns etc. was currently being re-tendered with the aim of reducing the costs of graduation and adding extra value for students and their families.
 |
| 3.4.20 | Student Services: Ms Barron summarised the key successes this year as RESLife and the joined up approach this had created for the welfare and wellbeing of first year students; the staff development for programme leaders and academic staff had increased confidence in the level of support being provided and had contributed to a more integrated approach to supporting students. |
| 3.4.213.4.22 | The Chair thanked Faculties and Professional Services for their myriad of efforts to ultimately improve the student experience. There was evidence that the students and University had been well served this year.**Noted:**  The Faculty ESEPs and Professional Services ESEPs were noted. |
| 3.5 | Annual Review of Key Performance Indicators/Performance Indicators |
| 3.5.13.5.23.5.33.5.43.5.53.5.63.5.7 | The Chair reported that the paper circulated for this meeting was the latest review and would be presented to the University Board on 5 May; many of the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)/Performance Indicators (PIs) have moved positively.KP11 – Academic Strength had significantly improved and without the capping applied when a target had been met, the performance for this KPI had been greater than 100%.PI6 (Academic staff with teaching qualifications and/who are HEA Fellows) and PI2 (UG students undertaking sandwich out or short placement) are both areas which have room for improvement in terms of our performance.The Chair explained that where our performance/achievement was nearer our targets, the marginal gains were small but overall performance is healthy.Mr Swanson queried the “employability” indicator and the Chair explained it was a legacy target dating back to benchmarked performance in 2012. The target was reviewed each summer with the acceptance that data continuity will be lost if there are too many changes.Dr Main discussed PI6 and the need for the data to be cleansed as the picture was better than it looked with Department staff complying and, with the steps already in place, he anticipates FM meeting their target next year. Prof Holley confirmed the PG Cert was going through review this year and Dr Main was confident the number would rise.**Noted:** The Committee noted the paper. |
| 3.6 | SUBU President’s Report |
| 3.6.13.6.23.6.33.6.43.6.53.6.63.6.7 | The SUBU President’s Report was noted and the following additional points were highlighted:This year has been challenging but overall very productive for SUBU with a huge increase in student engagement at general meetings and the fresher’s fair had been ranked number one in the country. Recently, SUBU had been nominated for NUS’ Most Internationalised Union of the year for work with Global BU on internationalisation as well as the NDA (National Diversity Awards) nomination for LGBT Community Organisation Award.Mr Asaya advised that SUBU was working with students to encourage them to vote in the forthcoming General Election.The HE Bill had received Royal Assent with a delayed link to TEF and fees which Mr Asaya feels was due to student campaign and protests.Mr Asaya stated he was proud of what each SU VP has achieved to enhance the student experience at BU. Following on from this, the Committee was asked to note that Mr Swanson and Miss Larkins would be leaving at the end of the current academic year. Mr Asaya thanked them for their efforts and contributions to the work of SUBU.In response to how SUBU are measuring student engagement, Mr Asaya advised their meeting in November was the highest attended and Mr Cooke explained they are profiling students’ diversity when voting.**Noted**: The Committee noted the SU President’s Report. |
| **4.** | **PART 2: FOR APPROVAL AND ENDORSEMENT** |
| 4.1 | There were no items for approval or endorsement. |
|  |  |
| **5.** | **PART 3: FOR NOTE** |
| 5.1 | Centre for Excellence in Learning Update |
| 5.2 | Prof Holley asked for two items to be shared with Faculty and Professional Services teams:* The CELebrate 2017 Conference would be taking place on 13 June with the theme of Assessment & Feedback. Members were asked to encourage staff and students to submit abstracts e.g. co-presenting a workshop, present a paper or a poster. The closing date for abstracts had been set for Monday 8th May.
* The National Teaching Fellowship Scheme on 7 June 2017 would have Professor Sally Brown, Chair of the Association of National Teaching Fellows as the keynote speaker.
 |
|  |  |
| **6.** | **ANY OTHER BUSINESS** |
| 6.1 | V4L  |
| 6.1.1  | Dr Roushan had prepared an update as requested and as the meeting had overrun offered to send to the clerk to circulate to all attendees. The Chair agreed, thanking Dr Roushan for providing this. |
| 6.2 | SUBU |
| 6.2.1 | This meeting was to be Mr Cooke’s last meeting of ESEC as he would be leaving BU in June to take up a new post in Cornwall. |
| **7.** | **DATE OF NEXT MEETING** |
|  | Wednesday 27 September 2017 at 2.00pm in the Board Room |

 |  |

**Appendix 1: AMENDED STATISTICAL DATA FOR ACADEMIC APPEALS IN 2016**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2016 UG** | **2015 UG** |
| Total number of UG appeals  | Local Stage (Faculty/Partner) | Central Review Stage(University) | Hearing(University) | Total number of UG appeals | Local Stage(Faculty/Partner) | Central Review Stage (University) | Hearing(University) |
| Faculty/Partner |  | upheld | partially upheld | not upheld | upheld | partially upheld | not upheld | upheld | partially upheld | not upheld |  | upheld | Partially upheld | Not upheld | Upheld | Partially upheld | Not upheld | Upheld | Partially upheld | Not upheld |
| FHSS | 22 | 9 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 18 | 1 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FM | 53 | 17 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 26 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FMC | 41 | 7 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 6 | 2 | 33 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| FST | 70 | 24 | 3 | 41 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 66 | 19 | 2 | 39 | 2 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ***BU*** | ***186*** | ***57*** | ***3*** | ***117*** | ***0*** | ***2*** | ***29*** | ***0*** | ***1*** | ***0*** | ***182*** | ***69*** | ***7*** | ***98*** | ***4*** | ***2*** | ***33*** | ***0*** | ***1*** | ***0*** |
| AECC | 35 | 13 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 11 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BPC | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ***Partners*** | ***38*** | ***13*** | ***0*** | ***25*** | ***0*** | ***1*** | ***4*** | ***0*** | ***0*** | ***0*** | ***24*** | ***11*** | ***0*** | ***13*** | ***0*** | ***0*** | ***3*** | ***0*** | ***0*** | ***0*** |
| **Total** | **224** | **70** | **3** | **142** | **0** | **3** | **33** | **0** | **1** | **0** | **206** | **80** | **7** | **111** | **4** | **2** | **36** | **0** | **1** | **0** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2016 PG** | **2015 PG** |
| Total number of PG appeals  | Local Stage(Faculty/Partner) | Central Review Stage(University) | Hearing(University) | Total number of PG appeals | Local Stage (Faculty/Partner) | Central Review Stage(University) | Hearing (University) |
| *Faculty/Partner* |  | upheld | partially upheld | not upheld | upheld | partially upheld | not upheld | upheld | partially upheld | not upheld |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *FHSS* | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *FM* | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *FMC* | 8 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *FST* | 6 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ***BU*** | **20** | **5** | **2** | **12** | **0** | **0** | **1** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **19** | **2** | **0** | **17** | **0** | **1** | **6** | **0** | **0** | **0** |
| *Partners (AECC)* | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ***Total*** | **23** | **6** | **4** | **12** | **0** | **0** | **1** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **19** | **2** | **0** | **17** | **0** | **1** | **6** | **0** | **0** | **0** |