**Minutes of the meeting held on 18 May 2016 at 10.00am in the Board Room**

Present:

Prof T McIntyre-Bhatty (Chair) Deputy Vice Chancellor

Ms P Peckham (Secretary) Faculty Academic Administration Manager (FST)

Ms M Frampton (Clerk) Policy and Committees Officer (AS)

Ms M Barron Head of Student Services (SS)

Dr B DyerDeputy Dean (Education & Professional Practice (FMC) and

Chair of the Student Voice Committee

Assoc Prof Genoveva Esteban Member of the Professoriate (FST)

Dr R Gunstone Senate Representative (FST)

Dr C Hunt Associate Dean (Student Experience) (FST)

Mr A James General Manager of the Students’ Union (SUBU)

Mr S Jones Head of Facilities Management

Ms A Lacey Student Representative Champion (HSS)

Mr J Leung Vice President (Activities) of the Students’ Union (SUBU)

Ms J Mack Head of Academic Services (AS)

Dr A Main Deputy Dean (Education & Professional Practice) (FM)

Ms E Mayo-Ward Vice President (Education) of the Students’ Union (SUBU)

Dr S Minocha Pro Vice-Chancellor (Global Engagement) (OVC)

Prof K Phalp Deputy Dean (Education & Professional Practice) (FST)

Mr R Pope Vice President (Welfare), Students’ Union (SUBU)

Dr G Roushan Chair of the Technology Enhanced Learning Strategy Forum

Dr P Ryland Associate Dean (Student Experience) (FM)

Ms C Schendel-Wilson SU President 2014/15, Students’ Union (SUBU)

Ms C Symonds Head of Quality and Academic Partnerships (AS)

Dr S White Senate Representative (HSS)

Prof T Zhang Head of the Graduate School (GS)

In attendance:

Ms S Carter Monitoring and Evaluation Analyst (AS) [Agenda Item 3.2]

Ms N Finnes Educational Development and Quality Manager (AS)

Mr S Honnoraty (Observer) Student Representative Champion (FMC)

Prof G Thomas Professor and Director of the Centre for Excellence in Learning (CEL)

Apologies:

Apologies had been received from:

Mr J Cooke Head of Student Engagement (SUBU)

Dr D Holley Centre for Excellence in Learning Representative

Mr S Laird Director of Estates

Canon Dr B Merrington University Chaplain

Dr C L Osborne Head of Academic Operations (OVC)

Prof E Rosser Deputy Dean (Education & Professional Practice) (HSS)

Prof C Shiel Professor (FST)

Ms D Sparrowhawk Faculty Director of Operations (HSS)

Mr J Ward Director of IT Services

1. **Welcome and Introductions**

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

**2. Minutes of Previous Meeting held on 5 April 2016**

2.1 Accuracy

The minutes were approved as an accurate record of the meeting.
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| |  |  | | --- | --- | | 2.2 | Matters Arising | | 2.2.1 | Minute 2.2.1 – Review of Education & Student Experience Plans (ESEPs) 2014/15 | |  | *The current University timetabling system and processes had been reviewed with completion being most likely in the 2017/18 academic year. Due to IT resources being allocated to directly support the SITS Project and with the Unified Calendar activity being dependent on the SITS solution being implemented, the Unified Calendar recommendation was de-scoped from the SJP. It was likely that the primary focus of the reshaped project would be to provide management information with the secondary benefit to student experience. The project was dependent on progress with SITS, so further enhancements to this aspect of the timetabling function would not be possible until 2017/18 AY at the earliest. The proposed recommendation comprises a two phased scoping exercise which would be handled and owned by the Project Management Office.* | |  | **Action Ongoing:** Further work was ongoing. An update would be available at the next meeting. | | 2.2.2 | Minute 2.2.2 – NSS Results – Early Publication of Timetables | |  | *Work would continue to implement the scheduling process and address any opportunities to improve both the quality and timing of the timetabling outputs. Faculties had identified a number of constraints which limited an earlier release than September e.g. class group allocation, new entrant, repeat student numbers and option choices, staff recruitment/staffing changes, Week One planning and course structure changes. The newly proposed date of placement decisions by 31 August compounds the current class group allocation and publication issue, by further increasing uncertainty around student numbers per course. A number of opportunities to enhance the outcome mid-process were also identified, which if adopted by Faculties should improve the overall process and outcomes for 2016/17.* | |  | **Action Ongoing:** Mr Jones confirmed that work was ongoing. Planned student timetable release dates were noted as:  FMC – w/c 5 September 2016  FM – w/c 5 September 2016  FHSS – Tuesday 30 August 2016  FST – w/c 5 September 2016  Members were requested to contact Mr Jones should any further discussion be required. | | 2.2.3 | Minute 3.1.12 – Debate Item – Sustainable Development – the responsibility of our colleagues in Estates, or an educative agenda? | |  | *DDEPPs were requested to encourage staff members to submit case studies to Prof Shiel which demonstrated good practice and excellence, and showed how sustainable development was being embedded into the curriculum and preparing learners to live and work sustainably. DDEPPs were requested to encourage discussion at FASC meetings around Sustainable Development.* | |  | **Action Completed:** DDEPPs confirmed that colleagues had been encouraged to put forward case studies. | | 2.2.4 | Minute 3.1.12 – Debate Item – Sustainable Development – the responsibility of our colleagues in Estates, or an educative agenda? | |  | *Prof Shiel agreed to circulate best practice to members.* | |  | **Action Completed:** The ESEC Clerk circulated a paper to members on 21 April 2016. | | 2.2.5 | Minute 3.1.9 – Debate Item – Solving Problems with Placements | |  | *With regards to the first bullet point in Section 3.2 of the paper, Mr Jones advised that this area would be a practical point to be addressed before the proposal moved forward. Dr Osborne confirmed she had met with Mr Jones and Ms Green to discuss the consequences of the bullet point listed within the paper and a Working Group had been set up to discuss implementation. Dr Osborne had also been liaising with multiple stakeholders in Faculties and relevant Professional Services to create an action plan for implementation. This would be circulated to Executive Deans and relevant Heads of Professional Services by mid-May.* | |  | **Action Ongoing:** Linda Ladle, Sarah Green and Dr Osborne had met with Faculty Placement Teams to discuss implementation. Further information would be available in due course. | | 2.2.6 | Minute 3.1.12 – Debate Item – Solving Problems with Placements | |  | *Mr Pope advised that students do feel the University could provide more communication during their placement year. Dr Holley had been working with Faculties to assist with carrying out some pilot initiatives. Dr Holley also confirmed that she had been successful in adding Blackboard ‘ConnecTXT’ (a bespoke SMS system) to the myBU ‘package’. IT Services and Blackboard were now working with Dr Holley to get the system embedded and operationalised. When testing was complete, CEL would invite Faculties to nominate pilot projects.*  **Action Ongoing:** ConnectTXT had now been installed on servers and was in the process of being tested. It was expected to ‘go live’ by the end of May. | |  | *Ms Barron had been working with M&C on a Placement students’ web page in addition to a number of other initiatives regarding the placement process. Student Services are the service owner for cross-university placement processes, although Faculties provide the specific pre and on placement support. As there would be a large amount of review activity regarding employability in the next academic year (PVC Global is UET lead) it would be best to deal with any of these issues through that mechanism rather than CEL working in parallel.* | |  | **Action Completed:** The Placement page was in draft format and would ‘go live’ shortly. An emergency contact card had been created which would be distributed to all WS students over the next few weeks (pre-placement). Work was also ongoing around updating pre-placement risk assessments and the employer handbook. Ms Barron was the service owner for cross-university placement activity and any developments which were not specific to an individual Faculty should be agreed with Ms Barron. | | 2.2.7 | Minute 3.2.1 – Updated ESEPs – IT Services ESEP | |  | *IT Services have been working with M&C to rollout the ‘single sign-on’ to multiple systems over a phased period. A further update on the preferred solution, a road map indicating which applications could be linked and project timescales would be discussed at the next meeting in April 2016.* | |  | **Action Ongoing:** Ms Fernandez would provide a further update after the Digital Vision Steering Group meeting in July 2016 when the roadmap and timescales were due to be discussed. Ms Mack advised that a draft timeline was now in place for implementation of the ‘single sign-on’. It was not clear whether the majority of ‘single sign-on’ work would be completed by September. Ms Mack would ask Ms Fernandez to provide an update to members.  **Action: JM** | | 2.2.8 | Minute 3.2.9 – Updated ESEPs – Student Support ESEP | |  | *BU does not have the capacity currently to hold accommodation for incoming exchange students, as the number of incoming students had increased significantly. The Committee agreed that a decision would need to be made imminently as to whether BU could hold a small void, irrespective of the number of beds within BU. Ms Barron confirmed that the University had housed 18 incoming exchange students in Semester 1 of 2015/16 and a further 25 in Semester 2 and the biggest challenge was the overlap of incoming and outgoing students which meant that the dates were not streamlined. By 2018 there would be more housing stock available which would allow more movement between semesters for both incoming and outgoing students provided the overlap issue could be addressed. Ms Barron would continue work on this issue.* | |  | **Action Ongoing:** As previously advised, further accommodation would not be available for some time as there was no quick solution. Ms Barron had however contacted all Faculties to discuss the issue of Semester 1 and 2 overlap and whether this could be addressed. Responses had been received from all Faculties but were yet to be looked into further. Ms Barron also advised that she would discuss the academic structures of incoming international students with the Academic Partnerships Team which may help with easing accommodation issues. | | 2.2.9 | Minute 3.2.10 – Updated ESEPs – Student Support ESEP | |  | *Members agreed that the Student Wellbeing initiative had been an excellent initiative. The Committee would be provided with a breakdown by Faculty at the end of the academic year.* | |  | **Action Ongoing:** This information would be provided at the September meeting of the Committee. | | 2.2.10 | Minute 3.6.7 – SUBU President’s Report | |  | *Discussions had been finalised with transport providers for the University and if further discussions were required they would need to take place imminently in order that further renegotiation could take place to accommodate Lansdowne based students. Ms Schendel-Wilson would advise Mr Jones the scale of the bus requirements issue and feed back to the Panel following further research.* | |  | **Action Ongoing:** Many Lansdowne based students had stated that they would like to take part in various activities at Talbot Campus, however the cost of transport was an issue and discussions were still ongoing with regards to transport for Lansdowne students. Ms Mayo-Ward advised that the Go Out And Talk (GOAT) Team would be carrying out research in October 2016, when the team would try to establish exactly what activities Lansdowne students wished to take part in.  Mr Jones advised that the new bus contract had been awarded to More Buses with enhancements to the timetable for next year; an extra bus would be provided and a new route would be introduced. | | 2.2.11 | Minute 5.2.2 – Annual Report: Multi Faith Chaplaincy | |  | *The Committee agreed that the University did provide good services to students, although it was not clear whether the Employee Assistance Programme (EAP) was providing a suitable service for staff members. An update would be provided.* | |  | **Action Completed:** The Committee were provided with a paper which showed a rolling overview of the EAP usage. While the initial figures looked small, the usage of the system for information, guidance and general research was probably higher than expected. The University would continue to do all that it could to publicise the EAP and certainly for those about to go through the formal consultation process linked to the SJP, each staff member would be given new sets of information on how to seek support from the EAP. | | 2.2.12 | Minute 5.2.5 – Annual Report: Multi Faith Chaplaincy | |  | *Dr White commented that some staff members had been interviewed and appointed from various departments across the University and were due to receive Dignity and Wellbeing Advisor (DWBA) training in order to provide confidential DWBA support to students. An update would be provided in due course.* | |  | **Action Completed:** The Dignity and Wellbeing Advisor training took place on 27 April 2016. | | 2.2.13 | Minute 3.1.5 – Annual Report: Appeals and Complaints | |  | *The FM had received 12 postgraduate appeals in 2015, 8 of which had been resolved at the Local Stage. The programme/unit titles had not been listed in UNIT-e, therefore it had been difficult to establish whether the 12 appeals were connected at the unit level (they were not connected at the programme level). Dr Hai agreed to investigate the FM appeals further to establish whether the appeals were connected in any way.* | |  | **Action Completed:** The Local Stage appeals and response letters of the 12 PGR appeals were examined by EDQ. Of the 12 appeals, 6 were based on mitigating circumstances, 4 appeals questioned academic judgement, while the remainder raised issues of IT access and an error in the assessment process. There was no connection between the appeals which warranted any further investigation. | | 2.2.14 | Minute 3.1.6 – Annual Report: Appeals and Complaints | |  | *As the percentage of mitigating circumstance appeals submitted totalled 58.3% for BU Faculties (and 67% of appeals at AECC), the Committee requested Dr Hai to compare the University’s data with other HEIs.* | |  | **Action Completed:** HEIs have their own policies and procedures for appeals/mitigating circumstances, therefore a direct comparison of data is problematic. Information from an anonymised survey conducted in 2015 as to the percentage of appeals based on mitigating circumstances was examined. Of the 6 HEIs who responded, 3 reported a figure of 70% or over of appeals related to mitigating circumstances while 3 were in the 50-51% range. BU is thus not untypical in its figure of 58%. As noted in item 3.1.9, BU is reviewing how mitigating circumstances policies and procedures are publicised and is working towards widening the means of publicity. | | 2.2.15 | Minute 3.1.7 – Annual Report: Appeals and Complaints | |  | *Ms Mayo-Ward was unsure whether mitigating circumstances training was included in the Student Rep training, but would look into whether it would be viable to include mitigating circumstances training in Student Rep training.* | |  | **Action Ongoing:** Ms Mayo-Ward advised that there was not a sufficient amount of time to include all of the training required for Student Reps. Ms Mayo-Ward believed that mitigating circumstances training sat better with PAL, therefore Ms Mayo-Ward would contact Charlotte Thackeray, Peer Learning Officer, with regards to providing Student Reps with mitigating circumstances training.  **Action: EM-W** | | 2.2.16 | Minute 3.1.9 – Annual Report: Appeals and Complaints | |  | *Members agreed that students do not remember all the information provided when they start university, and therefore do not always go to their GP for evidence of their illness, therefore the introduction of a step-by-step process would be very helpful to students. Members also suggested the introduction of a multimedia video or an interactive programme on iBU which would take students through the process. Dr Hai agreed to look into this suggestion.* | |  | **Action Completed:** The Student Communications Officer and Dr Hai have met to discuss the development of a new multichannel communication plan which will include:   * Pushing an electronic mitigating circumstances reminder to students through iBU, Facebook and Twitter; * A review of where mitigating circumstances are currently advertised; * Implement an interim series of communications for the remainder of the 2015/16 academic year; * Developing a multi-channel communications plan for the 2016/17 academic year. | | 2.2.17 | Minute 3.1.10 – Annual Report: Appeals and Complaints | |  | *15 non-academic appeals had been rejected and 12 non-academic appeals were either upheld or partially upheld. Ms Barron advised that although the term appeal had been used, many issues were a consideration of parking circumstances (74%). The Committee requested more detail be included on those 12 that were upheld or partially upheld since those may have related to the 7 non-academic appeals relating to finance or immigration.* | |  | **Action Completed:** Updated information provided by Student Services: The 12 Non Academic Appeals that were upheld were all parking related. The 7 non-academic appeals that were rejected were all financial and related to decisions related to the awarding of bursaries or scholarships. The Financial Support Appeal Procedure has been updated/clarified and it was expected that this will reduce the number of cases that would proceed to an appeal. The car parking appeals will likely be dealt with under a ‘review’ rather than an Appeal. These changes should reduce the number of non-academic appeals being registered for these reasons. | | 2.2.18 | Minute 3.1.11 – Annual Report: Appeals and Complaints | |  | *The non-academic complaints listed in Table 11 did not provide the Committee with sufficient detail and the Committee was unable to determine whether of those that were still under investigation related to the ‘general’ category which was noted to frequently include issues relating to bullying or harassment – there were 7 non-academic complaints in this category. It was therefore not clear how seriously/timely University was dealing with such complaints. Dr Hai agreed to provide more detailed information moving forward in order to provide comfort to members that non-academic complaints were being dealt with effectively.* | |  | **Action Completed:** Updated information provided by Student Services: The cases reported in Table 11 related to several different issues related to fees, scholarship, letter requests, graduation and/or immigration issues. The rejected complaints related to a student’s fee status, a Faculty handling of procedures and a complaint relating to ALS support. In terms of the complaints received in Student Services throughout the year in relation to bullying and harassment, one involved a Sports Team and was dealt with by SportBU at the local stage. The other complaints related to students who described being bullied within their accommodation, however in most cases, the complainants have not pursued their complaint, despite being given the support of both Student Services and SUBU Advice. Student Services are continuing to investigate complaints in a timely manner. | | 2.2.19 | Minute 3.2.5 – Anonymous Marking Update | |  | *Members were requested to ask colleagues in Faculties to send Ms Symonds any feedback or comments to help inform processes moving forward.* | |  | **Action Completed:** Ms Symonds received comments from Anonymous Marking Working Group and the comments received have been included in the Anonymous Marking Update paper which was listed on the ESEC agenda for discussion. | | 2.2.20 | Minute 3.3.7 – Vision4Learning Update and Designing Learning Excellence | |  | *A discussion took place around feedback and the Committee agreed that timely responses to feedback from students would be a ‘quick win’ for the University. Dr Holley and Dr Roushan would provide a ‘Suite of Innovation’ at the next meeting that members could share with colleagues in Faculties. Any feedback/comments from SUBU would be welcomed.* | |  | **Action Completed:** SUBU sent their feedback/comments directly to Dr Roushan and Dr Holley. | | 2.2.21 | Minute 3.3.8 - Vision4Learning Update and Designing Learning Excellence | |  | *Dr Holley agreed to circulate a link to information which would help members to understand EU good practice and could inform discussions taking place within Faculties about the best methods to move forward academically and pedagogically.* | |  | **Action Completed:** Dr Holley circulated the link to information which would help members to understand EU good practice to ESEC members. | | 2.2.22 | Minute 3.4.3 – SUBU President’s Report | |  | *Ms Barron questioned whether any SimOn comments had been received with regards to Student Services as she had not received any comments to date. Ms Mayo-Ward was unsure whether the facility for Student Services had been put in place, but would check to see whether any comments relating to Student Services had been received as Estates, IT and the Library had been receiving comments.* | |  | **Action Completed:** Student Services would now start to receive SimOn data. | | 2.2.23 | Minute 3.4.9 – SUBU President’s Report | |  | *Currently, SimOn responses were sent to ADSEs in Faculties. If SimOn information should be forwarded on to other Faculty staff, members were requested to advise Ms Mayo-Ward.* | |  | **Action Completed:** Ms Mayo-Ward advised that no further contact had been made by Faculty staff, therefore SimOn data would continue to be sent to ADSE’s for dissemination within Faculties as required. | | 2.2.24 | Minute 3.4.11 – SUBU President’s Report | |  | *DDEPPs were requested to progress the essence of the discussion regarding SimOn at each FESEC meeting and any actions that arise should be acted upon by each department.* | |  | **Action Completed:** DDEPPs confirmed that SimOn had been disseminated within Faculty Departments and had been discussed at FAB and FESEC meetings. | | **3.** | **PART 1: FOR DISCUSSION** | |  |  | | 3.1 | Debate Item: Suite of Innovation | | 3.1.1 | Following on from the previous meeting regarding Excellence in Learning, Dr Holley discussed the Vision4Learning project at the recent Technology Enhanced Learning Strategy Forum (TELSF) meeting and had asked Faculties to cascade and implement i-Innovate into Peer Review and Education Practice (PREP) for all academic staff. The paper outlined the previous discussion held and the current changing landscape of Higher Education and the arguments for the positive actions being proposed. Promoting Excellence in Learning would be a key concept going forward given emergent HE policy and a focus on Teaching Excellence (TEF). Additionally, a number of the initiatives within the University were based on student feedback and would aid quality enhancement. | | 3.1.2 | The TEL Toolkit was now well embedded and data was being shared with academic staff and Faculties. The TEL Toolkit would be closely monitored to ensure it stayed fresh and up to date. A forthcoming tool, developed by the Epigeum consortium would assist with blended learning, and Faculties would be updated with expected implementation dates shortly. Faculties would be requested to further discuss and determine the mechanisms for taking the actions forward for next year and also promoting and embedding Excellence in Learning. | | 3.1.3 | Earlier discussions by the Committee had focused on the i-Innovate initiative as part of PREP and how the Centre for Excellence in Learning (CEL) would become more actively involved in supporting academic staff. Data would be shared with DDEPPs on the initial competencies framework that David Biggins had promoted earlier in the year and the data would also be shared with Faculties which would confirm whether academic staff were engaging with CEL. | | 3.1.4 | Since the last meeting, Dr Roushan, Dr Holley and Mr Biggins had been examining journals and carrying out research which would help academic staff and supporting staff to engage and use myBU and the TEL Toolkit more innovatively. Dr Roushan was keen to hear members’ thoughts and comments with regards to roll out of the initiative in the next academic year. | | 3.1.5 | Dr Ryland suggested that a summary checklist be provided that lists all of the tools available and could assist with coherent experiences for students. Members agreed that Programme Teams should be encouraged to feed back their plans through each FESEC. DDEPPs were requested to collate information from Programme Teams and Heads of Departments.  **Action: DDEPPs** | | 3.1.6 | DDEPPs had agreed in principle to have a University wide i-Innovate PREP where each academic staff member would be asked to make one small teaching innovation, ideally using myBU through a TEL Toolkit tool - this exercise would help identify skills/development gaps. The launch would take place at the start of the 2016/17 academic year and then be followed by i-Innovate. | | 3.1.7 | Prof Thomas advised the Committee of the ‘Students as Trainers’ project, which would allow students to help academic staff to use technological tools. Members agreed that this was a real practical step as the majority of academic staff may have developmental needs with respect to embedding TEL. This initiative would feed into PREP i-Innovate. The ‘Students as Trainers’ project would add value to students’ learning experiences, and academic staff would be able to use this project as part of their Higher Education Academy (HEA) fellowship application, which would also contribute to the development of the University’s Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). | | 3.1.8 | As part of the TEL Toolkit follow up, a ‘How do you use yours’ competition took place and 12 entries were received. All Faculties were represented and entrants had been requested to submit their entry in any form of what they had achieved innovatively around the TEL Toolkit. All 12 of the entries were positively received and would be recognised by the Vice-Chancellor on 19 May 2016. | | 3.1.9 | The Committee agreed that they would like CEL to support Faculty teams in the various initiatives taking place over the summer. Prof Thomas had requested teams to identify their individual needs and the resources required. Prof Thomas reminded the Committee that Faculties have such a wealth of talent associated with CEL and she was keen to know what would fit best with pedagogy and the best way CEL could support teams by providing workshops and training in order to move forward. | | 3.1.10 | Following a discussion, members agreed that it would be useful if Faculties could be provided with a toolkit of information, e.g. a small set of slides to direct DDEPPs, ADSEs, HoDs, Programme Leaders and Faculty teams to show the start point of each conversation.  **Action: GT** | | 3.1.11 | Members also agreed that it would be useful for Faculties to see the 12 entries from the ‘How do you use yours’ campaign in one location to view.  **Action: GT** | | 3.2 | Widening Participation Annual Report | | 3.2.1 | The 2014/15 academic year was the third year of the higher fee regime and it was a requirement for the University to have a Fair Access Agreement (FAA) approved by the Director of the Office for Fair Access (OFFA) in order the University was able to charge above the basic fee level. The report provided an overview of the monitoring process and a review of activity in the current academic year. The report also looked ahead to 2017/18. | | 3.2.2 | 2014/15 was the first year the University used the wider range of Widening Participation (WP) indicators and in 2014/15, 74% of new undergraduate HEFCE funded, non-NHS sponsored students, met at least one of the WP indicators. This figure had been 36% in previous years. The increased percentage of WP students from 2013/14 reporting could be attributed to the wider definition of WP indicators. | | 3.2.3 | During 2014/15, the University’s Widening Participation Strategy acknowledged the importance of having a fusion of access measures targeted at different aspects of the student journey e.g. raising aspirations and achievement, financial support, pro-active support to meet student needs and support provided to students’ for their own personal development. A very limited level of targeted work had been carried out, however the University was trying to address this moving forward. During 2014/15, there had been a relatively poor response to evidencing impact. The plans would be refined next year and would need clearly to indicate that the University was targeting funding wisely and evidencing impact. | | 3.2.4 | Members were advised that moving forward, the sector would be discontinuing the NS SEC categorisation from the statutory monitoring return. As a result, the University had decided that a like grouping of students would be identified by using ACORN data and re-profiling targets on that basis. | | 3.2.5 | Minimal queries were received from HEFCE and OFFA regarding the statutory monitoring return, with HEFCE confirming satisfaction and sign off only three working days after the submission deadline. This was probably helped by the intensive data quality review before submission and had worked well this year. It was noted that for 2015/16, the information submitted would be broadly similar but would see the rise of the BU FAR (Fair Access Research) programme which was established in 2014/15. In 2015/16 the multi-disciplinary team would comprise staff from across Faculties, Professional Services and SUBU who were undertaking in-depth analysis and investigating outreach, admissions, retention and attainment and student experience. | | 3.2.6 | 2015/16 would be a transition year for the University’s Financial Support Maintenance Bursary funding which would move to a one year model. WP models would be evaluated more closely in 2015/16 as during 2017/18, the landscape would be changing vastly and the University would need to adjust its spend with regards to how WP students were supported. For 2017/18, all targets would be refreshed, with access and success for both BME applicants and for white working class males being a specific foci alongside increased recognition for mental health and Specific Learning Difficulties. | | 3.2.7 | Ms Schendel-Wilson advised that there had been some very good work carried out at the University regarding Fair Access and it was important to keep communicating with the student body, noting why decisions were made to help raise awareness and help understanding of the rationales for the support being offered. This was when Fair Access would start to have an impact on the University. The results would inform the University’s actions around induction and assessment strategies. As an example, Ms Barron highlighted the use of Panopto and the advantages of its introduction. The University needed to ensure that the right message was communicated to all students -- that BU was an inclusive institution, where students were heard, understood and supported, and that employability initiatives were inclusive and communicated in a meaningful way to students and staff. Members agreed that Widening Participation and Fair Access information should be included in staff induction so that all staff have an understanding and were able to support students with specific needs. | | 3.2.8 | The Committee agreed that Widening Participation and Fair Access information should be widely communicated throughout the University. Prof McIntyre-Bhatty agreed to circulate a précis of conceptual changes to the Fair Access Agreement 2017/18 to all members for dissemination through Faculties and Professional Services.  **Action: TMB** | | 3.2.9 | **Noted:** The Committee noted the Widening Participation Annual Report 2014/15. | | 3.3 | Student Engagement in Programme Approvals and Reviews | | 3.3.1 | The paper outlined a proposal for student engagement with programme approval and review panels with effect from the 2016/17 academic year. The paper had been considered by the Student Voice Committee (SVC) meeting on 20 April 2016, where the principles and proposals were supported. SVC recommended the paper to the Committee for approval. | | 3.3.2 | The University currently provides a number of opportunities for students to participate in quality assurance and enhancement activities, and students have also long been engaged in the design and review of programmes through formal monitoring and feedback processes and through more informal discussions with programme teams. | | 3.3.3 | Increasingly across the sector it was apparent that an increasing number of universities now included a student on panels for programme approvals and reviews, therefore it was timely for the University to consider engaging its students with this activity. The proposal was that moving forward there would be a student representative at each approval panel. SUBU and EDQ would jointly provide compulsory training sessions for all students who were selected for the role following the application process. A pilot of the proposal would start in the 2016/17 academic year. | | 3.3.4 | There had been some debate within the sector regarding the appropriateness of paying or offering an incentive to students when participating as a panel member for programme approvals/reviews. SVC had discussed the options relating to rewarding students. | | 3.3.5 | The Committee supported the proposal of having a student representative on each panel, but suggested the student should be part of the Faculty under review, but not the particular programme, in line with QAEG membership. Ms Finnes agreed to include the suggestion in the procedures published. | | 3.3.6 | Ms Barron advised members that all PAL Leaders were recruited through MyCareerHub and suggested that the recruitment and potential payment of students as panel members be in line with this method. Ms Barron explained the current process of recruiting PAL Leaders and how opportunities were advertised on MyCareerHub. Following discussion it was agreed the advertising of opportunities and potential payments would be discussed further outside the meeting. | | 3.3.7 | Dr White questioned whether employability had been discussed previously and suggested students should receive a Certificate of Engagement in order to demonstrate their key skills at interviews. The Certificate of Engagement could also sit within the SUBU Leadership Award. *Post-script: It should be noted that Certification of Placement experiences had been discussed and agreed at the Committee earlier in the 2015/16 cycle, and that such certification would be incepted in 2017/18*. | | 3.3.8 | **Noted:** The Committee noted the paper. | | 3.4 | Anonymous Marking Update | | 3.4.1 | Ms Symonds provided an overview of the outcomes arising from the Anonymous Marking pilot activity that took place during semester 2 across the four Faculties. | | 3.4.2 | The two main difficulties identified were:   * Contacting students who did not submit by the deadline: All Faculties routinely contact students who have not submitted on time to advise them that their assignment had not been received and that their work would be considered as a late submission if it was received within 72 hours. It was not possible to preserve the anonymity of this group of students if Faculties were to continue with this practice. Faculties were concerned as it was considered that this practice was highly desirable and was an important part of their responsibilities to students. * Monitoring of Tier 4 students: Submission of assignments was used a part of the monitoring of engagement by Tier 4 students. If work was submitted anonymously it was not possible to identify these students without removing the anonymity for the entire cohort. Not being able to use submission of assignments as a monitoring mechanism was potentially a serious issue. | | 3.4.3 | It should be noted that anonymity in the cases above cannot be preserved *administratively*. It is still possible for candidates’ anonymity to be preserved for *academic* marking purposes. Some positive comments had been received with regards to Anonymous Marking. From the student perspective, they wanted to take Anonymous Marking forward. | | 3.4.4 | Due to the various technical limitations identified, a series of manual workarounds and specifications for use were developed by the Learning Technology Team for the pilot and formed the procedures for online anonymous submission and marking that were used by staff in Faculties. Feedback received by the Working Group generally supported anonymous marking but there was concern that it precluded the provision of more personalised feedback. Most of the feedback received on the pilot related to issues with Turnitin and students not using their student reference number correctly, despite receiving clear instructions to ensure their anonymity. | | 3.4.5 | The next step would be to resolve the technical issues and identify the best approach to move forward. The knowledge and experience gained from the pilot had been extremely useful and had enabled the Working Group to detail the immediate next steps, which included:   * A detailed investigation of student views/expectations of anonymous feedback. * A resourced and detailed scoping exercise to be undertaken of the current and proposed infrastructure, including the VLE and Turnitin, to determine its capabilities in relation to anonymous marking in order to make detailed recommendations to ESEC. This is to include an investigation into how other HEIs manage the process of anonymous marking within their IT infrastructures. * Planning to ensure the various components of the systems infrastructure integrate in order to ensure that the final solution was efficient and effective for staff and students. * Discussion on future staffing resource, roles and responsibilities to support the activity. | | 3.4.6 | Dr Main commented that one member of academic staff with significant external examiner experience had commented that other HEIs were using the same software as BU (Blackboard, Turnitin and Unit-E) and anonymous marking was working effectively. It was suggested that the Learning Technology Team look into changing settings for each programme which could make anonymous marking work effectively. | | 3.4.7 | Ms Schendel-Wilson reminded the Committee of the importance of all staff understanding why anonymous marking was being introduced to the University. The issue with regards to the resourcing of anonymous marking would need to be resolved within Faculties. Ms Mayo-Ward requested members to communicate any reasons why anonymous marking could not be implemented and the expected start date. | | 3.4.8 | Members agreed that the essence of the discussion would be disseminated within Faculties to reaffirm that anonymous marking was commonplace in universities. It was envisaged that anonymous marking would be introduced during the next academic year. | | 3.4.9 | Further work would continue over the summer which would include looking at the capabilities of the VLE and Turnitin in order that detailed recommendations could be suggested. This would include an investigation into how other HEIs manage the process of anonymous marking within their IT infrastructures. Further discussions would also take place with regards to future staffing resource, roles and responsibilities to support the activity. Ms Symonds agreed to provide Prof McIntyre-Bhatty with an update on the work which was expected to be carried out within the next four weeks and the next three months. It was agreed that further discussions would now need to take place outwith of the Committee in order to ensure progress.  **Action: CS** | | 3.5 | Annual Review: Postgraduate Taught (PGT) Framework Review | | 3.5.1 | The Postgraduate Development Awards (PGDA) was introduced in order to engage postgraduate taught students (PGTs) with their broader, extra-curricular development. The award was now in its third year and registration has been increasing since the introduction of a wider range of activities. The Framework offers a range of training sessions and events (e.g. workshops, seminars, conferences and cultural events) and activities at the Graduate School, Faculty and Programme level and continues to enhance the PGT student experience. A larger number of postgraduate students were now engaging and recently part time and distance learners had been engaging which was encouraging to see. | | 3.5.2 | The Postgraduate Professional and Personal Development (PPPD) Framework would help PGTs to recognise their own strengths and weaknesses, help PGTs to plan how to maximise personal and academic achievements, enhance their own employability, improve postgraduate student experience and to provide a platform for postgraduates to connect as one community. | | 3.5.3 | Although completion rates remained low, since the introduction of the PGDA in 2013/14 the number of PGTs registered for the award had increased from 100 in 2013/14, to 200 in 2014/15 and 270 in 2015/16. | | 3.5.4 | **Noted:** The Committee noted the paper. | | 3.6 | Review of Education and Student Experience Plans (ESEPs) | |  | Faculty of Health & Social Sciences ESEP | | 3.6.1 | Dr White confirmed the Faculty had been working hard in order to achieve its goals. Prof Zhang commented that it had not been obvious that PTES had been incorporated into the HSS ESEP and she encouraged further discussion to take place within the Faculty. Dr White confirmed that PTES would be included in due course. PRES and PTES had been discussed by the Faculty Academic Board and it was agreed that both PTES and PRES would feed into the HSS ESEP as the Faculty had spent a lot of time and resources in responding to actions. | | 3.6.2 | The Committee noted the timetabling issues and that students were unhappy with any timetable amendments. The Faculty was encouraged to be proactive and explain the reasoning behind the changes to students and why amendments were necessary. | |  | Faculty of Media & Communication ESEP | | 3.6.3 | Dr Dyer explained that the revised Faculty ESEP had been underpinned by the Departmental ESEPs which had been subject to peer review at the Faculty Executive meeting. The Faculty ESEP now focused on top level core themes rather that differentiated actions for individual Departments. The Faculty had been making good progress in the areas of Organisation and Management and Assessment and Feedback which had been evidenced by early completion of IMPs, meeting central timetabling deadlines and a reduction in the number of timetable changes recorded for semester 1. The FMC FASC would continue to monitor 3WAT for improvement. | | 3.6.4 | A standardised approach to MUSE was now embedded and the Faculty was working towards greater consistency of reporting in order to close the feedback loop. The Academic Adviser role had been evaluated and was selected as the PREP activity this year, in addition to responding to PTES and PRES data. It was anticipated that emerging themes would be shared across the Faculty and with colleagues in FHSS. | |  | Faculty of Management ESEP | | 3.6.5 | The Faculty of Management departments had been thoroughly taking the enhancement agenda forward which was evidenced in the FM ESEP. There had also been strong initiatives around the NSS to communicate positively and establish appropriate reflection. MUSE scores had improved slightly between 2014/15 and 2015/16, however it was clear that academic staff needed to give more consideration and attention to specific improvements for the next academic cycle. Progress had not been consistent across the Faculty, therefore assistance would be given to those staff members who require further help in order to ensure there was an improvement of MUSE scores and feedback. The next round of appraisals would also help identify any training needs or help required with delivery of lectures. | | 3.6.6 | Since January 2016, the Faculty had been building a new set of initiatives to put in place from March 2016 onwards which would make an effective difference for 2016/17. The Faculty had also started a database which included areas of good practice and current/recent innovations. The database would provide a baseline for the exchange of good practice through the Faculty. | | 3.6.7 | Prof Zhang commented that it had not been obvious that PTES had been considered and incorporated into the FM ESEP and she encouraged further discussion to take place within the Faculty. Dr Main agreed to add more PTES information into the FM ESEP moving forward.  **Action: AM** | |  | Faculty of Science and Technology ESEP | | 3.6.8 | The Committee was advised that the FST ESEP had been revised and submitted as part of the Faculty Quality Audit in February 2016. The version submitted to ESEC had been updated to reflect actions, and to also draw upon the latest set of MUSE data. | | 3.6.9 | Prof Phalp advised that the Faculty was in the process of organising an Away Day for Heads of Education to get together and share best practice and innovation. MUSE data had been further examined and some interesting trends would be looked at further as well as the impact of unit sizes. MUSE had been very useful to the Faculty at unit level especially now trends could be seen and the implications of them. MUSE data would be used to reflect on the numbers of tutors who deliver to large units, particularly on the first year, and the impact on student experience. Dr Main would also be looking at the same information for the FM as the Faculty also has many large teams of staff. Both Faculties would be considering how to reduce the scale of large team teaching since it did not appear to foster unit/module ownership and enhancement. | |  | Professional Services ESEPs | | 3.6.10 | It was noted that some Professional Services ESEPs had made reference to the huge level of work going on throughout the University; there had been some very focused and clear enhancements made this year. However, a number of ESEPs had not highlighted how the Professional Service intended to contribute to enhancing the student experience or had not made reference to the NSS evidence and extensive analysis that had been provided; it was agreed that this would need to be included in ESEPs moving forward. Professional Services members advised that work would continue on the prioritisation of resources in order that students receive the best return.  **Action: Heads of Professional Services** | | 3.6.11 | Members agreed that it was sometimes difficult to gauge NSS evidence for Professional Services due to the way NSS questions were worded, although it was noted the University does hold a lot of NSS, MUSE and now SimOn data which could be used. Ms Mayo-Ward advised the Committee that the Go Out And Talk (GOAT) Team would be requesting some input from Professional Services shortly in order that SUBU staff could ask specific questions to students. | | 3.6.12 | **Noted:** The Faculty ESEPs and Professional Services ESEPs were noted. | | 3.7 | SUBU President’s Report | | 3.7.1 | The elections for SUBU Full Time Officers had taken place and were the most successful elections yet in terms of the number of student voters, with a diverse range of candidates from across the BU population. | | 3.7.2 | Cyber bullying through Yik Yak had been a huge issue for SUBU and would be addressed. Nationally, election candidates had been bullied and this had been such a huge issue that the National Union of Students (NUS) recently passed policy that they would be tackling it. It was important that the University and SUBU worked together to ensure cyber bullying did not take place next year. | | 3.7.3 | With regards to the NUS President election, and the rumours in the media, Ms Schendel-Wilson confirmed that SUBU Full Time Officers had no issues with the recent NUS elections and had always found the NUS to be very useful and gave invaluable support. The Full Time Officers were happy with the result of the election. | | 3.7.4 | The highlights from SimOn data and recent SUBU ‘Vision’ Days were:   * Students were finding 1:1 support from Academic Advisers very useful and important. * As mental health issues were increasing amongst students, they would like better communications about access to relevant services. * It would be useful if Academic Advisers could be trained to point students in the right direction as students’ first point of contact. * Fair marking was something that was perceived to be very important in Faculties. * Hidden course costs is an issue that need to be looked into further, as there was a perception that students could ‘buy’ themselves a better education and the more money that was spent, the better the end product would be. * Campus estates are very good but the lack of social learning space was obvious at this time. There have also been several comments about sports facilities needing to be improved upon. | | 3.7.5 | **Noted:** The Committee noted the paper and requested that Faculties and Professional Services act upon the information that has been provided to enhance the student experience. | | 3.8 | Annual Review of Key Performance Indicators/Performance Indicators (KPIs/PIs) | | 3.8.1 | The overall performance of the University was strong with the majority of the Key Performance Indicators/Performance Indicators moving positively. However the University still needed to focus on the following Performance Indicators to ensure delivery on the BU2018 strategy, even though a number of them are better than sector benchmark:  PI6 – Academic staff with a teaching qualification and/or who are HEA Fellows (%)  PI7 – Students engaged in exchange and mobility in their programme (%)  PI10 – Student/staff co-authored publications per academic FTE per year (ratio)  PI11 – Graduates entering professional/managerial employment or further study (%) | | 3.8.2 | Performance as monitored by the NSS was also a main foci moving forward. | | 3.8.3 | **Noted:** The Committee noted the paper. | | **4.** | **PART 2: FOR APPROVAL AND ENDORSEMENT** | |  | Student Disciplinary Procedures | | 4.1 | The updated Student Disciplinary Procedures had been rewritten to include the feedback received from the Equality and Diversity Steering Group, EDQ, Students’ Union, Legal Services and UCU. The updates also met recommendations from the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) and internal disciplinary and Fitness to Practise panels and reflected best practice. | | 4.2 | It was noted that the procedure was not intended to be a legal procedure and reference had been made to the Criminal Records Procedure. | | 4.3 | Members were requested to email any further comments to Ms Barron by close of business on 25 May 2016. | | 4.4 | **Approved:** The Committee approved the updated Student Disciplinary Procedures. | | **5.** | **PART 3: FOR NOTE** | | 5.1 | Centre for Excellence in Learning Update | | 5.1.1 | **Noted:** The paper was noted. | | **6.** | **REPORTING COMMITTEES** | | 6.1 | Student Voice Committee Minutes | | 6.1.1 | **Noted:** The minutes of 20 April 2016 (unconfirmed) were noted. | | 6.2 | Faculty Education & Student Experience Committee (FESEC) Minutes | | 6.2.1 | **Noted:** The Faculty of Health & Social Sciences FESEC minutes of 13 April 2016 (unconfirmed) were noted. | | 6.2.2 | **Noted:** The Faculty of Media & Communications FESEC minutes of 21 April 2016 (unconfirmed) were noted. | | 6.2.3 | **Noted:** The Faculty of Science & Technology FESEC minutes of 27 April 2016 (unconfirmed) were noted. | | 6.3 | Technology Enhanced Learning Strategy Forum Minutes | | 6.3.1 | **Noted:** The minutes of 3 May 2016 (unconfirmed) were noted. | | **7.** | **ANY OTHER BUSINESS** | | 7.1 | Members were advised that nominations for the National Teaching Fellowship Awards were now open and members were encouraged to participate in the scheme and nominate colleagues as appropriate in order to promote the National Teaching Fellowships and continue to engender a sense of value related to teaching both within and outwith of the University. The deadline for nominations was 12.00 noon on 28 July 2016. | | 7.2 | The Chair thanked members for their contributions to the Committee over the past academic year. The Chair also thanked the SUBU Sabbatical Officers for their hard work and contributions to the University throughout the year. | | **8.** | **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**  Monday 19 September 2016 at 2.00pm in the Board Room | |  |  | |  |