**Minutes of the meeting held on 17 January 2017 at 2.30pm in the Board Room**

Present:

Prof T McIntyre-Bhatty (Chair) Deputy Vice Chancellor

Prof R Stillman Deputy Chair

Ms P Peckham (Secretary) Faculty Education Services Manager (FST)

Ms M Pearson (Clerk) Academic Quality Officer (AQ)

Mr D Asaya SU President 2016/17, Students’ Union (SUBU)

Mr J Cooke Head of Student Engagement (SUBU)

Dr K Curtis Co-opted Member of the Professoriate (FHSS)

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

Chair of the Student Voice Committee

Ms B Elias SU Vice-President (Activities) 2016/17, Students’ Union (SUBU)

Prof G Esteban Member of the Professoriate (FST)

Prof D Holley Centre for Excellence in Learning Representative

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

Mr S Jones Head of Facilities Management

Prof V Katos Member of the Professoriate (FST)

Ms G Larkins SU Vice-President (Community) 2016/17, Students’ Union (SUBU)

Ms J Mack Head of Academic Services (AS)

Canon Dr B Merrington University Chaplain

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

Dr C L Osborne Head of Academic Operations (OVC)

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

Prof S Porter Member of the Professoriate (FHSS)

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

Dr G Roushan Chair of the Technology Enhanced Learning Strategy Forum

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

Ms C Souter-Phillips SU Vice-President (Welfare) 2016/17, Students’ Union (SUBU)

Mr J Swanson SU Vice-President (Education) 2016/17, Students’ Union (SUBU)

Mr J Ward Director of IT Services

Dr S White Senate Representative (FHSS)

Prof T Zhang Head of the Graduate School (GS)

In attendance:

Ms L Ladle Careers and Employability Manager (SS)

Observers:

Michael Wood Good Governance Institute

Dr Debbie Sadd Principal Academic (FM)

Dr Sue Warnock Head of Education (FM)

Apologies:

Apologies had been received from:

Ms M Barron Head of Student Services (SS)

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

Ms A Lacey Student Representative Champion (FHSS)

Mr S Laird Director of Estates

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

Dr T Zhang Head of the Graduate School

1. **Welcome and Introductions**

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

**2. Minutes of Previous Meeting held on 22 November 2016**

2.1 Accuracy

The minutes were approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | 2.2 | Matters Arising | | 2.2.1 | Minute 2.2.9 – Updated ESEPs – Student Support ESEP | |  | *The University does not have the capacity currently to hold accommodation for incoming exchange students, as the number of incoming students had increased significantly. Despite not having anything specifically allocated for exchange students, BU had housed 18 incoming exchange students in Semester 1 2015/16 and a further 25 in Semester 2. Ms Barron advised that a meeting was due to take place shortly to discuss the issues with providing accommodation to incoming exchange students. A further update would be provided at the January 2017 meeting.* | |  | **Action Completed:** A plan was now in place for the second semester of 2018 having beds available for incoming exchange students. This was a positive step in improving the accommodation provision for Semester 2 exchange students from next academic year. | | 2.2.2 | Minute 2.2.12 – SUBU President’s Report | |  | *Many Lansdowne students had stated that they would like to take part in various activities in Talbot Campus, however the cost of transport was an issue and discussions were still ongoing with regards to transport for Lansdowne students. The Go Out And Talk (GOAT) Team carried out research in October 2016. The results of the survey were provided to members at the November 2016 meeting. The majority of students had stated their main reasons for using a free inter-campus bus service was to access Talbot Campus facilities e.g. the library and larger lecture theatres. Members agreed that if it was not possible to provide a free inter-campus bus service, students should be advised accordingly as the issue had been ongoing for two years. It was suggested that the University should give some thought into preparing a statement which could be provided to students.*  **Action Ongoing:** SUBU had ameeting with Facilities to discuss the cost of possibly providing free transport on Wednesdays afternoons as this is really important for students based at Landsdowne. Since that meeting, some analysis showed it was viable to offer free travel on Wednesday afternoons. However, there are concerns that Talbot students may want a similar provision and might see this as unfair. It was also possible that this offer may mean that students would not pay for a bus pass and this has cost consequences. It was noted that activities on Talbot Campus on Wednesday afternoons may have a clear link to employability on the ‘course to careers’ journey. This discussion would be taken forward by the travel planning group. | |  |  | | 2.2.3 | Minute 2.2.11 – Update on Student Induction 2016/17 | |  | *The organisation of the induction system had not worked well this year. Mr Swanson agreed to send Dr Holley some feedback for the Induction Working Group taking place on 30 November 2016 and advice what had worked well and what had not worked well to ensure errors did not occur next year. A further update would be provided at the January ESEC meeting.*  **Action Completed:** An arrivals survey was conducted to gather feedback on the induction process. Anupdate on the work of the Induction Working Group was listed on the agenda for discussion under item 3.4. | |  |  | | 2.2.4 | Debate Item – V4L Implementation Plan | |  | *The Committee was reassured that the old and new VLE would run in parallel for ten months and the new VLE would not be primarily in use until the core of the new system was ready and available for learning. The old VLE would not be terminated until September 2018 when confidence could be placed in the new VLE and it was capable of integration and cultural change. A further update would be provided at the next ESEC meeting in January 2017*.  **Action Ongoing:** The VLE Implementation team would be meeting later this week with the providers of the new VLE (Desire2Learn with Brightspace) to look at what might constitute a means for colleagues from across the University to use the VLE to its fullest potential. As anticipated, it was likely that, after discussions this week, they would opt for a phased implementation from September 2017 through to September 2018. The team wanted to ensure the new VLE was working and capable of being used to its full potential before all Faculties transitioned. There have been wider discussions around pedagogy and innovation and what might happen with the new VLE. The team was working to develop an implementation timeline. It had been good to see many academics getting involved, and the team has decided to put in place subgroups to work on selected actions and report back. The initial task force was smaller than initially thought but now had members who could influence others (key stakeholders). Members agreed it was useful to approach the implementation in stages rather than as one ‘big bang’ as the risk with transitioning all Faculties or students in September 2017 was high. A Best Practices Guide was in the process of being developed and would be reported upon in the next meeting. | |  |  | | 2.2.5 | Student Services Annual Report 2015/16 | |  | *This year had seen a decrease in terms of applications for bursaries and scholarships. The reason for the reduction was currently unknown. There had also been a reduction in the number of emergency loans being provided to students which may be as a result of students receiving their Student Loans earlier than in previous years. As CEL had carried out a piece of work some time ago regarding bursaries, scholarships and student loans, the Committee suggested that CEL revisit the work previously carried out now that bursaries were means tested.*  **Action Ongoing:** CEL compiled a paper that looked at the financial implications of bursaries. The first section was from work done by one of the post-doctoral researchers and formed part of a larger report that could be made available. The second section was work that Dr Eccles had carried out externally and there was a small reading list for those who were interested. There were two things to note in the paper. First, the end of the first paragraph highlighted that bursaries were available to support students who needed financial support – they were not just a marketing tool. Second, there had been a previous discussion about resource-based bursaries, and schemes have become easier over time. This is to be handed over to the Fair Access Agreement Management Group (FAAMG) and Marketing & Communication to discuss. On a final note, another report was about student carers and how much difference the support can make to them, so there was good work being done. **Action: D Holley, FAAMG, M&C** | |  |  | | **3.** | **PART 1: FOR DISCUSSION** | |  |  | | 3.1 | Organisation Development Impact Report | | 3.1.1  3.1.2  3.1.3  3.1.4  3.1.5  3.1.6  3.1.7  3.1.8  3.1.9  3.1.10 | Members were advised that the report had been written seven months ago, therefore an update would be provided on the work currently being carried out and for members to provide feedback with regards to how to foster academic staff engagement; thereby making a positive difference on organisational performance.  Organisational Development (OD) were currently looking at interim feedback on the academic leadership programme and although participants had not yet accessed all modules of the programme, a number of themes and patterns had arisen including:   * Absence management issues and performance issues had been highlighted on all modules. Many felt they were spending much of their time dealing with under-performance and in turn those who performed well were not receiving enough attention. * It was noted that personal confidence levels had risen with participants feeling more capable of addressing different situations. * Managers also indicated that there was some confusion about what skills and attributes the University was looking for when nurturing talent in individuals.   It was recognised that the Academic Leadership Programme was new and evolving and participants had welcomed the involvement of UET.  Despite the fact that interest has been shown in the tools being offered and ways to stretch and nurture talent, the challenge remains to match the programmes on offer to what people want and need. The following issues in this area were highlighted:   * Despite providing modules requested by programme leaders, attendance has been disappointing and not all who register were attending on the day. One explanation for low attendance was thought to be the time required and questions over whether the commitment was a good investment of time. In spite of low attendance, external facilitators have indicated that the events successfully highlighted concerns that managers face. * OD is looking at addressing needs, but questions if there needs to be a more local approach to what leaders need. Conversations with programme leaders working at Lansdowne indicate that there is an issue with the time involved in getting to Talbot Campus. As a consequence, some Faculties are running internal training, so maybe OD training could be more Faculty based. It was emphasized that support of line management is important and it was questioned if there is a way to have Department heads help programme leaders fit this type of training into their roles.   The academic leadership programme creates space for a shift in culture in the way programme leaders were supported. The importance of the programme was emphasized and it was noted that this was a huge investment where the active involvement of UET was highly valued.  However, the programme needed to be reinforced at Faculty level (embedded in action plans), and leaders should be expected to reflect on workshops and take part in succession planning.  Members questioned how the University recognised high performing lecturers in terms of professional practice and teaching quality. To this end, CEL offers support for staff to complete a PGCert or to apply for promotion. Faculties should highlight and reward contributions to student experience and the reputation of the Faculty. It was also important that SUBU members were heard with regards to recognising excellent teachers. It was confirmed that recognition for teaching excellence also applied to part-time hourly paid lecturers.  A number of other initiatives were outlined which included a pilot programme in HSS to reinvigorate the mentoring programme and supporting students workshops with a focus on attendance.  All of the training from OD has the potential to feed into the staff appraisal system which encourages individuals to take responsibility and invest their objectives into taking forward the University. Moving forward, there needed to be improved connections between individuals working forward their career and progressing the University.  The Committee thanked Dr Harding and Ms Barber for providing an update. Members noted the coaching programme would recommence in due course.  **Noted:** The Committee noted the Organisational Development Impact Report. | | 3.2 | Annual Report: Multi Faith Chaplaincy | |  |  | | 3.2.1  3.2.2  3.2.3  3.2.3a  3.2.4  3.2.5  3.2.5a  3.2.5b  3.2.5c  3.2.6  3.2.7 | The BU Chaplaincy is a very small team with Canon Dr Merrington being the only full time member of staff. Members were reminded that religious societies were not overseen by chaplaincy but were part of SUBU.  It was noted that Student Services had initiated a multi faith group which ties in with Prevent to look at future issues and encourage dialogue.  A recurring issue with the Chaplaincy was a shortage of space, particularly for Islamic students to perform daily prayers. Students currently have access to the Student Hall for Friday prayers, but there was no space for daily prayers during the week. This was especially problematic for ladies as they were not comfortable coming to any of the space on offer. This was also an issue at Landsdowne as the current space in Bournemouth House was not ideal. It was suggested that space for these students could be located using the Engine Room in The Old Fire station; however, while this was possible on Fridays, it presented logistical problems during the week with students needing to pray multiple times throughout the day.  With this in mind, the University needed to consider the direction it was taking with regards to recruiting international students. If there was marketing in global regions where students were primarily Islamic, then a prayer room was an incentive and increasing numbers of Islamic students would continue to contribute to the lack of space. Student Services would include this in their delivery plan going forward.  Other Chaplaincy activities included the Global Café which was now held in the Fusion building and particularly attracts Erasmus students. Lunches were also being provided for PhD students to encourage them to mix and socialise which would help them to become better academics should they pursue that career path. The PhD lunches currently attracted approximately 40 students. Overall, the Chaplaincy seeks to hold activities which fill any gaps in activities offered by BU.  The Chaplaincy also noted a number of activities relating to the Counselling/Wellbeing Service but was currently trying to move away from this as it has historically become emergency first aid for emotional issues. It was acknowledged that there were problems with the wellbeing provision including issues with wait times for counselling and an overall lack of space and counsellors. The Chaplaincy was hesitant to open doors for this again as they are a spiritual space. However, they were still seeing students (about 10 a week) that should be going to Wellbeing. As the Chaplaincy falls under Student Services, the wellbeing provision is being picked up under Student Services delivery plan going forward.  Regarding the wellbeing provision, it was explained that these services, including counselling, were provided by a trust and they were currently fulfilling their contract. However, demand had grown and the provision needed to be reviewed. It was questioned if the contract for services included a proviso around wait times, but it was again confirmed that the trust was currently meeting all contractual obligations. It was agreed that this discussion needed to be picked up in delivery planning and the contract with the trust needed to be revisited. This was especially important as many of the issues raised were similar to those raised in the previous two years. **Action: M Barron/L Ladle**  Counselling services currently had a no show rate of about 20% (which is typical for the NHS), and this likely increased the pressure placed on the service. It was possible that no show rates tied into wait times because students who were in crisis wanted the service immediately and felt they could not wait. There was a strong degree of triage where people with urgent needs were seen more quickly, and it was noted that Wellbeing services were not the NHS; there were NHS services available. However, it was acknowledged that NHS services also had a long wait time, so the University needed to fulfil its duty of care to students.  Because of long wait times, many members of staff felt they were currently providing a counselling service to distressed students and it was acknowledged that this was a particular issue at Landsdowne as there was no counselling office or hub there. However, this created issues of staff boundaries, and there were currently workshops being offered to help determine boundaries and assist staff in signposting students to the appropriate services.  In reality, the Chaplaincy was best equipped to provide support with issues like student deaths. They handle everything from informing students and cohorts, caring for students, speaking with SUBU, speaking with the coroner and family, and providing thanksgiving services.  The Committee commended the Chaplaincy for the incredible amount of work that was done and thanked Canon Dr Merrington for the update.  **Noted:** The Committee noted the Multi Faith Chaplaincy Annual Report. | | 3.3 | International Mobility of Students Update | |  |  | | 3.3.1  3.3.2  3.3.3  3.3.4  3.3.5  3.3.6  3.3.7  3.3.8 | The report was discussed and the following areas were highlighted:   * The PI7 numbers looked at all students engaged in mobility, rather than just UG students. Subsequently, numbers had doubled to 4.0% since the previous report, and a breakdown was outlined in section 3.1 of the update. The target was 20% by 2018 with a goal of 10% by 2017/18. Key recommendations to raise these numbers further included considering a wider definition of mobility that included virtual mobility, continuing work on promoting mobility (activities like GlobalBU), and looking at funding streams. * Significant work had been done to streamline the processes and workflows of GEM and to collect relevant data efficiently. However, the IT system project had not yet moved forward so there remained risk associated with manual data input and handling. A system to manage international mobility remained a priority (see recommendation 7.5 of the report) * Global Engagement had been working closely with accommodation to take a proactive approach to accommodation barriers. This included shorter leases for exchange students. * Several initiatives were piloted in 2015/16 which saw a shift from individual student mobility to cohort mobility. The Destination China, India, and Malaysia projects were successful with more than 60 staff and students participating. Numbers were expected to continue to grow. * Study Exchange had grown and 2016/17 had seen more student interest in Erasmus+ than ever before. Funding for this programme had currently run out and the contingency was being used. A 100% increase in funding would be requested for 2017/18. * Five recommendations had been made in section 7 of the report, and the IT system remained a top priority.   The FM noted that they were seeing more students going overseas than ever before. However, with more students travelling, more issues had been emerging. It was important that mechanisms were in place to capture these and look at both individual and systematic issues that arise across faculties. FM had also had an issue with incoming students about mapping curriculum appropriately instead of ‘cherry picking’ any module that sounded interesting.  The Committee commended the Global Engagement Team on the report, but it was noted that Erasmus mobility numbers were still low. It was agreed that this was a good time for the University to focus on creative ways to engage with and ask how we internationalise our curriculum. The development of virtual mobility was very positive for non-traditional students (often with family and work commitments in the UK) as it allowed them have an international experience without being required to travel.  It was noted that virtual mobility is a great lightweight way to get students to engage, but the Committee questioned if it should be monitored separately from physically traveling.  It was emphasised that Mobility activities were not in place just to chase a PI. This target was set as it brought benefits, skills and experiences that employers were looking for and valued. 67% of employers indicated that international experience is important, rising from 32% just three years ago. What these programmes really aimed to ensure is that access to international experiences and development is provided in order to support improved future employability of students.  It was noted that there also needed to be a strategic move towards better data capture of mobility activities that might be happening in Faculties on an individual basis. A system to capture data related to mobility activities was expected later this year.  A Global Challenge Summit was announced for May to bring global employers in health to campus to engage as an extracurricular activity (perhaps compulsory for certain courses). This was still new, but it was hoped that this would increase the number of FHSS students engaging with mobility. It was noted that it would be useful to have guidance on types of virtual mobility that improve employability. **Action: J Kuncova**  The committee noted that there seemed to be a lost opportunity with empty outgoing student exchange places and it was explained that this was due as much to a lack of funding as anything else. This was one reason to move from individual to cohort mobility as it decreases cost.  **Noted:** The Committee noted the International Mobility of Students Update and the recommendations that would need to be taken forward in the appropriate executive fora (since many concerned funding, for example) taking account of the discussion of the Committee. | |  |  | | 3.4 | Student Induction Working Group and Arrivals Survey | |  |  | | 3.4.1  3.4.2 | The induction working group report was noted and a written summary was provided. The following were highlighted:   * Faculties were establishing working groups that would feed back to the University working group February. The Faculties who had formed these working groups last year had much smoother induction operations. Faculties were being asked to start these meetings from February and then to meet once a month thereafter. ADSEs were leading the meetings.   **Action: ADSE-All faculties**   * There was still a lot of work to do in joining up induction working groups with SUBU, LLS, and other services and it was important for colleagues in professional services to know what the individual Faculties were planning.   The Arrivals Survey report was noted that a written summary was provided. The primary areas of focus were those areas that scored under 70% in the survey. The following were highlighted:   * There were accommodation issues that were being addressed by Student Services. The survey highlighted that those having issues were often late applicants who did not get the accommodation choice they wanted. It was noted that it was important that the University be honest and open with them about this possibility. It was also explained that there was not enough accommodation for students last year, but that this was being looked at. One action being taken was that housing would be released in four waves instead of three to address busy times. * SUBU had taken on board how to liaise with students through a number of channels (e.g.Snapchat). It was agreed that SUBU would look at the fresher’s booklet as it is not proving as useful as students expect. This will be discussed further at breakfast meetings.   **Action: SUBU Officers**  **Noted:** The Committee noted the Student Induction Working Group and Arrivals Survey. | | 3.5  3.5.1 | SUBU President’s Report  The SUBU President’s Report was noted and the following areas highlighted:   * SUBU had its first BME Awards which celebrated the diverse range of students in attendance at the University with over 300 students in attendance. * SUBU Debates was launched and the first debate was around Cultural Appropriation. There had been a really good response to this and another debate was scheduled for February. * A lot of work had been taken up in line with the sector to lobby MPs and march against rising fees. * SUBU was now present on Landsdowne more to ensure that students did not feel isolated from SUBU support. * SUBU held its first ever housing fair which was a massive success and helped students settle in with the local community. * The VP Education held an entrepreneurial fair and had been working with the laptop loan programme, both of which had been successful. * The VP Activities had been working on engaging with students at Lansdowne and was working on the first sports and societies fest in February to highlight the sports teams, clubs and societies at the University. * A large number of student reps had been trained prior to Christmas, but more training was in process.   **Noted:** The Committee noted the SUBU President’s Report. | |  |  | | 3.6 | Update on Changes to Placements | | 3.6.1  3.6.2  3.6.3 | ESEC and Senate approved four changes to placements which were outlined in section one of the paper. The paper also provided an update on the communication and timetable that was sent out.  A number of actions were ongoing including timetabling, modelling, and appropriate mechanisms for certificates which is being explored by AS. Further updates on this work would be provided at the March and June ESEC meetings.  Students services had been working on standardising placements and a report on this would be provided at the March ESEC meeting.  **Noted:** The Committee noted the Update on Changes to Placements. | |  |  | | **4.** | **DEBATE ITEM** | |  |  | | 4.1 | Attendance Monitoring | | 4.1.1  4.1.2  4.1.3  4.1.4  4.1.5  4.1.6  4.1.7  4.1.8  4.1.9  4.1.10 | The Computing Department’s system for attendance monitoring was suggested as a debate item to consider the possibility of scaling up the system. The system in Computing was developed not just for attendance but for engagement and counselling because of the clear connection between attendance and performance. Sometimes students did not fully understand the impact of studying at university, and this system was a good way to identify these students early.  Computing students had been set an expected attendance rate of at least 80% by the staff as well as attending meetings with academic advisors, and induction and Computing seminars. If students were flagged in more than one area, then they were contacted. Performance was also monitored through assessment submission and performance, an early essay, programming uploads, and an in class test. These provided early indicators of performance.  The system worked by setting up tests on myBU to check that students are attending. It was a lot of work because each test needed to be set up separately for the whole year for each unit. However it allowed for statistics to be gathered because student submission and performance could be monitored and combined with other factors to see if a student should be contacted.  An email was sent for the first warning and the student was given a slot for a five minute interview. Outcomes of these meetings included student withdrawal, finding some with poor work/play balance or even undisclosed mitigating circs and these are then handled appropriately. Each outcome was addressed with an appropriate action which could include counsel at the meeting, reference to the Academic Advisor, or even suspension. This monitoring and feedback to students was an ongoing process. With this system, after three strikes, a student was considered to have removed themselves from the programme with each email/letter counting as a warning. This system ensured that, at an early stage, students were made fully aware of the consequences of their actions.  The pros of this system were that it provided a good overview of student engagement, allowed for early discussions with students (identify issues, discuss options), created a single central process (ideally would be maintained by academic advisors), and improved cohort morale (in discussions with students, they indicated that they like a strong system they can rely on. Sometimes non-attending students can provide a negative impact on morale). The cons of the system included the amount of work it took to collate, the amount of time it took to interview and follow up students, and the amount of repetition involved.  The Committee felt that this system was very interesting, and it was noted that a couple years ago there was an attempt to use QR codes to monitor attendance because students complained about other students social loafing and non-attending. This was evaluated positively by students but not by staff who felt it took too long to set up.  One concern was the tone of the letters which seemed harsh and the Committee questioned how the proposed system related to the University’s policy on retention and withdrawal. It was important to link any monitoring process with the disciplinary processes of the University, and it was questioned if this type of monitoring removed the responsibility from students to monitor their own attendance.  Another concern was that the Computing system was not necessarily promoting inclusive learning and teaching as there may have been other issues causing low attendance and this process could cause additional stress. There was no data available regarding the types of students who were not attending/submitting work or their reasons for their situation but in some instances it was felt that the system had improved relationships with students who had been called in because they felt supported.  It was pointed out that, in terms of the new VLE, analytics might help in monitoring attendance and academic advisors may be able to share a dashboard of information with the student. However, it was important be realistic about what the VLE could do as attendance is another set of data that would need to be collated, so work needed to be done to pull the information together.  Computing was commended for seeing a problem and trying out solutions, especially with such a large cohort of students because it showed real support and caring. However, it was felt that the system was not scalable. Instead, it was agreed that the focus should be on an analytics solution in a central location because then data could be pulled from other systems. As there was clearly an interest in finding a solution, it was agreed that Faculties should work with IT for further discussions on analytics and possible solutions for attendance monitoring. **Action: DDEPPs** | | **6.** | **PART 3: FOR NOTE** | | 6.1 | Centre for Excellence in Learning Update | | 6.1.1  6.1.2  6.1.3 | The Committee **noted** the Centre for Excellence in Learning Update paper.  CEL was currently gathering feedback on the use of augmented reality and virtual worlds and wanted to hear from anyone who was using it.  Special attention was called to the different student awards this year and thanks were given for the work done across all faculties. | | 6.2 | Annual Report: Dignity, Diversity and Equality Steering Group | | 6.2.1  6.2.2  6.2.3 | The Committee **noted** the paper.  It was emphasized that this was incredibly important work, and the University needed to re-examine how it supported students and provided for equality.  It was noted that there was a University Mental Health Day on 2 March 2017. | |  |  | | 6.3 | TeachBU Update | | 6.3.1  6.3.2 | The Committee **noted** the TeachBU Update.  It was noted that there were still spaces available for Reflections on Leadership. It would be valuable to have more senior people put through to this course. A number of people had shown interest but had not registered. | | **7.** | **REPORTING COMMITTEES** | | 7.1 | Student Voice Committee Minutes | | 7.1.1 | The Committee **noted** Student Voice Committee minutes of 30 November, 14 December, and 4 January. | | 7.2 | Technology Enhanced Learning Strategy Forum Minutes | | 7.2.1  7.2.2 | The Committee **noted** the Technology Enhanced Learning Strategy Forum minutes of 6 January.  The VLE had been discussed previously, but there were more upcoming meetings. In particular, there was a meeting about online submissions and updates would be provided. | | 7.3 | Faculty Education & Student Experience Committee (FESEC) Minutes | | 7.3.1 | The Committee **noted** the Faculty Education and Student Experience Committee minutes as listed below: | | 7.3.2  7.3.3 | * FM minutes of 28 September and 23 November * FMC minutes of 26 October * FST minutes of 5 December   It was noted that there had been a positive focus in these minutes and value in the discussion and dialogue going into these meetings. It was also noted that despite some diversity, there was a positive level of consistency across the minutes.  The Committee requested that information from the Faculty of Management employability audit be shared when complete. | | **8.** | **ANY OTHER BUSINESS** | | 8.1 | There was no other business. | | **8.** | **DATE OF NEXT MEETING** | |  | Wednesday 29th March 2017 at 2.00pm in the Board Room | |  |