**Minutes of the meeting held on 29 March 2017 at 2.00pm 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 C Street (Clerk) Academic Quality Officer (AQ)

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

Ms M Barron Head of Student Services (SS)

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

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

Mr S Jones Head of Facilities Management

Ms J Mack Head of Academic Services (AS)

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

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

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

Dr S White Senate Representative (FHSS)

In attendance:

Ms W Chow Academic Quality Manager (AQ)

Mr O Kozsla Student Representative (undergraduate)

Ms M Frampton Academic Quality Officer (AQ)

Prof G Thomas Head of the Centre for Excellence in Learning

Observers:

Mr I Donaldson Principal Academic (FHSS)

Ms S Thompson Senior Lecturer (FMC)

Apologies:

Apologies had been received from:

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

Mr J Cooke Head of Student Engagement (SUBU)

Prof G Esteban Member of the Professoriate (FST)

Prof D Holley Centre for Excellence in Learning Representative

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

Prof V Katos Member of the Professoriate (FST)

Ms A Lacey Student Representative Champion (FHSS)

Mr S Laird Director of Estates

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

Canon Dr B Merrington University Chaplain

Ms M Morgan Associate Dean Student Experience

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

Prof S Porter Member of the Professoriate (FHSS)

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

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

Mr J Ward Director of IT Services

Prof 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 17 January 2017**

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 2.2.12 – 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 reason 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 Completed:** Mr Jones confirmed the trial for free travel on Wednesday afternoons would run after Easter until the end of the academic year. Estates and SUBU were co-ordinating to ensure tickets were securely allocated so there was no abuse of the system. SUBU confirmed the arrangements and believed students would be delighted with this development. Estates and SUBU would monitor how the trial works, reporting back to ESEC at the next staging point/new academic year and possibly introduce this on a more permanent basis.  |
| 2.2.2 | Minute 2.2.11 Debate Item – V4L Implementation Plan |
|  | *The Committee was reassured that the old and new Virtual Learning Environment (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.* **Action Completed:** Dr Roushan advised the Implementation Plan was developing well, with the sub-group in place. They were finalising the mapping process and the latest version was being mapped onto Fusion.  |
|  | Dr Roushan advised that confirmation for the Implementation Plan, in terms of Faculties’ involvement, had been received.Phase 1 in September 2017 would include all FHSS programmes, FST would have a small number of programmes nominated as well as all of their programmes at Level 4. Dr Roushan advised there were lots of academics coming forward, which was very positive, although some programmes have been declined at this time since demand was now outstripping the supply of available support that the project could provide for phased implementation. FM and FMC both have two programmes (one of the FMC programmes was a joint programme with FST). Training had started with the Learning Technologists. Academic staff training would start shortly. Dr Roushan explained V4L has created a task force looking at implementation and best practice using either of the VLEs. ER confirmed FHSS held their first meeting earlier today and noted the planned training dates were 08 May to 12 June 2017. Prof Rosser requested staff training be more flexible as academic staff have heavy teaching commitments during that time so it was very difficult to arrange a whole day for training. FHSS were developing a new action plan to communicate with students at Induction so that students were on board right from the start. Drop in sessions would be available as migration to the new VLE takes place. HSS were absolutely committed and would also communicate with students at the start of Years 2 and 3. Dr Main suggested that it may be better for Year 1 Students to use the new VLE rather than those students returning from placements who would be learning another/different system to that used before. Dr Roushan confirmed that the Steering Group had reviewed these issues but that it should be noted that the system should provide better for the student experience and that BU was fortunate in that it was able to phase implementation rather than expecting the whole institution to change at the same time.. The team was trying to manage academic staff expectations and their programmes.Prof Stillman raised the issue of part-time students, especially Masters students who may have to learn another VLE part way through their course. Dr Roushan explained that they had tried to work with Faculties to address these students and where there were brand new programmes these were prioritised to ensure the VLE was ready as soon as possible.Prof Rosser raised the issue of only having two Academic Learning Designers who were keen to support the Faculty, however more would be welcomed. In response, it was noted that the Learning Designers were posts within the University that were additional to the already established team(s) of Learning Technologists within the University. Prof Rosser was delighted to be engaged with the trial and have the new VLE in place. It was noted that all the FHSS curricula was due to be reviewed in 2017 as well as introducing new programmes.  |
| 2.2.3 | 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 Completed:** Ms Barron confirmed this issue had been discussed at the recent Fair Access Agreement Management Group (FAAMG) meeting so should also be discussed by the Bursary Implementation Group (BIG) who would take this forward.  |
|  |  |
| 2.2.4 | **International Mobility** |
|  | Minute 3.3.5 – International MobilityIt was emphasized that mobility activities are not just to chase a PI. This target was set because mobility brings benefits that employers are looking for and that are evidenced to provide better career trajectories for all students, and especially for those from disadvantaged backgrounds. 67% of employers indicate that international experience is important, rising from 32% just three years ago. What these programmes really aim to ensure is that access is available to support improved future employability. The questions that were currently being considered included whether the benefits of international mobility can be accessed through simulated activities and/or engagement through virtual means. Minute 3.3.7 – Virtual MobilityIt was noted that it would be useful to have guidance on types of virtual mobility that improve employability. |
|  | As no-one from the Team was able to attend the ESEC meeting and members did not raise any issues, it was agreed to await a further update be provided at the next meeting in May. **Action: J Kuncova** |
| 2.2.5 | **Faculty Induction Work Groups** |
|  | Minute 3.4.1 – Faculty Induction Working GroupsFaculties are establishing working groups that have met or will meet shortly to have discussions which will feed back to the university wide meeting in February. Faculties who had 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.  |
|  | The Chair requested more information from 2 of the Faculties:Ms Barron: confirmed meetings of the Institutional Induction Working Group are taking place monthly rather than three monthly to pick work up and this is working well. It had been a very engaged recent meeting with Faculties with a real desire for collaboration across the University. She is confident it is going to work better.FMC: Dr Dyer provided the update on Ms Morgan’s behalf; Ms Morgan is chairing meetings and following the working group model with lots of ideas coming from the previous organisation.FHSS: Dr White advised their meeting had drawn on experience from last year and the Students Union. The timetabling issues are ongoing but work has exceeded expectations and they will meet monthly until Induction Week. |
|  |  |
| **3.** | **PART 1: FOR DISCUSSION** |
| 3.1 | Annual Report: Appeals & Complaints |
| 3.1.13.1.23.1.33.1.43.1.53.1.63.1.7 3.1.83.1.93.1.103.1.113.1.123.1.133.1.143.1.15 | The report was discussed and the following areas were highlighted:Based on the evaluation of data arising from the processing of students appeals and complaints in 2016, the University may be assured that its published procedures have been appropriately applied during the reporting period. There is also evidence to indicate that the University’s policies and procedures for considering students’ appeals and complaints remain fit for purpose. * A total of 247 **academic appeals** were lodged with the University in 2016.
* Analysis of the data for 2016 indicated that there had been a 40% increase in the total number of appeals in comparison to data from the previous reporting period (175 recorded for the 2015 report). The increase in appeals related to the University’s undergraduate provision delivered by FM, FST and AECC.
* In 2016, the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) did not overturn any outcomes from BU’s internal processes for considering appeals and complaints. It had advised BU to ‘settle’ on three occasions. ESEC noted that as part its outreach visit to BU, OIA had advised that it encouraged HEIs to reach an amicable resolution to student complaints wherever possible. In support of this approach, it would invite HEIs to double check its decision making and ‘settle’ with the student, without the OIA undertaking a formal review of the complaint.

ESEC was asked to consider the following recommendations:1. In light of the significant increase in the number of appeals received in 2016, the NSS scores for the Assessment & Feedback section at programme and Department level in 2016 be reviewed in conjunction with the University’s data for appeals to ascertain whether there is any correlation [*paragraph 4.4]*;
2. The appeals data for 2015 be re-examined to capture details regarding outcomes (i.e. upheld, partially upheld or not upheld) to facilitate the identification of any emerging trends which may indicate a cause for concern *[paragraph 4.9];*
3. AQ works with FM and FST to examine Local Stage data for appeals to clarify whether the increase in student appeals in 2016 was due to any systemic issues or common factors *[paragraph 4.11]*;
4. AQ works with AECC to examine its Local stage data for appeals to clarify whether the increase in student appeals in 2016 was due to any systemic issues or common factors *[paragraph 4.14]*;
5. Faculties, SS and AQ monitor the timescale for consideration of appeals and complaints at each stage (i.e. LS, CRS and Hearing) to ensure alignment to published procedure [paragraphs 4.24];
6. A common template be developed for capturing data for Faculties performance in case turnaround times *[paragraph 4.25]*;
7. Timescales allocated for Local and Central Review Stages be reviewed and sector norms be taken into account as part of this *[paragraph 4.25]*.

Dr White questioned whether she could share the report with others in the FHSS, which the Chair confirmed. Dr White explained that some anticipated improvements had been discussed with Prof Rosser who was working on this area. Also, Dr White was meeting with AECC on a monthly basis to address any issues and agreed to share information with Academic Quality.Ms Peckham queried some the data listed for FST in the report as the Faculty’s records show there were 68 appeals in 2015, however the report states 36 appeals which significantly alters some of the recommendations made within the report. Ms Chow advised the data used was taken from the previous year’s report. Ms Peckham stated each Faculty provides its own annual report i.e. data is already available within the University, and discussed at Faculty Education & Student Experience Committee (FESEC) meetings. It was agreed that 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. Ms Peckham further reported that, looking at the local stage academic appeals for FST in 2016, 66% of these had been based on mitigating circumstances. There was agreement that the high number of appeals, in comparison to last year may not in itself be a concern. Examination of the data available for the causes behind this increase would allow the University to develop a better understanding for this area of activity. **Action: WC/PP**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: MB.**Prof Phalp queried whether the frequency with which ‘bias or the ‘perception of bias’ had been put forward as a ground for academic appeal. It was confirmed that there had only been one case recorded in 2016. With regards to the recommendations 1 -4, as listed above, 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, as noted above. **Action: WC.**The Chair noted the reduction in appeals on the grounds of Mitigating Circumstances and welcomed this change. It 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: WC.**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. Ms Barron reminded the Committee that guidance from the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) indicated that the University could exceed the time target however the student must be kept fully informed. **Action: WC.**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: WC.** The Chair asked the Committee if on the basis of paragraph 3.1.2 they were happy with the report, given that the FST data for 2015 would be considered outside of this meeting to allow comparisons and wanting to learn from lessons learned. On the evidence of paragraph 3.1.2, this was agreed with the Committee in favour of the recommendations and that WC should report back on the actions within the next month. |
| 3.2 | Timetable Publication, Placements and Unified Calendar Update |
|  |  |
| 3.2.13.2.23.2.3  3.2.43.2.53.2.63.2.73.2.83.2.93.2.103.2.11 | Timetable Publication Update – SITS data issues Summer 2016Mr Jones reminded the Committee that in September 2016 he had reported the implementation of the timetable had not proceeded as well as anticipated, in particular with the introduction of SITS. The key action had been to set up a working group that would work on five key areas. The action plan provided explained the actions being taken and when they should be resolved. A final meeting would take place to conclude the actions and also to set up a workshop for all stakeholders involved to ensure everything goes smoothly this year.The intended timetable release dates would be: FHSS 29 August 2017 with the FM, FMC and FST on 4 September 2017 which were similar dates to last year and would allow three weeks before the ‘Welcome Week’. The Committee noted the different dates between Faculties and Mr Jones explained the team had provided the earliest dates possible whilst working with the new process changes across the University. Dr White asked whether the FHSS date could be released earlier as many of their students needed to make personal arrangements in order to be able to attend the course. Whilst this was understood, Mr Jones explained that if the calendar was released earlier, timetable changes would then take place which students had historically not liked. It was a matter of balancing accuracy and release dates, although work would continue on trying to improve on the earlier release of timetables.**Noted:** The Committee noted the Timetable Publication Update. Unified CalendarMr Jones advised he had hoped to have progressed further by now. Work was ongoing with some of the creative solutions IT had put forward and Advanced Learning are testing a reporting tool as part of Facility. This could lead the way to a module which we could use, should it perform well. It was hoped the Unified Calendar would be presented to the IT Board in April. IT wanted to improve the student experience, provide everything in one place and improve the standard of reporting and providing more management information. The IT proposal was for users to use their favoured calendar and the chosen platform would pull other events, programmes, exams or timetables onto that calendar, however it was very important to get everything set up correctly. The VLE would also be set up with the each preferred calendar. Prof Michael Wilmore has now signed off the requirements for presentation to the IT Board. 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: SJ**Ms Mack questioned the Dependencies List and the reference made to an EDQ project. Ms Mack requested some clarification on the details of this project, especially as EDQ no longer existed. It was expected that this may refer to the SITS workstream. Mr Jones agreed to follow this question up and to also amend EDQ to Academic Quality. **Action: SJ****Noted:** The Committee noted the Unified Calendar Project update.PlacementsThe Placements Sub-group were due to meet on 24 April 2017 to discuss timescales and the structure for review by the larger working group on 18 May 2017 with a view to implementing a process in June. The outcomes would be reviewed in September and the timeline would be captured on the spreadsheet.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 16/17 to inform understanding of the implications for scheduling in 17/18 when the new deadline would be in place. At the meeting on 27 March 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 and 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 Mandi and Sarah Green on this but she had not had any further involvement.**Action: SJ**  |
| 3.3 | SUBU President’s Report |
|  |  |
| 3.3.13.3.23.3.33.3.43.3.53.3.6 | The SUBU President’s Report was noted and the following additional points were highlighted:Apologies were tendered for the late submission of the SUBU President’s Report. The recent SUBU elections had seen a record breaking number of votes of over 3,000 and increased in engagement amongst students resulting in five newly elected Full Time Officers from July 2017, with three officers being re-elected.In addition to his work at Lansdowne campus, Mr Asaya and Mr James had visited the Yeovil College campus to see how SUBU supports Yeovil College students. Prof Rosser thanked SUBU for their visit and asked whether there were plans to visit the satellite site at Portsmouth. Mr Asaya confirmed that a visit to Portsmouth was planned and reported that the meeting at Yeovil had gone well with students appreciating the SUBU presence and it had been agreed that a pool table would be provided as well as further visits. There was a limited SU role at the Yeovil College and last year SUBU funded the sign language courses that students had requested. Overall, the students were happy and it was recognised they also have strong academic support.Ms Barron asked whether SUBU would consider a role in addressing an identified wellbeing issue for reducing anxiety for students preparing to deliver presentations as part of their programme and whether SUBU would be willing to provide sessions in addition to those provided by the Learning Development Team and Faculties. A discussion took place as to where the core responsibility for this training lay and whether Faculties should provide this training when asking students to deliver their presentations. Whilst it was agreed the core responsibility did indeed lie with Faculties and does already take place there with some help in Student Services and from PAL Leaders, it was recognised that “soft skills” were needed to help students who often experienced anxiety when delivering presentations. The reason for raising this point was in the hope that students may be more engaged if additional/co-curricula activity was provided by SUBU with a student focus. SUBU were happy to support this and there was also the suggestion that there may be merit in considering sessions surrounding group work dynamics, explaining why people work differently and maybe in an unexpected way although it was confirmed this is already covered in most curricula. Dr White had met with UNISON earlier this month who were keen to be more involved in students’ development and wellbeing; Ms Barron advised that arrangements had already been made for a meeting next week.**Noted:** The Committee noted the SU President’s Report. |
|  |  |
| **4.** | **DEBATE ITEM** |
|  |  |
| 4.1 | Inclusive Curriculum and Technology Enabled Assessment |
| 4.1.4.1.24.1.34.1.44.1.54.1.64.1.74.1.8 | Presentation: “Digital Assessment: what, why and when”. The presentation slides will be circulated with these minutes. Digital assessment was defined as the presentation of evidence, for judging student achievement, managed through the medium of computer technology. The presentation explained the benefits for both students and academic staff such as inclusive learning, streamlined processes resulting in faster feedback or assessment, whilst considering formative and summative digital assessment. It included the practicalities of introducing digi-exams such as having dedicated exam facilities, how these would be used, what equipment would be provided, what other universities are already doing as well as how exam questions are assigned to students, what preparations BU would need to put in place etc.The need for workshops to assist academics to write multi-choice questions (MCQ), especially at Level 7/Masters Level was suggested. Questions/exams could be rotated by cohort to ensure students were not asked the same questions. It was suggested a working group could produce basic questions which the Faculties could then work on to suit their own needs and this learning need was recognised by the Committee. Drawing on previous shared experience, lecturers setting MCQs 10 years ago had found it took much longer to set the right questions, avoiding the pitfall of students anticipating the answer by the style and formatting of the question; that this required experts to check whatever the University decided to use. The Committee agreed.Managing the infrastructure for digital assessment was discussed in terms of practicalities of having enough space, enough students to make it an effective resource. It was understood this would mean reconsidering our view of what is an exam, what exam conditions etc. are simply because a traditional exam model would not work online and the importance of getting the balance right in terms of format.It was recognised that there are a lot of benefits of digital assessment but disappointment was expressed that the University’s new VLE would not offer more chance to radically overhaul how assessments are currently done. It was also recognised that students are over assessed and if there was a way digital assessment could be an opportunity to reduce the burden on students and staff, however, it was also accepted that some Professional Bodies may/do require at least one “exam”.Positive comments include that inclusive learning and assessment was an exciting area for development and that from an External Examiner’s perspective, not receiving large packets of papers was appealing especially as their experience of videoed presentations had worked well as it also gave students the opportunity to review their performance. It was stated that marking MCQ was great in terms of the practicalities of marking, especially within the Three Week Assessment Turnaround. Whilst there are cost implications, there is also the need to check student numeracy to ensure they understand the requirements of them and that online exams would be time limited to read the question and answer. The Committee accepted the need to ensure that what works in the University also works in the workplace as well as the need to be mindful for additional needs students to ensure we were not inadvertently setting students up to fail.The Chair thanked the Committee for their helpful and enthusiastic debate for the way forward with a new model of assessment. The Chair advised there will be an advertisement for a new CEL Theme Leader in assessment role (to be in post from August onwards) and suggested forming a working group with people who have an interest and experience to start some work and gather evidence how to make it work and feel real. The Chair also stated the need to consider what type of pedagogy and assessment we want at BU and how this fits within BU2025 and the next strategic plan; being more clear in terms of what we want to achieve and providing a more prescriptive boundary for how we want things to be done and done well, whilst recognising the need for plenty of diversity within that boundary since we want to be distinctive. This agenda is also facilitated by the strategy of digitalisation for BU that IT have been developing.The Chair thanked the presenters. |
| **5.** | **PART 2: FOR APPROVAL AND ENDORSEMENT** |
|  | There were no items for approval or endorsement. |
| **6.** | **PART 3: FOR NOTE** |
| 6.1 | Centre for Excellence in Learning Update |
| 6.1.1 | The Committee **noted** the Centre for Excellence in Learning Update paper.  |
| **7.** | **REPORTING COMMITTEES** |
| 7.1 | Student Voice Committee Minutes |
| 7.1.1 | The Committee **noted** Student Voice Committee minutes of 1 March. |
| 7.2 | Technology Enhanced Learning Strategy Forum Minutes |
| 7.2.1 | The Committee **noted** the Technology Enhanced Learning Strategy Forum minutes of 8 March. |
| 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: |
|  | * FHSS minutes of 11 January
* FM minutes of 1 March
* FMC minutes of 25 January
* FST minutes of 23 February
 |
| **8.** | **ANY OTHER BUSINESS** |
| 8.1 | It was noted FHSS reported enhanced MUSE scores and: The adjustment of the timing of the MUSE exercise itself to accommodate FHSS delivery patterns had gone well and produced good results; this was believed to be due to asking students’ opinions at a more relevant time in their learning journey.  |
| **9.** | **DATE OF NEXT MEETING** |
|  | Wednesday 3 May 2017 at 2.00pm in the Board Room |

 |  |