BOURNEMOUTH UNIVERSITY

SENATE

Wednesday 30 October 2013, 2.15pm

The Boardroom, Poole House, Talbot Campus

AGENDA

		Paper	**Timing**
1	**Welcome, apologies and declarations of interest**		
2	**Minutes of the Meeting of 19 June 2013 (VC)** 2.1 Matters Arising 2.2 Membership	SEN-1314-16 Verbal Update	**2.15**
3	**Report of Electronic Senate Meeting of 9 October to 16 October 2013**	SEN-1314-17	
	PART A – Vice-Chancellor's Communications		**2.30**
4	4.1 Strategy & HE Sector update	Verbal Report	
	PART B – Presentation		**2.50**
5	5.1 Fusion Building 1 (Mr S Cox and Mr K Papa (Architects) plus academic leads - Mr I MacRury and Mr D Patton)	Presentation	
	PART C – Other Reports		**3.35**
6	6.1 REF Update (Prof Bennett) 6.2 Integration of the School of Design, Engineering & Computing and the School of Applied Sciences (Prof Roach)	SEN-1314-18 Verbal Report	
	PART D – Routine Committee Business		**4.00**
7	**Minutes of Standing Committees:** 7.1 International & UK Partnerships Committee (unconfirmed), 2nd October 2013 7.2 University Research Ethics Committee (unconfirmed), 16th October 2013 **School Academic Boards:** 7.3 ApSci School Academic Board (unconfirmed), 3rd October 2013 7.4 HSC School Academic Board (unconfirmed), 3rd October 2013 7.5 MS School Academic Board (unconfirmed), 2nd October 2013	 SEN-1314-19 SEN-1314-20 SEN-1314-21 SEN-1314-22 SEN-1314-23	
8	**Any other business** **Please Note:** items of any other business should be notified a week in advance to the Secretary of Senate.		
9	**Dates of next meeting:** **Electronic Senate – 9.00am, Wednesday 5 February 2014** **Senate Meeting – 2.15pm, Wednesday 26 February 2014**		

BOURNEMOUTH UNIVERSITY   **UNCONFIRMED**

SENATE

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF SENATE held on 19 JUNE 2013

Present:	Prof J Vinney (**Chair**)
	Mr C Allen; Mr G Beards; Dr C Bond; Ms L Bryant (SUBU); Prof D Buhalis; Mr D Evans; Mr J Holroyd; Mr A James; Mr S Jukes; Prof T McIntyre-Bhatty; Ms J Quest; Prof E Rosser; Mr M Simpson (SUBU); Mrs C Symonds; Dr H Thiel; Prof G Thomas; Prof T Zhang
In attendance:	Mr J Ballantyne (Item 5); Ms M Barnard (Item 5); Ms S Chaytor-Grubb (SUBU); Ms M Frampton (Policy & Committees Officer); Ms A Hall (SUBU); Mr B Jones (Item 5); Ms J O'Brien (Item 5); Ms M Perkins (Item 5); Mr G Rayment (Committee Clerk); Mr M Ridolfo (Item 5); Ms N Silvennoinen (Items 6.2 and 6.4); Ms Y Uddin (Item 5)
Apologies received:	Mr J Andrews; Prof M Bennett; Dr C Chapleo; Prof P Comninos; Prof B Gabrys; Dr S Jeary; Ms J Mack; Prof R Palmer; Prof D Patton; Prof J Roach; Prof H Schutkowski; Dr K Wilkes

1. WELCOMES, APOLOGIES AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies were noted as above. The Chair welcomed Mr G Beard as the recently appointed Interim Director of Finance, and Ms A Hall, SUBU sabbatical officer (elect).

2. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF SENATE HELD ON 20 MARCH 2013

The minutes were approved as an accurate record.

2.1 Matters Arising

2.1.1 <u>Item 7.5: Electronic School Academic Board:</u> Prof Thomas reported on the School of Health & Social Care's (HSC's) trial of an electronic School Academic Board meeting. The School had developed a system based on a different platform to that used for the Electronic Senate meetings. Some technical problems had been experienced, notably the fact that the system could not be accessed externally, and these needed to be resolved. Nevertheless, the approach had allowed for more in-depth debate at the live meeting. Attendance had also increased.

2.2 QAA Update
2.2.1 The DVC reported that the QAA had now completed work on the institutional review and it was hoped that the University would receive a report of their initial, high-level findings shortly. He thanked all the staff that had been involved in the process and was pleased to report that the University had been presented as a professional and engaged institution.

3. REPORT OF ELECTRONIC SENATE MEETING OF 20 MAY TO 5 JUNE 2013

3.1 Senate noted the report. Following additional comments posted by members, two matters had been flagged for further discussion at the 'live' meeting – recruitment of students by Kaplan and the capping of formal elements. The latter would be addressed through the discussion at agenda item 6.2 (below).

3.2   In respect of the additional comments made regarding the recruitment of international students through the BU International College (Kaplan), the DVC noted that a full report on the BUIC proposals had been submitted to the Media School Academic Board on 15th May. On-going discussions with Kaplan were taking place, in which Media School staff had been actively involved. It was agreed that there should be parity of student admissions to the University in terms of capability to succeed, between BUIC student admissions and students joining the University through traditional routes.

3.3   The DVC reported that, following on from the discussion of the International Student Experience at the previous Senate meeting, the University Leadership Team had approved proposals to establish an Internationalisation Centre which would provide a central resource for staff and students. Further details were under consideration with a view to introducing this during the 2013/14 academic year.

4.   VICE CHANCELLOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

4.1   HE Sector Update

4.1.1   The Chair reported that lobbying activity in advance of the next general election was already underway within the HE Sector, with a view to influencing the political parties' manifesto commitments. The two main representative bodies for the sector continued to be the Russell Group and the University Alliance, with Universities UK also aiming to provide a 'single voice' for the sector. The Government's 'Witty' review was currently on-going and this aimed to consider how Universities could drive growth and provided economic benefits for the country as a whole. Recommendations from this review were expected shortly and it was possible that they may influence changes to the thresholds for research funding.

4.1.2   The Comprehensive Spending Review for 15/16 onwards was due to be announced on 26 June and it was anticipated that this would result in cuts to the funding for the Department of Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS). Details of the possible impact of any cuts were not yet known and were dependent on the government's priorities and, for example, whether any particular areas of investment might be ring-fenced – such as science and technology. Overall the picture within the HE sector remained mixed but BU continues to maintain a strong profile relative to other comparable institutions. It was expected that a more proactive and creative approach to the academic profile will be needed over the next 5 years and beyond to further strengthen demand across the whole academic footprint

4.2   BU2018 Update
This item was taken under 4.1 (above)

4.2.1 Key Performance Indicators

4.2.1.1 The DVC tabled the April report on Key Performance Indicators, as presented to the April 2013 meeting of the University Board. Changes had been made to the Staff : Student Ratio (SSR) KPI which now showed two measures – including and excluding vacant posts respectively. Following discussion at the Board, further validation checks had been carried out to ensure that the data informing the KPIs was robust. These checks had revealed the need for further work on 4 of the PIs within the 'Academic Strength' KPI, and this would be undertaken over the Summer to ensure the measurement clarity and data availability.

4.2.1.2 Members were invited to submit any additional comments or questions on the detail of the KPI report directly to the DVC out of committee. It was agreed that the KPI report would be presented again to Senate in one year's time, and annually thereafter.

5. **GROW@BU**

5.1 Prof Thomas introduced the presentation 'Grow@BU: Project or Philosophy?' for which she was joined by Ms O'Brien (Project leader); members of the Student Engagement Team and Mr Ridolfo (member of the Grow@BU Steering Group). Grow@BU had been formed to target and support non-traditional student entrants, such as those from low-participation areas. It aimed to embed the concept of coaching behaviours and had been evaluated following the completion of the first year of operation. A further commitment had subsequently been made to continue the project, based on the results of that initial review.

5.2 An explanation of the project's key objectives was presented as helping to develop resilience and independence amongst students in order that they might reach their full potential. The initiative was closely linked to the University's widening participation commitments. Work had been undertaken to raise awareness of the project among all staff and to recognise coaching and mentoring as specific skills.

5.3 The project was supported by a Student Engagement Team, which provided a member of staff for each School. All were recent graduates of BU and the team encompassed a wide range of skills. They employed a specific Grow@BU coaching model to provide support and help to empower students.

5.4 Moving forward, further work would be undertaken to communicate the scheme and engage staff; to enhance and adapt the current approaches in line with the findings of the first 12 months; and to gather quantitative and qualitative data on the implementation of the project. The scope of the project had been expanded from its initial focus on Widening Participation students to all level C students and 'top-up' students from FE colleges.

5.5 Members discussed the funding of the project and any possible restrictions or limitations on the project scope which might arise from the need to observe the commitments of the Fair Access Agreement. Members also noted the possible challenges arising from perceptions of widening participation groups and the possible stigmatisation of those seeking extra support.

5.6 Turning to the need for staff development and engagement, some remarked that this was not a new concept and that many staff would already see coaching and mentoring as part of their role. Others felt that it was important to avoid providing too much support, in such a way as to prevent the students becoming empowered and gaining independence.

5.7 It was agreed that GROW@ BU was not really a project nor a philosophy but a vehicle for positive culture change and it was recognised that it has a valid place at the university as a means to developing students' skills and abilities. A steering group will continue to overview its implementation and the progress of the SET through its second year; the membership will be revisited. Members were thanked for their contribution and invited to send any further thoughts to grow@bournemouth.ac.uk.

6. **OTHER REPORTS**

6.1 **3B – Admissions (Research Degree Programmes): Policy and Procedures**

6.1.1 Prof Zhang presented the draft Admissions (Research Degree Programmes): Policy & Procedures which had been recommended to Senate for approval by the Academic Standards Committee following endorsement by the Research Degrees Committee. This new policy and procedure sets out the research degree admissions process to ensure that these procedures were fair, transparent and consistent. Schools and Student & Academic Services had been consulted in drawing up the document, which mirrored the process for taught programmes.

6.1.2 The 3B – Admissions (Research Degree Programmes): Policy and Procedures were **approved**.

6.2 Standard Assessment Regulations for Taught Awards: Recommendations for Change for Academic Year 2013/14

6.2.1 Mrs Symonds and Ms Silvennoinen presented this paper which proposed several changes to the Standards Assessment Regulations for Taught Awards to take effect for all new entrants and existing students from 2013-14. The recommendations arose from a review of the regulations undertaken by the Quality Assurance Standing Group (QASG) and had subsequently been considered and endorsed by the Academic Standards Committee.

6.2.2 Senate agreed that non-attendance at examinations should be covered by the Regulations and **approved** the recommendation *that Section 9 of the regulations (Submission of coursework, non-attendance at examinations) be amended to include non-attendance at examinations for completeness and retitled 'Submission of coursework and attendance at examinations' with amended wording as per Appendix A, Sections 9.3-9.4* of the paper.

6.2.3 Members debated the proposals concerning the capping of formal element marks rather than unit marks. Ms Quest explained that some colleagues in the Media School had suggested that the proposals be subjected to a wider consultation and also that they might be 'road-tested' with Assessment Boards prior to being implemented. Mrs Symonds explained that the proposals had been subject to the proper decision-making process, with several iterations of discussion at the QASG (which included School representation) and endorsement by the Academic Standards Committee prior to submission to Senate. It had also already been agreed that the proposals would be subject to thorough evaluation after the first full year of implementation. The Chair recognised that the proposals would divide opinion amongst academic staff but supported the view that the measures be put in place now and subject to a full review in a year's time.

6.2.4 Senate **approved** the recommendation *that Section 12 of the regulations (Provision for failed candidates, reassessment) be amended to cap formal element marks rather than whole unit marks at the pass mark following successful reassessment in one or more formal elements of assessment with amended wording as per Appendix A, Sections 12.3 and 12.5-12.8* of the paper.

6.2.5 Senate **approved** the recommendation *that Section 12 of the regulations (Provision for failed candidates, reassessment) be amended to specify that all students qualify for the same amount of reassessments regardless of the total number of credits they have failed in a level with amended wording as per Appendix A, Section 12.3* of the paper.

6.2.6 Senate **approved** the recommendation *that the guidance regarding Board discretion be included in 6L – Assessment Board Decision-Making, including the Implementation of Assessment Regulations: Procedure to support the proposal to allow all students the same opportunities for reassessment* of the paper.

6.2.7 Senate **approved** the recommendation *that Section 12.7, 'Provision for Failed Candidates', of 6A - Standard Assessment Regulations (Postgraduate Taught Programmes) be amended to allow an Assessment Board to determine whether a failed Dissertation or Final Project is retrievable for repetition purposes level with amended wording as per Appendix B* of the paper.

6.3   Research Excellence Framework (REF) Update

6.3.1   The DVC briefly updated Members on REF activity. The mock exercises and review of outputs had been completed. The Research Assessment Steering Group (RASG) would meet on 4th July and make its recommendations to the Vice Chancellor. Following this staff would be informed of the decisions regarding selection.

6.4   Breaches of Research Ethics – Recommendations for Change – 6M – Misconduct in Academic Research: Policy and Procedure and 6H – Academic Offences: Policy and Procedure for Taught Awards

6.4.1   Mrs Symonds presented this paper which set out recommended changes to the Misconduct in Academic Research and Academic Offences Policies. The proposed changes were intended to provide a transparent and robust process for dealing with ethical misconduct. The changes would take effect from 2013-14 and would have to be communicated to all staff. Prof Zhang sought clarification regarding visiting research staff and students. It was agreed to check that they were within the scope of the proposed changes (as the intention was that it should cover all staff and students).

6.4.2   The recommended changes, as set out in the paper, to *6M – Misconduct in Academic Research: Policy and Procedure* and *6H – Academic Offences: Policy and Procedure for Taught Awards* were **approved** by Senate, subject to confirmation that visiting staff and students were within scope.

6.5   Dorset Healthcare Trust: University Department of Mental Health: 2nd Year Annual Report

6.5.1   Prof Thomas presented the second annual report of the Dorset Healthcare's 'University' Status, University Department of Mental Health (2012-13) and explained that there was a positive continuing commitment to this work and that a meeting was scheduled to take place shortly with the Chief Executive and the Chair. Senate noted the report.

7.   MINUTES OF STANDING COMMITTEES

7.1   Academic Standards Committee, 2 May 2013 (unconfirmed)

The minutes were noted.

7.2   International & UK Partnerships Committee, 16 May 2013 (unconfirmed)

The minutes were noted.

7.3   Education and Student Experience Committee, 29 May 2013 (unconfirmed)

The minutes were noted.

7.4   School of Design, Engineering and Computing, School Academic Board, 22 May 2013 (unconfirmed)

The minutes were noted.

7.5   School of Health and Social Care, School Academic Board, 16 May 2013 (unconfirmed)

The minutes were noted.

8. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

8.1   There was no other business.

9. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING:**

Electronic Senate – 9.00am, 9 October 2013 to 5.00pm, 16 October 2013
Live meeting – 2.15pm, 30 October 2013

BOURNEMOUTH UNIVERSITY

ELECTRONIC SENATE

REPORT OF A MEETING OF ELECTRONIC SENATE held on
9 October 2013 (9AM) TO 16 October 2013 (5PM)

STATEMENT ON QUORUM

The meeting was quorate with 16 members confirming attendance*.*

MATTERS RAISED BY MEMBERS

1.   **MATTERS RAISED BY MEMBERS**

There were no matters raised by members.

ITEMS FOR NOTING AND APPROVAL

2.   **REVIEW OF SENATE TERMS OF REFERENCE (SEN-1314-01)**

Purpose of the paper: To seek Senate approval to the recommended amendments to the Senate Terms of Reference.

Decision required: Senate is asked to **approve** the amendments to the Senate Terms of Reference.

Chair's Decision

No comments received, Senate Terms of Reference approved.

3.   **REVIEW OF THE ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE (SEN-1314-02)**

Purpose of the paper: To seek Senate approval to the recommended amendments to the Academic Standards Committee Terms of Reference.

Decision required: Senate is asked to **approve** the amendments to the Academic Standards Committee Terms of Reference.

Chair's Decision

No comments received, Academic Standards Committee Terms of Reference approved.

4.   **REVIEW OF THE UNIVERSITY RESEARCH & KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE (SEN-1314-03)**

Purpose of the paper: To seek Senate approval to the recommended amendments to the University Research & Knowledge Exchange Committee Terms of Reference.

Decision required: Senate is asked to **approve** the amendments to the University Research & Knowledge Exchange Committee Terms of Reference.

Chair's Decision

No comments received, Research & Knowledge Exchange Committee Terms of Reference approved.

5.   REVIEW OF THE EDUCATION & STUDENT EXPERIENCE COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE (SEN-1314-04)

Purpose of the paper: To seek Senate approval to the recommended amendments to the Education & Student Experience Committee Terms of Reference.

Decision required: Senate is asked to **approve** the amendments to the Education & Student Experience Committee Terms of Reference.

Chair's Decision

No comments received, Education & Student Experience Committee Terms of Reference approved.

6.   REVIEW OF THE UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE (SEN-1314-05)

Purpose of the paper: To seek Senate approval to the recommended amendments to the University Research Ethics Committee Terms of Reference.

Decision required: Senate is asked to **approve** the amendments to the University Research Ethics Committee Terms of Reference.

Chair's Decision

No comments received, University Research Ethics Committee Terms of Reference approved.

MINUTES OF STANDING COMMITTEES

7.   ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE, 29 JULY 2013 (SEN-1314-06)

Decision required: Senate is asked to **note** the minutes. There are **no** 'Recommendations for Approval'.

Chair's Decision

Item noted, no further action.

8.   ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE, 20 SEPTEMBER 2013 (SEN-1314-07)

Decision required: Senate is asked to **note** the minutes. There are **no** 'Recommendations for Approval'.

The Deputy Dean (Education) for HSC commented that the School of Health & Social Care did not wish to proceed with the development of the BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science award at present, as previously discussed in Section 4.3.1 of the minutes. The programme would be reviewed and enhanced and possibly move to a Dip HE following further discussion with the South West Ambulance Trust (SWAST). The Academic Standards Committee would be kept informed of the final target award when discussions with the team and stakeholders had taken place.

Chair's Decision

Item noted, no further action.

9. **EDUCATION AND STUDENT EXPERIENCE COMMITTEE, 24 JULY 2013 (SEN-1314-08)**

Decision required: Senate is asked to **note** the minutes. There are **no** 'Recommendations for Approval'.

Chair's Decision

Item noted, no further action.

10. **EDUCATION AND STUDENT EXPERIENCE COMMITTEE, 25 SEPTEMBER 2013 (SEN-1314-09)**

Decision required: Senate is asked to **note** the minutes. There are **no** 'Recommendations for Approval'.

Chair's Decision

Item noted, no further action.

11. **INTERNATIONAL & UK PARTNERSHIPS COMMITTEE, 4 JULY 2013 (SEN-1314-10)**

Decision required: Senate is asked to **note** the minutes. There are **no** 'Recommendations for Approval'.

Chair's Decision

Item noted, no further action.

12. **INTERNATIONAL & UK PARTNERSHIPS COMMITTEE, 20 SEPTEMBER 2013 (SEN-1314-11)**

Decision required: Senate is asked to **note** the minutes. There are **no** 'Recommendations for Approval'.

Chair's Decision

Item noted, no further action.

13. **GRADUATE SCHOOL – SCHOOL ACADEMIC BOARD, 16 JULY 2013 (SEN-1314-12)**

Decision required: Senate is asked to **note** the minutes. There are **no** 'Recommendations for Approval'.

Chair's Decision

Item noted, no further action.

14. **SCHOOL OF TOURISM - SCHOOL ACADEMIC BOARD, 22 MAY 2013 (SEN-1314-13)**

Decision required: Senate is asked to **note** the minutes. There are **no** 'Recommendations for Approval'.

Response From the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Professor Bennett) to the Action Noted on the School of Tourism Cover Sheet

It is acknowledged that issues of legal jurisdiction between BU and international partners can be a source of delay and tension in generating partnership agreements. To be clear however the University is not complacent about this matter nor is it culturally insensitive about issues of jurisdiction. Equally quality assurance cannot be ignored. Through the International Task Force, and the enhanced communication it has brought, matters have improved during the last 18 months in driving forward partnership agreements and a range of flexible legal alternatives have been actively used to unlock issues around MoU's. The comment from the School of Tourism is therefore unfortunate and not a true reflection of the current picture around these matters. If members of the School are concerned about specific examples or problem cases then they should raise them, in the first instance, through the International Task Force.

Chair's Decision

Item noted, no further action.

15. **UNIVERSITY RESEARCH & KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE COMMITTEE, 1 JULY 2013 (SEN-1314-14)**

Decision required: Senate is asked to **note** the minutes. There are **no** 'Recommendations for Approval'.

Chair's Decision

Item noted, no further action.

14. **UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE, 12 JUNE 2013 (SEN-1314-15)**

Decision required: Senate is asked to **note** the minutes. There are **no** 'Recommendations for Approval'.

Chair's Decision

Item noted, no further action.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Next in-person meeting: Wednesday 30 October 2013 at 2.15pm

Next Electronic Senate meeting: 9.00am on 5 February 2014 to 5.00pm on 12 February 2013

Committee Name	SENATE
Meeting Date	30 October 2013
Paper Title	REF Update
Paper Number	SEN-1314-18
Paper Author/Contact	Professor Matthew Bennett (PVC)
Purpose & Summary	For information.
Decision Required	To note the update.
Confidentiality	None

1

BU submission to REF2014

As at 2nd September 2013

1.0 Executive summary

This paper provides an overview of the preparations undertaken to organise Bournemouth University's (BU) submission to the Research Excellence Framework 2014 (REF2014). Submissions are made in November 2013 and results are available thirteen months later in December 2014. The paper gives a summary of purpose, structure and potential implications of the REF as well as a brief overview of BU's REF preparations, including governance structures, the scale and complexity of preparations, and mock exercises, and finally provides an outline of BU's likely submission to REF2014 compared to the previous research assessment exercise (RAE2008).

2.0 REF2014

The Research Excellence Framework (REF) is the system for assessing the quality of research in UK higher education institutions (HEIs). It replaces the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE), the last of which was RAE2008. HEIs will make submissions to REF in up to 36 units of assessment (UOAs) in November 2013 and the results will be made available in December 2014. The REF will be undertaken by the four UK higher education funding bodies. The exercise is managed by the REF team based at HEFCE and overseen by the REF Steering Group, consisting of representatives of the four funding bodies.

There are three assessment elements to the REF:
- Outputs (65%) – assessed through the peer review of four outputs (or less if circumstances apply) per submitted individual.
- Impact (20%) – assessed through the peer review of one impact statement per UOA plus a number of impact case studies[1].
- Environment (15%) – assessed through the peer review of one environment statement per UOA.

The primary purpose of the REF is to produce assessment outcomes for each submission made by institutions:
- The funding bodies intend, as they have in the past, to use the assessment outcomes to inform the selective allocation of their research funding to HEIs, with effect from 2015-16 (quality-related research (QR) funding). The funding algorithm and the variables to be included will only be known once the results are in the public domain.
- The assessment provides accountability for public investment in research and produces evidence of the benefits of this investment.
- The assessment outcomes provide benchmarking information and establish reputational yardsticks. This last aspect is for institutions like BU the crucial one.

The results will be used by three of the four main league tables of university rankings in the UK to rank institutions by the quality of their research, as they currently do with the results from RAE2008. This is especially important as the results impact on the league tables every year until then results of the next REF exercise are released, usually a period of between five and seven years. It is therefore a 'one off chance' to impact on this key variable. The University needs to achieve good scores in all UOAs in REF2014 to enable BU to rise up the league tables and to

---

[1] The number of impact case studies required is dependent on the FTE of Category A individuals submitted and is based on the following metric: two case studies up to 14.99 FTE plus one further case study for each additional 10 FTE.

2

increase its reputation as a research institution, attracting academically strong undergraduate and postgraduate students (home, EU and international) and high quality, research-active staff. Failure to do well in REF has huge reputational consequences for an institution such as BU which is fighting constantly not to just become a teaching only operation.

The total QR funding available in 2013-14 is £1,018,494,976[2] and this is allocated between HEIs based on their scores in RAE2008. BU has been allocated £1,452,403 of this which constitutes *c*.1.2% of BU's total forecast income. Whilst BU's REF aim has always been 'glory not gold' it is important that we aim if possible to receive a similar level of QR funding, and ideally see an increase, as this provides funding that can be used to further invest in our research capacity, capability and environment and ensures research activity remains a sustainable operation.

QR money is one strand of the twin strand research funding model used in the UK. In theory it is there to offset the loss (i.e. < full economic costs; circa 80%) that is incurred when competing for and winning Research Councils UK (RCUK) and Charity based funding which forms the other track. It provides therefore the cross subsidy that keep research alive in the UK. It is worth noting, however, that this only works at institutions which receive significantly more QR funding than BU; we are forced to cross subsidise our research out of our teaching income (i.e. the funding model does not work for all institutions). The more QR income we receive, however, the less we need to provide a cross subsidy between income streams.

It is also worth noting that a good REF result is also beneficial to the University securing further external research/enterprise grant and contract income as many funders will look at REF results as an indicator of quality to inform funding decisions, for example, the standard Knowledge Transfer Partnership (KTP) application form requires the discipline-specific RAE2008 result to be included.

3.0 BU REF preparations

3.1 Staff involved

BU has been preparing systemically for the REF submission since summer 2010 when the governing committees overseeing the internal REF process were established by the Vice-Chancellor. An overview of each of the main groups involved in preparing the submission is provided below.

REF Academic Steering Group
The REF Academic Steering Group (RASG) was convened by the Vice-Chancellor and the inaugural meeting was held in June 2010. The membership was reviewed in July 2011 and some minor amendments made to reduce the overlap between RASG and RALT. It is chaired by the Pro Vice-Chancellor and reports to the Vice-Chancellor (who is an *ex-officio* member). Other members include the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Director of HR, Director of Marketing and Communications, Head of the Graduate School, Head of Research and Knowledge Exchange, a nominated representative from the REF Academic Leadership Team, and a senior member of the professoriate. RASG is responsible for the strategic management of the REF submission, including responsibility for making recommendations to the Vice-Chancellor with respect to which UOAs and which members of staff should be submitted to REF2014. RASG's recommendations with respect to staff selection are informed by both data from and views expressed by: external expert reviewers, UOA Leaders and the BU REF Circumstances Board.

REF Academic Leadership Team
The REF Academic Leadership Team (RALT) was established by the Vice-Chancellor and met for the first time in September 2010. RALT supports the work of RASG in the University's internal preparation process and final submission to the REF. RALT comprises all RASG members plus

---

[2] Provisional allocation as per HEFCE letter March 2013

3

the UOA Leaders (one per UOA). The UOA Leaders are senior BU academics selected by the Vice-Chancellor and Pro Vice-Chancellor with the Deans of Schools to lead the preparation of candidate UOAs. The UOA Leaders were selected on the basis of subject knowledge, experience and expertise. They are responsible for coordinating and finalising their UOA's final submission and for managing these submissions through the preparatory exercises. They are also responsible for communicating closely with the relevant School(s) in disseminating key information relating to the REF and communicating RASG decisions. The UOA Leaders have a role to play in making recommendations to RASG about staff selection but the final selection recommendations are made by RASG alone.

BU REF Circumstances Board
The BU REF Circumstances Board was established in late 2012 with the remit of reviewing all disclosed individual staff circumstances and determining whether the submitted cases meet the requirements set out in the REF guidance. The Board is responsible for reviewing all disclosed individual staff circumstances. The Board is chaired by a Senior HR Manager with support from the Equality and Diversity Adviser, two members of the professoriate, and a Senior RKE Officer. The Board members were selected based on their prior knowledge and expertise in individual staff circumstances and equality and diversity issues.

BU REF Appeals Panel
The BU REF Appeals Panel was to be convened by the Vice-Chancellor in the event of an appeal being lodged by an individual staff member regarding staff selection decisions. The panel were an independent group of six senior academics, identified by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and the Deans, and had the remit to undertake a review of each appeal case.

School Quarterly REF meetings
In autumn 2012 each School initiated quarterly REF meetings at the request of the Pro Vice-Chancellor. The aim of the meetings is to ensure that the School management teams are aware of the REF preparations and any resource requirements can be addressed. The meetings are chaired by the Dean and membership includes the School's UOA Leader(s), Director of Operations, Deputy Dean (R&E), c. three research-active academics, and representatives from the R&KEO. The Pro Vice-Chancellor also attends these as required.

Research and Knowledge Exchange Office (R&KEO)
The management and advisory structure is facilitated centrally by the R&KEO under the guidance of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor. The R&KEO provides support for the REF planning process, including:
- Preparing the preparation timetable;
- Offering policy guidance and advice to RASG, RALT and academic staff;
- The internal communications for the REF;
- The coordination of a series of REF preparation exercises starting in autumn 2010;
- Data collection and verification;
- Internal responsibility for the REF data collection system;
- Establishing the Code of Practice;
- Providing guidance and support for the writing of the impact case studies, impact narratives and environment narratives;
- Final submission to the REF exercise.

The key individuals involved from the R&KEO are the Head of RKE, Research Development Officer (Public Engagement), Research Communications Manager, and Research Development Officer (REF).

Academic involvement
In addition to those submitting outputs for review, a significant number of academics have been involved with the REF preparations. During the course of preparation the original number of UOAs being considered for submission has decreased from thirteen to eight. Each UOA has always had at least one senior academic coordinating it. In addition a number of impact case studies have

4

been prepared during the past few years (c. 40) and each of these has involved at least one academic, with most involving a group of academics. The final preparation task that has involved a large number of academics has been the internal review of outputs for two of the mock exercises (summer 2012 and spring 2013) whereby each UOA had a team of c. 3 senior academics (in addition to the UOA Leader) to read, review and score all submitted outputs, and to attend the review panel meetings to discuss their scores with the external reviewers.

3.2 REF preparation exercises

A series of mock exercises were held between December 2010 and June 2013 with the aim of seeking external feedback on the draft submissions that would help to shape the final submission. Table 1 lists the exercises that took place and provides information to show the size, scope and cost of each exercise.

Exercise	Description	Number of individuals / outputs	Number of external reviewers	Approx. cost
1. Winter 2010/11	Light-touch review of outputs and very early stage environment narratives	c. 282 individuals and c. 1,128 outputs	21 externals	c. £14k
2. Summer 2011	Mini-mock exercise for UOAs 7 and 26 only (as mock # 1)	c. 30 individuals and c. 120 outputs	3 externals	c. £2k
3. Winter 2011-12	Review of environment narratives and impact statements	n/a	22 externals	c. £14k
4. Summer 2012	Full review of all outputs (up to six per individual)	c. 265 individuals and c. 1,325 outputs	27 externals	c. £50k
5. Spring 2013	Full review of all outputs (up to six per individual), environment narratives and impact statement plus a separate exercise for the review of the impact case studies	c. 322 individuals and c. 1,610 outputs	30 externals for the review of outputs, environment narratives and impact statements 10 externals for the review of the impact case studies	c. £75k
6. Summer 2013	Review of additional outputs	c. 75 individuals and c. 155 outputs (on-going)	30 externals	c. £4k to date

Table 1: REF preparation exercises held between winter 2010 and summer 2013

During the REF preparation exercises the internal and external reviewers were required to score each individual output using the REF star ratings (unclassified, 1*, 2*, 3*, 4*) based on their assessment of the originality, significance and rigour of the research. For the final exercises (summer 2012, spring 2013 and summer 2013) the scores were used by RASG to determine staff selection, i.e. those individuals whose outputs will be submitted to REF2014. Each UOA was set a UOA-specific inclusion threshold (for example, four outputs at 2* with no negative risk) as a working hypothesis. This threshold was then applied to the individuals/outputs in the UOA and
5

each individual was discussed by RASG. In some cases the inclusion threshold was increased, for example where the FTE of staff needed to be reduced to accommodate the limit imposed by the impact case studies.

3.3 External HEFCE-sponsored REF events

BU held two HEFCE-sponsored events, one in February 2011 and the other in February 2012, that were open to BU staff to attend as well as externals. The events were badged as REF information sessions for universities in the south of England and presenters included the Deputy REF Manager (HEFCE), Chairs from the main REF Panels, and senior academics from across the UK who had been involved in HEFCE's impact case study pilot. Each event attracted in excess 150 delegates from over 30 institutions and were excellent PR successes measured in terms of attracting external delegates onto campus and for linking BU with research and the REF.

4.0 BU's submission to REF2014

BU will be making a submission to REF2014 in eight of the possible 36 UOAs. In all UOAs (other than UOAs 19 and 34) BU will submit an increased number of academics which reflects the progress towards BU2018 of engaging more academics with undertaking research and publishing high quality outputs.

Proportion of BU academic staff submitted:
*   RAE2008 = 23.9% (total eligible academic staff - 464.88, September 2007)
*   REF2014 = 31.2% (total eligible academic staff – 498.5, July 2013)
*   Increase of 7.3% of eligible academic staff base

Final adjustments to staff selection are underway and we expect the percentage of submitted staff to increase further in the next couple of weeks. It is anticipated that BU's performance across the board will be an improvement on performance in RAE2008, with UOA 17 (Geography, environmental studies and archaeology) expected to so especially well.

<div align="right">
Julie Northam
Head of RKE
Matthew R Bennett
Pro Vice-Chancellor
August 2013
</div>

6

UOA (REF2014)	RAE2008 FTE	REF2014 FTE	Variance	Notes
3 Applied health professions, dentistry, nursing and pharmacy	14.90	21.4	↑ 6.5 FTE increase	Includes RAE2008 UOAs 4 and 11
4 Psychology, psychiatry and neuroscience	0 (included in Computer Science)	12	↑ 12 FTE increase	
15 General engineering	21.4	24.96	↑ 3.56 FTE increase	Includes RAE2008 UOAs 23 and 25
17 Geography, environmental studies and archaeology	18.5	28.1	↑ 9.6 FTE increase	Includes RAE2008 UOAs 32 and 33
19 Business and management studies	30.00	17.5	↓ 12.5 FTE decrease	Includes RAE2008 UOAs 36 and 38. Tourism included in RAE2008 but submitted separately to REF2014
26 Sport and exercise sciences, leisure and tourism	0 (included in Business & Management Studies)	14	↑ 14 FTE increase	
34 Art and design	14.50	14	↓ 0.5 FTE decrease	
36 Communication, cultural and media studies	11.90	23.8	↑ 11.9 FTE increase	
TOTALS	**111.20**	**155.76**	↑ **44.56 increase**	

Table 2: Comparison of BU's submission to RAE2008 and likely submission to REF2014 (as at 2 September 2013)

7

BOURNEMOUTH UNIVERSITY

INTERNATIONAL & UK PARTNERSHIPS COMMITTEE

UNCONFIRMED MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 2ND OCTOBER 2013

SUMMARY

1. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR APPROVAL

None

2. APPROVALS

Section 3.1.1 – University Sains Malaysia (USM) – Student Exchange
Section 3.1.2 – Hong Kong Polytechnic University – Research/Staff Exchange and Student Exchange
Section 3.2.1 – Yuan Ze University, Taiwan – Research/Staff Exchange
Section 3.3.1 – European Academy of Caring Science (EACS) – Research/Staff Exchange

3. OTHER RELEVANT ACTIONS

Section 3.4 – Erasmus Mundus Approval Process

UNCONFIRMED

BOURNEMOUTH UNIVERSITY
INTERNATIONAL AND UK PARTNERSHIPS COMMITTEE (IUPC)

Wednesday 2nd October 2013, 9.00am – Board Room, Bournemouth University

Present:

Professor Matthew Bennett (MB) (Chair)	Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research, Enterprise and Internationalisation)
Marianne Louise Barnard (MLB)	Partnerships Academic Administration Manager (AS)
Kerry Leanne Berry (KLB)	(Acting) Head of International Marketing & Student Recruitment (M&C)
Dr Elsbeth Caswell (EC)	Lecturer (MS)
Dr Rick Fisher (RF)	Senior Lecturer, Adult Nursing (HSC)
Professor Mark Hadfield (MH)	Deputy Dean Research, Enterprise & Internationalisation
Stephen Jukes (SJ)	Dean (MS)
Dr Alastair Morrison (AM)	Partnerships & International Development Manager (AS)
Professor Holger Schutkowski (HS)	Deputy Dean (ApSci)
Associate Prof Chris Shiel (CS)	Associate Professor (ApSci)
Dr Richard Shipway (RS)	Associate Dean: International Engagement (ST)
Jennifer Taylor (JT)	Education Development & Quality Manager (AS)
Deborah Wakely (DW)	Head of Legal Services, Legal Services

In attendance:

Mortiz Ehlen (ME)	International Mobility Officer (AS)
Maxine Frampton (MF) (Clerk)	Policy & Committees Officer (AS)
Dr Philip Long (PL)	Associate Dean (ST)

Apologies:

Dr Ana Adi	Head of International Development (MS)
Dr Samantha Leahy-Harland	Director of Operations: International & Regional Development (OVC)
Jacky Mack	Head of Academic Services (AS)
Professor Iain MacRury	Head of Research & Knowledge Exchange (MS)
Professor Roger Palmer	Dean of the Business School (BS)
Professor Hongnian Yu	Professor in Computing (DEC)
Professor Tiantian Zhang	Head of Graduate School

ACTION

1. **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

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

2. **MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING OF 4TH SEPTEMBER 2013 (IUPC-1314-24)**

2.1 **Accuracy**

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

2.2 **Matters Arising (IUPC-1314-25)**

   Item 3.1.2 – Wuhan City Vocational College (WCVC) – Recognition with Advanced Standing (Level 1) – Due Diligence
   This action is ongoing. The MS SASC had amended the programme to 2+2 rather than 3+1 as both the MS and WCVC had considered the 2+2 to be more beneficial to both parties. It was noted the next MS SASC meeting was due to take place mid-October 2013 to assess the papers.

   AA

Item 4.1 – International Recruitment – Summary of Partnership Issues/Actions from country visit reports January/February 2013 – Jai Hind College
This action is ongoing. SJ advised that the proposed partnership with Jai Hind College would be discussed at the next MS Exec meeting. SJ would obtain an update from AA and provide an update to IUPC members by email.

SJ

Item 3.1.1 – SAE, Off-campus Delivery (Level 2) – Due Diligence
This action is ongoing. Discussions were ongoing regarding the nature and format of the partner approval event, and it was anticipated the partner approval event would take place towards the end of this term.

SJ/MLB

Item 3.5 – Partnership Development Progress Monitoring – Beijing Normal University, China (BNUZ) (Recognition with Advanced Standing)
The action is ongoing. The curriculum mapping had not yet been carried out and was dependent on the Undergraduate Review in the School which was not complete. Further information was still awaited from the BS. Following discussion, it was agreed to archive the Recognition Development.

AM

Item 3.5 – Partnership Development Progress Monitoring – Beijing Wuzi University, China
This action is ongoing. The curriculum mapping had not yet been carried out and was dependent on the Undergraduate Review in the School which was not complete. Further information was still awaited from the BS. Our contact at Beijing Wuzi University was due to look at the MoU upon her return to work following the summer holidays.

BS

Item 4.1 – Current Partnerships for Archiving – University of Economics and Law (UEL), Vietnam
This action is ongoing. A termination letter was sent on 20 September 2013 by Legal Services.

MLB

Item 3.1.1 – St Petersburg State University (SPSU) – Research/Staff Exchange
This action is ongoing. Academic Partnerships were awaiting confirmation from the partner regarding the MoU.

AM

Item 3.2.2 – Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales Sede (FLACSO) – Research/Staff Exchange
This action is ongoing. The Committee agreed an MoU of 3 years in length would be provided. A variation letter was produced by Legal Services and passed to the MS on 24th September 2013. Cheryl Martens (MS) was liaising with the contact to get approval of the draft.

SJ

Item 3.3.1 – Chulalongkorn University – Student Exchange
This action is ongoing. Due Diligence documentation was still outstanding, therefore MLB and EC would have a further discussion regarding the documentation required. This would be discussed at the next IUPC meeting on 13 November 2013.

AM

Item 3.5 – Partnership Development Progress Monitoring – Beijing International Studies University (BISU)
This action is ongoing. RS had spoken to Keith Wilkes and there was no further progress to report. It was confirmed this should now be archived by IUPC.

RS

Item 3.5 – Partnership Development Progress Monitoring – Wuhan Commercial Service College
This action is ongoing. SJ advised this would be considered at the October MS SASC meeting.

SJ

Item 3.5 – Partnership Development Progress Monitoring – TwoFour54
Action completed. This would now be a commercial arrangement and IUPC confirmed this should now be archived.

3.   PARTNERSHIP DEVELOPMENTS

3.1   Staff/Student Exchange Partner Approvals

3.1.1   University Sains Malaysia (USM) – Student Exchange – Partnership Development Proposal (IUPC-1314-26)

RF introduced the University Sains Malaysia (USM) Partnership Development Proposal (PDP).

USM had a long standing link with BU and the relationship had been developing well. The Committee was requested to assess the proposal for a Student Exchange partnership.

An MoU had been signed by BU and USM in 2010 which established the conditions for a range of activities which included student teaching and learning, as well as a research collaboration, which had resulted in well received research output. The proposed partnership development would offer students from the 20 credit Level I Unit 'Overcoming Disability' on the BA Sociology and Social Policy programme the opportunity to undertake a 20 day placement in Malaysia in the second semester.

University Sains Malaysia (USM) – Student Exchange – Due Diligence (IUPC-1314-27)

ME introduced the Due Diligence report to the Committee.

USM was listed as a high ranking University in Malaysia and South East Asia and was one of the four Higher Institutions of Learning recognised by the Malaysia Ministry of Education as a Research Intensive University.

It had been difficult to obtain some Due Diligence information, although Dr Crabtree had obtained some information from senior staff at USM. USM would not provide any financial information as it was a Public University and their financial information was confidential, therefore it had not been possible to assess the financial risk.

USM had not provided all of the documentation requested for the Legal Due Diligence checks e.g. Data Protection requirements and information regarding disputes, complaints or litigation. Health & Safety documents had been provided although they were in Malay. USM confirmed they did not have Equal Opportunities and Disability policies.

DW advised that as the Universities in this area of the world did not have Equality Opportunities and Disability documentation, most institutions had an 'express statement' regarding disability and discrimination. Members agreed that formal written assurance would be required from a Dean or senior academic at USM relating to USM policies on equal opportunities and equal rights as they apply to our students who attend USM, and on provision of support for additional learning needs that those students may have. It was agreed that all students should be fully briefed before travelling to institutions without Equality Opportunities and Disability Policies.

The Committee **approved** the proposed partnership with University Sains Malaysia (USM) subject to the receipt of a formal letter or email which confirms that USM acknowledged our concerns regarding Equal Opportunities and Disability, and that they were aware of the issues of diversity and equality which BU aspires to and was legally obliged to provide. Upon receipt of the formal letter or email, this document would be approved by Chair's Action.

Action: RF to contact USM regarding the letter or email providing reassurance on the issues of diversity and equality.   **RF**

3.1.2   Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU) – Research/Staff Exchange and Student Exchange – Partnership Development Proposal (IUPC-1314-28)

RS gave a brief overview of Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU) Partnership Development Proposal (PDP).

Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU) – Research/Staff Exchange and Student Exchange – Due Diligence (IUPC-1314-29)

ME introduced the Due Diligence report to the Committee.

RS confirmed the outstanding issues for items F2, L1 and L2 of the Level 2 Due Diligence report had now been clarified. DW confirmed that a high number of credible references had been received, therefore this had been considered as an acceptable risk.

The Committee **approved** the proposed partnership with Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU) for Research/Staff Exchange and Student Exchange.

Action: RS to send Student Exchange Agreement template to partner for their final approval.   **RS**

3.2   New Partnership Developments

3.2.1   Yuan Ze University, Taiwan – Research/Staff Exchange – Partnership Development Proposal (IUPC-1314-30)

PL introduced the Yuan Ze University Partnership Development Proposal (PDP).

PL and KLB had met with Dr Wei-Yun Yang at the European Education Fair in Taipei in November 2012. Dr Yang expressed an interest in summer schools for Yuan Ze's English Language and Literature students at BU. PL visited Yuan Ze University in May 2013 to give a guest lecture and also met with several senior academic staff.

The ST at BU and Yuan Ze University were both keen to establish an agreement in the area of Staff Exchange and Research in the areas of tourism, culture, literature and media.

Yuan Ze University, Taiwan – Research/Staff Exchange– Due Diligence (IUPC-1314-31)

AM introduced the Due Diligence report to the Committee.

Yuan Ze University was established in 1989 and was ranked 70th in the Times Higher Top 100 Universities in the under 50 years' old category, and also ranked within 350-400th place in the 2011-2012 World University Ranking category. In 1985 Yuan Ze University received special government funding of $1bn to encourage teaching excellence. Yuan Ze University had other UK HE partners such as the University of Leicester and Durham University. It was noted that Durham University had no formal partnership with Yuan Ze University but did have links for research collaboration.

The Committee **approved** the proposed partnership with Yuan Ze University.

Action: PL to confirm MoU with partner.   **PL**

Action: AP to request CAF from Legal Services and arrange signature.   **AP**

3.3   New Partnership Developments – Revisions

3.3.1   European Academy of Caring Science (EACS) – Research/Staff Exchange – Partnership Development Proposal (IUPC-1314-32)

RF introduced the European Academy of Caring Science Partnership Development Proposal (PDP).

The revision of the PDP had arisen as the EACS had initially been set up by Prof Galvin with the University of Brighton, University of West of England, the University of Boras and Linnaeus Universities, to promote European collaboration in caring science. The original proposal included the University of the West of England, however this institution had now decided not to proceed with the collaboration. In addition, Prof Galvin had transferred to the University of Hull and therefore the Committee were now requested to bring the University of Hull into the collaboration. All of the institutions had agreed on the content of the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) and this was now ready for signature.

European Academy of Caring Science (EACS) – Research/Staff Exchange – Due Diligence (IUPC-1314-33)

MLB introduced the Due Diligence report to the Committee.

Following the revision to the EACS PDP, the Due Diligence report had been updated to include the University of Hull and to remove the University of the West of England.

The Committee **approved** the proposed partnership with the European Academy of Caring Science.

Action: Academic Partnerships to arrange the MoU to be signed.   AP

**3.4   ERASMUS MUNDUS APPROVAL PROCESS
             (IUPC-1314-34)**

AM gave an overview of the proposal of the new process to approve new Erasmus Mundus partners through IUPC. The papers explained the background and legal issues of the new process and cited BU having to give power of attorney to the lead partner as the primary driver for introducing the new process.

New templates had been created for the Erasmus Mundus Partnership Development Proposal (PDP) and Due Diligence report. The new PDP template was a simpler version of the original PDP, and the Due Diligence template would now take into account the Co-ordinator and Partner experiences with Erasmus Mundus grants. The Due Diligence report would confirm the institutions' status and that they were listed on NARIC.

Should any issues arise or the lead partner was deemed to be a risk, BU would ask to see a full proposal before an Agreement was signed. In addition, if an Erasmus Mundus grant had not been held previously by a partner, BU would ask for further information. If a partner were not envisaged to be a risk, BU would allow the funding application to proceed when the papers had been reviewed by the Committee. It was agreed that this new process would need a lot of forward planning.

Due Diligence reports on the list of previous and current partners would be scrutinised at the next IUPC meeting on 13th November 2013 and any issues noted.

**4   INTERNATIONAL RECRUITMENT PARTNERS 2013/14 UPDATE
             (IUPC-1314-35)**

KLB gave a brief update on international recruitment partners for this Autumn.

Indonesia

BINUS - Seven students had enrolled in 2013/14 which included four students to the BS and three students to the ST. Growth was looking positive and three visits were planned to BINUS by the Recruitment Team within the next nine months.

Thailand

Chulalongkorn University – Two exchange students had been welcomed to the MS this year and it was anticipated further students would also be received. These students were not part of a formal signed Agreement and were not part of Student Exchange.

China

Beijing Normal University, Zhuhai – It had been well documented that the number of applications for 2013/14 had been considerably lower than 2012/13 for the BS. A meeting would take place during week commencing 7th October 2013 with Kaplan International College regarding entry states and whether they could cater for these students more effectively. Further work and support would be provided by the International Recruitment Team to the BS.

Beijing Wuzi University – Recruitment numbers had been disappointing this year with no enrolments for 2013/14. It was hoped the programme review would provide the opportunity for BU to welcome more students.

Communication University of China – There had been five enrolments for 2013/14. Further visits were planned and work would continue on converting applications.

5. **PARTNER DEVELOPMENT UPDATES**
   (IUPC-1314-36)

   University of South Australia – AM was still waiting to hear from the University of South Australia.

   Victoria University – This partnership had been approved at an event on 18th September 2013.

   Ryerson University – The student exchange agreement had been renewed.

   Beijing Normal University (BNUZ) – Renewal – There was no further update from the School available at present. Following discussion, it was agreed to archive the Recognition Development.

   Beijing Normal University (BNUZ) – There was no further update from the School available at present. Following discussion, it was agreed to archive this Recognition Development.

   Beijing Wuzi University - There was no further update available from the School at present. Following discussion, it was agreed to archive this Recognition Development.

   Nanjing University of Finance & Economics – The MoU documents had been signed and would be taken to Nanjing by Feifei Xu on 14th October 2013.

   Wuhan City Vocational College – The curriculum mapping documents for approving the Recognition Development would be discussed at the MS SASC meeting in October 2013.

   Wuhan Commercial Service College – SJ advised that the curriculum mapping documents for approving the Recognition Development would be considered at the October MS SASC meeting.

   Beijing Jiaotong University – The School was now finalising a partner discount after the curriculum mapping documents had been approved by DEC SASC.

Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU) – This proposed partnership had been approved earlier in the meeting. The Student Exchange Agreement would progress and PolyU were content with proceedings.

Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU) - AM advised the MoU for Research/Staff Exchange could be archived.

University of Electronic Science and Technology of China - The curriculum mapping documents for approving the Recognition Development would be discussed at the MS SASC meeting in October 2013.

Xidian University – The MoU was awaiting signature by the VC and would be sent out shortly.

Liaoning University – AM was waiting for the partner to consider the MoU.

North China Electric Power University (NCEPU) – AM was still waiting for confirmation over the translation of the MoU. DW advised there would need to be one language prevailing. AM would contact NCEPU for a further update.   **AM**

Universidad EAFIT – AM would discuss this with Legal Services to obtain further advice.   **AM**
It was noted there was budget available should Colombian legal advice be required.

SENESCYT – BU was still waiting to be on a 'recognised universities' list. AM expected this to be completed late 2013/early 2014.

Facultad Latino Americana de Ciencesias Sociales Sede (FLACSO) – Cheryl Martens was liaising with the partner to get the draft approved.

PES Institute of Technology (PESIT) – The MoU had been signed and would be taken on the visit planned for October 2013.

BINUS University – Curriculum mapping was still being carried out and this would be sent to BINUS for their feedback.

Universiti Malaysia Sarawak – This partnership was approved by the panel on 18th September 2013.

Universiti Sains Malaysia – This partnership was approved at the IUPC meeting on 2nd October 2013.

Universiti Malaysia Pahang (UMP) – The BU and UMP Legal Departments would have further discussion as there was an issue with jurisdiction.

Tribhuvan University – The signed Agreements were sent to the partner on 16th August 2013. Following the initial approval of the Agreement, a query was then raised by   **AM**
Tribhuvan University. Academic Partnerships would update Legal Services with further information once confirmation had been received from Tribhuvan.

Utrecht School of the Arts (HKU) – A draft variation letter for the partner to approve would   **DW**
be prepared ahead of the standard BU signature procedure was commenced.

St Petersburg State University (SPSU) – Academic Partnerships had sent the draft MoU to SPSU.

European Academy of Caring Science - This partnership was approved at the IUPC meeting on 2nd October 2013.

Yuan Ze University - This partnership was approved at the IUPC meeting on 2nd October 2013.

Kasetsart University – The outstanding issues had all been resolved and the MoU would now be progressed.

Chulalongkorn University – ME had written to Chulalongkorn University several months ago and again at the end of September 2013 to request the outstanding documents or translated documents. They confirmed the translated documents would be available in a few weeks' time. Members agreed that a list of the documents available would be sufficient for BU's requirements in order that BU could make the necessary provision. Unfortunately, Chulalongkorn University did not respond in time to allow papers to be prepared and submitted to the IUPC meeting on 2nd October 2013.

The Student Exchange Agreement had been sent to Chulalongkorn University as a provisional draft document. However, they had raised a query which had been followed up by Academic Partnerships. Academic Partnerships were still waiting for a response from Chulalongkorn University. EC and Fiona Cownie would chase Chulalongkorn University for a response.

EC/FC

Action: AM agreed to check the signed MoU was on file and advise DW.

AM

MB requested that a log be kept to monitor the progress being made and actions being taken for each partner. The format of the log would be considered. It was noted that GlobalBU was used at present to log any progress and would be kept up to date with progress on actions.

AM

MB requested that the lead academic for each partner received a copy of all emails sent by staff regarding partners in order they are kept up to date with progress.

TwoFour54 – It was confirmed this would now be a commercial arrangement and could now be archived.

Montclair State University – The Student Exchange Agreement was sent to Montclair State University on 27th September 2013. Academic Partnerships were still awaiting the return of the Student Exchange MoU.

Mercy College – AM had recently attended a meeting where it had been agreed that the exchange would be taken forward within the MS. Further discussions would take place with the BS and DEC to take the intended partnership forward with Mercy College.

University of Central Florida – The signed Student Exchange Agreement had been signed and would be sent to the partner on 2nd October 2013. It was agreed the MoU development would now be archived.

6. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

MH advised the Committee that within DEC, they had some BU studentships which were co-funded with other universities within Europe. It was noted that a number of Chinese institutions had students studying in Europe using this route. All co-funded studentships were working well and the funding was being received by BU. DW advised that as long as the studentship documents were dealt with appropriately, this would not be a problem to Legal Services.

MB requested a list be provided by the GS which listed all Erasmus and Erasmus Mundus studentships and whether they were formal exchanges.

AM

Date of next meeting:
Wednesday 13th November 2013 – 9.00am to 10.30am– Board Room

BOURNEMOUTH UNIVERSITY

COMMITTEE MINUTES SUBMITTED TO SENATE

UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE

UNCONFIRMED MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 16 OCTOBER 2013

SUMMARY

1. **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR APPROVAL BY SENATE**

   None

2. **ACTIONS APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE**

   None

3. **OTHER RELEVANT ACTIONS OR ITEMS OF INTEREST**

   The Committee discussed at length a research ethics restructure proposal previously approved by URKEC. Several concerns were raised, to include the remit of the proposed Ethics Panels, timeliness of approvals and whether the proposed restructure was fit for purpose. The Chair summarised to say UREC would not support or approve the restructure as the rationale had not been given but acknowledged that as peers are restructuring ethics committees, this should be explored further.

   The Committee decided to not approve the revised Research Ethics Code of Practice until the proposed restructure is formalised and agreed.

Minutes of a meeting held on Wednesday 16 October 2013, 12:30, PG141

Present: Mr J Stevens (Chair); Dr K Appleton; Mr S Beer; Mrs S Collins; Dr V Culpin; Mr D Gobbett; Prof V Hundley; Ms E Jack; Dr I Jones; Dr D Lilleker; Dr S McKeown (on behalf of Dr G Roushan); Dr C Osborne; Prof H Schutkowski.

In Attendance: Mrs J Hastings Taylor (Secretary/Clerk); Prof I MacRury (Head of Research & Knowledge Exchange, Media School, for Item 6).

Not in attendance: Dr M Hind; Dr C Hodges; Dr G Roushan; Dr N Speith.

1 Welcome

Mr J Stevens welcomed members to the meeting. As this was his first UREC meeting, he first introduced himself and went through his biography (Item 3). He then asked UREC members to do the same; each member introduced themselves and stated their role within the University as well as their background and experience with research ethics.

2 Minutes from previous meeting (12 June 2013)

2.1 The minutes were approved as an accurate record.

Matters arising

2.2 Update Report on Special Inquiry (minute 1.1.3): An update report was distributed to UREC members regarding this matter (Item 4).

2.3 Raise awareness regarding research ethics e-module (minute 5.2): Sufficient awareness had been raised throughout the summer resulting in an 83% completion rate across the University. The e-module was further discussed as part of Item 10.

2.4 Including a reference to the requirement for ethical approval within the APF process (minute 8.4): Mrs J Hastings Taylor clarified that at the last UREC meeting, Dr D Lilleker raised concerns regarding the APF Quality Approval form and the suggestion on this that ethical approval should be gained prior to funding submissions; however, it was agreed that this would causes a great deal of extra work. Mrs J Hastings Taylor confirmed that a tick box had been added to the APF Quality Approval form to state 'I understand that acceptance of any award is subject to ethical approval via the online ethics checklist'. Dr D Lilleker made further comment that the APF training and form should highlight that ethical aspects of the project should be considered when approval is sought.

2.5 PDF formatting within the Online Ethics Checklist (minute 9.2): Mrs J Hastings Taylor informed UREC of the new ethics checklist function which allows attachments to be added as part of the checklist which is then sent straight to the supervisor/ ethics representative and addresses formatting issues. This issue is now resolved.

3 Biography: John Stevens

3.1 Mr J Stevens went through his biography in detail at the beginning of the meeting (Item 1).

4 Update Report: Trevor Hearing

4.1 Dr C Osborne provided UREC with an update on the Trevor Hearing complaint. She began with a brief overview of the issue and reassured the members that the required actions had been taken, to include the blog being removed. The thesis in question has not yet been submitted and measures are in place to ensure the submitted thesis is compliant with the Committee's requirements.

5 Research Ethics Restructure Proposal

5.1 Dr C Osborne presented a paper approved by URKEC on a restructure of the School Research Ethics approval process into three distinct Ethics Panels. She emphasised that the detail of how the process will work will be established by the three Ethics Panel Chairs and invited UREC to be involved in the new structure. Dr C Osborne asked for comments on the paper and concerns by UREC were raised.

5.2 Dr D Lilleker stated that the critical aspects of school based advice on processes would be missed in the new structure such as that which he offers. He did state that this could be given by a mentor or possibly the DDRE.

5.3 Dr K Appleton expressed concern that researchers wouldn't be clear on which Ethics Panel to apply to due to the crossover between the discipline-based Ethics Panels. Dr C Osborne clarified that the researcher would be able to approach the Ethics Panel Chairs or Ethics Panel Member to decide which is the best fit. Additionally, it is anticipated the Ethics Panels will have the option to cross-refer applications to another Ethics Panel if it thinks another is more appropriate; however, as Dr C Osborne noted, this detail is yet to be decided and would be clarified when the process is designed having taken the comments of UREC into consideration.

5.4 Several members raised concerns as to the time that would be taken to turn approvals around. Dr K Appleton noted that she didn't want the new process to be a barrier if the turnaround time was too long. Mr S Beer stated that he often approves ethics checklists within 24 hours when requested, in particular for proposals working with businesses. Dr C Osborne confirmed the timings of the Ethics Panels would be determined when the process is designed.

5.5 Prof V Hundley asked for clarity around the term 'above minimal risk' as the paper states if a proposal is above minimal risk it will be sent for Ethics Panel approval. Dr C Osborne stated this would be based on best practice and defined by the Ethics Panel Chairs as a collective.

5.6 Prof V Hundley also raised concerns that the Ethics Panel membership should not be based on grade hierarchy as many members of staff of lower grades are more experienced. Dr C Osborne stated that while the Chair would be a senior member of staff, membership would not be limited to those in senior positions. Prof V Hundley highlighted that the Terms of Reference should be amended to reflect this.

5.7 Several members raised the issue of time again with concern as to UG and PGT reviews. Mrs J Hastings Taylor and Dr C Osborne reassured UREC that UG and PGT could have their supervisor review their checklist as is currently the case and if it was above minimal risk only then would it go to an Ethics Panel for review.

5.8 Concerns were raised by Dr K Appleton as to how supervisors and those in the school would know when a student has gained ethical approval for a project. Mrs J Hastings Taylor stated that students will still select their School on the checklist and a mechanism could be built with IT to alert the supervisor that approval has been given. Those who need access to completed lists in the School can retain these.

5.9 Mr J Stevens questioned the rationale behind three Ethics Panels as opposed to another number. Dr C Osborne noted that the University is not wedded to three Ethics Panels. This simply came about because most research undertaken at BU can fit into all three Ethics Panels, but it was highlighted that there may be scope to explore a different number of Ethics Panels and/or different Ethics Panel titles and invited UREC members to discuss this further.

5.10   Dr D Lilleker raised an issue that Media School students undertake a dissertation within four months and if they require Ethics Panel sign off this could impact on their ability to do this. Psychology and HSC had similar concerns. Ms E Jack noted that this could impact on the student experience.

5.11   Prof V Hundley raised the issue as to how monitoring will be undertaken, for instance if an academic/ student completes the checklist to state that their research does not involve vulnerable patients when it in fact does.

5.12   The issue of poor supervision was raised and that projects could be easily signed off. Prof H Schutkowski raised that education is needed and this is a supervisory issue, not one linked to the proposed new process. Dr C Osborne highlighted that this is an issue in the current system which demonstrates the need to have this addressed as it is a wider issue.

5.13   Mr S Beer raised concerns that poorly trained supervisors may be less easily identifiable in the restructured process. He also raised the issue that the amount of proposals requiring full review may be increased fivefold by the restructure and stated that there is too much cross over between the proposed Ethics Panels.

5.14   Dr V Culpin commented that moving to three Ethics Panels from the six School-based Committees is not the solution. She noted that there is too much cross-over between the proposed Ethics Panels and is not convinced the proposed restructure will address the issue at hand; to effectively address the issue would mean there is only one committee. Dr C Osborne noted that the current School-based processes are different and this proposal will help to solve the inconsistency because the Ethics Panel Chairs will agree on the process for the University. Mr D Gobbett commented that the aim is to minimise process and maximise efficiency; however, the proposed process won't fix these problems. He also expressed concern about timeliness and questioned whether the proposed restructure is fit for purpose as he was not convinced and suggested a re-think.

5.15   The members were asked to clarify whether they fundamentally disagreed on the principle of the restructure and the answer was yes.

5.16   Dr I Jones stated an additional three Ethics Panels which are topic based would be confusing for staff as there are already differing research themes, Units of Assessment, research groups, etc.

5.17   Mrs S Collins stated that a user friendly system is needed which has consistency and is robust. She highlighted the University's drive to obtain more PGRs, which means more research will be undertaken and if any ethical issues arise which lead to legal action, an investigation would be launched into how similar systems operate in other institutors. Mrs S Collins highlighted that as other leaders in the field are making a move to a cross school structure then this should be aimed for.

5.18   Mr S Beer stated he wished to have brought to UREC all the complaints regarding ethics in order to highlight the value of the new structure and the need for this.

5.19   Mr J Stevens asked Dr C Osborne to provide a list for the next meeting of the number of complaints or percentage of risk against the number of projects approved. Dr C Osborne highlighted that the number of complaints can be irrespective, the severity of one can be significant. Mr J Stevens also requested figures on how many proposals would go through the Ethics Panels.

5.20   Mr J Stevens highlighted that if peers are implementing ethics restructures similar to this than we should as well as it is important to remain in line with best practice in the industry. He also noted the discrepancy in the current timelines for approval and how this needs to be consistent.

5.21   Dr V Culpin suggested the Ethics Panels are restructured around types of participants (i.e. vulnerable) rather than the discipline-based approach. Prof V Hundley noted this would be difficult in her discipline as a pregnant woman is only considered vulnerable at a certain point in her pregnancy.

5.22   Mr S Beer expressed his shock to receive the restructure proposal seeing as School Ethics Representative recently agreed to remain in post for a further three years during the June 2013 UREC meeting. He noted this is a substantial change and it was unexpected.

5.23   Mr J Stevens stated there are concerns around about timeliness and bureaucracy and he had concerns that what was described as the issues was not addressed by a restructure. He noted that the process needs to meet the needs of the researchers and that UREC needs to influence the process and design. Dr C Osborne stated that UREC and other stakeholders would have significant influence in the process and design of the restructure and that the proposal was more a strategic outline rather than detailing specific processes.

5.24   Mr J Stevens summarised to say UREC would not support or approve the restructure as the rationale had not been given but acknowledged that as peers are restructuring ethics committees, this should be explored further. He stated the paper had not built the case for best practice and in order to ensure the process will meet our needs, further information is needed before support or approval would be given.

> **ACTION:** Compile a list of the number of complaints or percentage of risk against the number of projects approved. Provide an estimate of the number of proposals that would go through the Ethics Panels on a monthly basis.
>
> **ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY:** Dr C Osborne & Mrs J Hastings Taylor

6   Journalism and Research Ethics

6.1   Due to the length of time spent discussing the Research Ethics Restructure Proposal, it was decided to introduce the final item on the agenda at this time to ensure the presenter was not unnecessarily delayed.

6.2   Prof I MacRury introduced the "Research Ethics Supplementary Guide: For Reference by Researchers Undertaking Journalism and media Production Projects," which is a supplement to the Research Ethics Code of Practice for journalism and broadcast research. The supplementary guide is a compilation of excerpts from the Press Complaints Commission's Ethics Guide, OFCOM's Broadcasting Code, BBC's Editorial Guidelines and NUJ Code of Conduct. He explained that the supplementary guide was created due to the lack of specificity around professional journalism and research ethics. Prof I MacRury explained that a tick box has been included on the Online Ethics Checklist requiring journalism and broadcast researchers to indicate they have read the supplementary guide. This will ensure a paper trail exists, which captures the researcher's knowledge and understanding of professional code of ethical conduct in journalism and broadcast research.

6.3   Prof I MacRury stated that BU is not the only university that has come up against the issue around journalism ethics and research ethics. He explained that the working group who developed the supplementary guide reviewed multiple other university processes to ensure best practice.

6.4   Mrs S Collins commented that the supplementary guide is an excellent document and a good amalgamation of professional codes of best practice regarding journalism ethics.

7   Revised Research Ethics Code of Practice

7.1   Mrs J Hastings Taylor presented the revised RECP for UREC approval. The last version was written in 2009 and the updated version includes best practice from other universities,

funding bodies and other key organisations that are credited at the end of the document. The new version is also aligned with the misconduct policy for the first time and also encompasses the restructure of the ethics committees into Ethics Panels in terms of process.

7.2   Mrs S Collins commented that she would send Mrs J Hastings Taylor some clarity from a legal perspective around some of the wording, and used 12.4 as an example. Mr J Stevens asked Mrs S Collins whether examples were helpful in the document and she was supportive of having these included as they are within the RECP.

7.3   Mrs J Hastings Taylor noted that the revised RECP is scheduled for dissemination in January but in line with comments on the restructure paper this is yet to be determined.

7.4   Dr D Lilleker stated that UREC could not approve the RECP due to the aspects referring to the restructure. Dr C Osborne emphasised that the content irrespective of the processes in there could be assessed. Mrs J Hastings Taylor stated the RECP was created prior to the restructure and that the changes made to the document to encompass these were minimal. Dr D Lilleker and Mr S Beer noted that the version without the restructure should have been sent for review and the RECP was not signed off. Mr J Stevens requested feedback on the RECP be sent to Mrs J Hastings Taylor by email.

7.5   Mr D Gobbett asked for clarity between the role of UREC and RKEO's role in relation to Par 2.1.

> **ACTION:** Send all comments to Mrs J Hastings Taylor.
>
> **ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY:** UREC members

8   Revised Academic Research Misconduct Policy and Communications Plan

8.1   Mrs J Hastings Taylor discussed this during her overview of the Revised Research Ethics Code of Practice (Item 7).

9   Obtaining Acceptance of Sponsorship from Bournemouth University: Standard Operating Procedures

9.1   Dr C Osborne introduced this document and explained that it is a new procedure to ensure the University is content to act as sponsor for research projects involving the NHS. She noted that the majority of NHS-related projects are sponsored by the NHS or a third-party, but this document sets out BU's SOPs for accepting sponsorship in instances where the NHS or third-party is not the sponsor.

10   Update: Research Ethics E-Module

10.1   Mrs J Hastings Taylor reported at the deadline for completion, the completion rate was 83% and thanked the DDREs in their efforts with this; in particular the School of Tourism and the School of Applied Sciences.

10.2   The completion rate of the e-module is currently at 87% with less than 100 staff yet to complete. Prof V Hundley requested a list of those who had not completed from her school so she could follow this up. Mrs J Hastings Taylor highlighted that she has been sending these to the DDREs but would be happy to share further and asked the other School Ethics Representative if they would find this helpful and the consensus was yes.

> **ACTION:** Send an updated list of those who have yet to complete the e-module to each School Ethics Representative.
>
> **ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY:** Mrs J Hastings Taylor

11   Membership: Recruiting Student and Externals

11.1   Mr J Stevens opened the floor to suggestions on how to best recruit a student and two external lay members to the Committee, as per the Terms of Reference. Mr S Beer commented that the recruitment of a student should be relatively easy; however, he suggested that the Committee advertise externally for the lay members and ensure a selection process is in place. Prof V Hundley commented that the advertisement could be placed through her professional networks.

11.2   It was decided that the external lay members would be recruited by the Committee members via their professional networks and the student would be recruited via the Graduate School, preferably a first year PGR to ensure continuity for several years.

> **ACTION:** Develop an advertisement for the recruitment of two external lay members and one PGR first year student. The external lay member advertisement will be distributed by the Committee members via their professional networks and the student advertisement will be distributed via the Graduate School.
>
> **ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY:** Mrs J Hastings Taylor

12   AECC/BU Ethical Agreement

12.1   Mrs J Hastings Taylor raised an issue that a journal contacted BU as it wished to publish an article by David Newell, AECC (which is accredited by BU for its courses) and wanted to ensure it had gained ethical approval as the author stated that BU oversees the AECC ethical approval process. She highlighted that AECC do have a rigorous ethical approval process but BU does not have a formal agreement with them for this and asked if UREC felt this was desirable, subject to Legal Services acceptance, that their ethical approval processes fall under the same auspices as BU's processes.

12.2   Mr S Beer stated this sounded a reasonable suggestion but questioned how this would be monitored and whether there is a need for us to supervise the college in their approvals. He also raised the issue of whether this would then be replicated for other FE colleges we work with.

12.3   Mr J Stevens asked what the benefit of creating an agreement would be and Mrs J Hastings Taylor stated this would be useful as she often receives enquiries from journals requesting evidence of ethical approval. Mr J Stevens asked whether BU would be 'rubber stamping' the AECC ethical approval process by establishing an agreement and if so how would their standards be monitored. Mrs S Collins commented that Legal Services would most likely have concerns about this. She also noted that if BU validates the AECC degrees then an agreement on how research is conducted must be in place and we should monitor this as any complaints could end in litigation.

> **ACTION:** Liaise with Legal Services regarding BU's agreement with AECC and report back.
>
> **ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY:** Mrs J Hastings Taylor

13   Other Matters Raised by School Ethics Representatives

13.1   Dr S McKeown raised an issue that an undergraduate student in the Business School would be undertaking a law dissertation on the legal regulation of pornography. She requested any advice from UREC members on best practice going forward. Several members agreed that so long as there was adequate support for the student and no requirement to view pornography as part of the research, that there wouldn't be any major ethical concerns.

14   Reports from School Committees

14.1   Prof V Hundley and Ms E Jack presented the RG2 report for the School of Health and Social Care. Prof V Hundley noted that the RG2 process requires a significant amount of administrative time and commented that administrative support for the proposed Ethics Panels will be necessary to ensure the workload doesn't become unbearable for the Ethics Panel Members.

15   Any other business

15.1   There was no other business.

16   Date of next meeting:

16.1   Wednesday 12 February 2014, 12.30, Room PG142

BOURNEMOUTH UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF APPLIED SCIENCES

SCHOOL ACADEMIC BOARD COMMITTEE

UNCONFIRMED MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 3RD OCTOBER 2013

SUMMARY

1. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR APPROVAL

   AGENDA ITEM TITLE -

   None

2. APPROVALS

   AGENDA ITEM TITLE -

   None

3. OTHER RELEVANT ACTIONS

   AGENDA ITEM TITLE -

   None

BOURNEMOUTH UNIVERSITY

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SCHOOL OF APPLIED SCIENCES

SCHOOL ACADEMIC BOARD HELD ON 3RD OCTOBER 2013

Chair: Jim Roach

In attendance: Wei-Jun Liang, Emma Jenkins, Paul Kneller, Kevin McGhee, David Osselton, Holger Schutkowski, Sulaf Assi, Roseanne Blaze, Zoe Bice, Emma Crowley, John Stewart, Tim Darvill, John Gusman (SUBU), Genoveva Esteban, John Gale, Phillipa Gillingham, Paul Cheetham, Iain Green, Martin Smith, Tilak Ginige, Rick Stafford, Richard Stillman, Sue Townrow (Secretary)

Apologies: Damian Evans, Ross Hill, Iain Hewitt, Kate Welham, Andy Ford,

1. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING
The minutes of the last meeting were received and approved.
For progress on actions, please refer to the action plan.

2. EDUCATION ENHANCEMENT

2.1 School Education and Student Experience Plan (ESEP)
RS advised that the key issue to be addressed is the improvement and consistency of assignment feedback. Several suggestions were discussed, including the use of oral feedback via the online system and using the Dean's office if quiet space is required for this.

Poor engagement at UG and its impact on results was discussed and it was agreed that better understanding of the causes was needed and that liaison with SUBU reps was key to this.

A discussion took place about the difference in assessment methods between schools and universities and students' expectations about support from academic staff on reaching BU. It was agreed that the BU induction needs to clarify this to students.

2.2 Peer Reflection on Educational Practice (PREP)
HS suggested that the issue of assignment feedback could be incorporated into this exercise. Further information will follow by email.

3. REPORTS

3.1 Student Representative Reports (including termly SUBU Synoptic Report)
There was a discussion about the 2-week induction and its benefit to students. JG advised that an evaluation will be published in due course.

3.2 Deputy Dean Report

3.2.1   R&KE
HS advised that about 2/3 of staff had submitted a total of 95 bids to REF with a total value of £6.8m.

3.2.2   PGR Numbers
HS noted that we have six MPhil/PhD and one MRes in place and six more MPhil/PhD coming in January. We have met our KPI on staff/PGR ratio.

3.2.3 PhD studentships

HS advised that there is now a new round of funded studentships. Workshops on funding are available - contact Lucy Bryant for more information.

3.2.4 ResearchPAD

Client testing in ongoing and the launch will be in November.

3.2.5 Media Skills Training

HS recommends this course for anyone dealing with journalists and the media – it is available through the Staff Development portal.

3.2.6 KTP

Support is available for anyone wishing to apply for a KTP – Lucy Rossiter in RK&E Ops is the contact.

3.2.7 Open Access Publication

Any feedback to HS by 11th October. The consultation document is on the HEFCE website. The main aim is to ensure that the results of publicly-funded research are publicly available.

3.2.8 BRIAN

Deadline for updating BRIAN profile is 16th October. Support can be obtained from Emma Crowley in the Library.

3.2.9 REF

Any new papers to improve an existing submission should be sent to Richard Stillman as soon as possible. 11th October is the deadline for collating information.

3.3 Associate Dean Reports

RS advised that the ARFM SASC was 2nd October (yesterday) and some details still need to be finalised so the reports will be supplied at the next SAB or circulated by email.

4. MINUTES OF REPORTING SUB-COMMITTEES

The UG and PG Framework Management Team minutes were reviewed. JR advised that the comments on recruitment would be included in the Delivery Plan discussions in due course.

5. MINUTES OF OTHER SUB-COMMITTEES/WORKING GROUPS

5.1   School Academic Standards Committee
Reviewed with no comments.

5.2   School Research and Enterprise Committee
Reviewed with no comments.

6. ITEMS RAISED BY STAFF

JR noted that he had received 39 email contributions across both schools towards the discussion about the new combined School. His timeline is a follows:

12/10/13	Deadline for further comments to JR
19/10/13	Present plans to UET
21/10-22/11	Formal Consultation period
30/10/13	New School name to Senate for approval
29/11/13	Submit final proposals for new structure to Senate
2/12-18/12	Selection/interviews to new posts where required
1/1/14	Start new year with new structure

There was a discussion about the name of the new school and the issue of being a Faculty and/or having Departments and on whether budgets would be devolved or centralised. JR advised that he invited debate and freedom wherever possible although the VC will have the final decision on the name and some centralisation of budgets allows for more effective smoothing of expenditure across various budgets.

7. PARTNERSHIP PROVISION
Minutes of Partnership Boards
7.1   Kingston Maurward College
RS noted that there was some improvement needed in the communication between the KM senior management and BU staff.

7.2   Weymouth College
RS commented that their Forensic Science programme may be discontinued from next year due to falling recruitment numbers.

7.3   Weald & Downland Museum
RS advised that there is an issue with obtaining an ARFM from W&D since the ending of our association with them.

8. UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC REGULATIONS, POLICIES AND PROCEDURES (ARPP)
All ARPPs are available on the website. JR noted that a briefing before the exam boards would be useful, in order to review any changes to ARPPs.

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS
EC noted that they have been allocated a £179k budget for ApSci Library and Learning Support so staff should let her know as soon as possible of any requirements.

Date and time of next meeting: to be advised.

BOURNEMOUTH UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF HEALTH & SOCIAL CARE

SCHOOL ACADEMIC BOARD

UNCONFIRMED MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 3 OCTOBER 2013

SUMMARY

1. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR APPROVAL

Proposed new Visiting Professors - See Section 9.1 of the minutes

Proposed renewals of Visiting Professors – See Section 9.2 of the minutes

2. APPROVALS

Proposed new Visiting Fellows and Associates - See Section 9.3 of the minutes

Proposed renewals of Visiting Fellows and Associates - See Section 9.4 of the minutes

3. OTHER RELEVANT ACTIONS

Chair's Action - See Section 9.5 of the minutes

BOURNEMOUTH UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF HEALTH & SOCIAL CARE

SCHOOL ACADEMIC BOARD

UNCONFIRMED MINUTES OF MEETING ON 3 OCTOBER 2013

APPROVALS

1.   Recommendations for Approval for Visiting Professors

Dr Anba Soopramanien
Recommendation for approval to Vice Chancellor.

Prof Zoe Matthews
Recommendation for approval by Vice Chancellor

Proposed renewals of Visiting Professors

It was noted that the following Visiting Profs active engagement had been checked with original proposers.

Dr David Kerr
Recommendation for renewal to Vice Chancellor

Prof Paul Thompson
Recommendation for renewal to Vice Chancellor

Dr Stephen Allen
Recommendation for renewal to Vice Chancellor

Gary Smith
Recommendation for renewal to Vice Chancellor

Prof Alan Breen
Recommendation for renewal to Vice Chancellor

Tamas Hickish
Recommendation for renewal to Vice Chancellor

Prof Kath Ryan
Recommendation for renewal to Vice Chancellor

Prof Sue Clarke
Recommendation for renewal to Vice Chancellor

2.   School Approvals

Proposed new Visiting Fellows and Associates

Dr Fraser Witherow
Approved

Adrian Harvey
Approved

Dr Javed Iqbal
Approved

Kevin Turner
Approved

Jonathan Snook
Approved

Dr Adrian Dawson
Approved

Proposed renewals of Visiting Fellows and Associates

Dr Robert Sawdy
Approved

Elizabeth Mytton
Approved

3.   Programme Approvals

Approval for 2 BSc (Hons) Public Health Programmes; UG level of SCHPHN, which had been running at M level, but Wessex now require an UG route, so we need to put on books for future commissions.

HSC SCHOOL ACADEMIC BOARD

UNCONFIRMED MINUTES

3 OCTOBER 2013

1.0	**Attendees and Apologies** **Attendees:** Gail Thomas, Jo Downey, Tim Galling, Andy Mercer, Barbara Dyer, Kip Jones, Sue Baron, Ann Hemingway, Fotini Tsofliou, Carol Clarke, Bethan Collins, Paula Pearson, Luisa Cescutti-Butler, Debbee Houghton, Eleanor Jack, Kim Vine, Angela Warren, Jan Hutt, Christopher Butt (Chair Student Midwifery Council), Zoe Sheppard, Michelle Obrien, Mary-Ann Robertson, Laura Reynolds, Charollotte Speake, Michele Heyward, Leann Willis, Sue Way, Lee Ann Fenge, Maggie Hutchings, Karen Pichlman, Sophie Chaytor-Grubb (SU VP Lansdowne), Kirsty Stanley, Clive Andrewes, Elizabeth Rosser, Andrea Lacey, Tamas Hickish **Apologies:** Amanda Watson, Clare Taylor, Clive Matthews, Colin Pritchard, Edwin van Tejilingen, Janet Scammell, Jill Davey, Jonathan Parker, Les Todres, Petra Brown, Sara Crabtree, Vanora Hundley, Angela Turner-Wilson, Lesley Elcock, Sue Melling, Anthea Innes, Carol Bond	
2.0	**MINUTES OF LAST MEETING**	
2.1	**Accuracy** Agreed as accurate.	
2.2	**Matters Arising**	
2.2.1	**Electronic SAB – Further development required.** This has been completed. Problems still exist with confirming attendance when accessing off site. There was confirmation that seventy colleagues participated in ESAB but this number may be higher if confirmation was a challenge. Action: JD to resolve. Staff reported problems in not being able to delete comments made if entered by error. Unfortunately, comments are unable to be deleted so care should be made before making any comment.	JD
2.2.1	**Bulletin Newsletter** This has been superseded by listening events which are to be discussed later.	
3.0	**EDUCATION ENHANCEMENT**	
3.1	**Feedback from recent Listening Events** GT thanked those who attended the 3 events. Attendance was approximately 25 -35 people for each event. The School Exec team also held a half awayday looking at the feedback and have undertaken an action plan for 10 key points. • myBU – problems with rollover and general shut downs. A meeting will be arranged with Ian Donaldson and Maggie initially to understand	

	what the issues are and have a focus group with academics and LTs. GT/DS/ER/AS will facilitate. Background information is currently being collated by DS.	
	• Need to avoid clearing in the future recruitment cycle for HEFCE UG programmes.	DS/AS/GT/ER
	In order to grow our student number we need to encourage UG students with ABB+ or equivalent such as BTEC DMM awards. HSC have a high intake of BTEC students, providing an opportunity to grow numbers for our programmes. We need to work quite actively over the next 3-4 months to identify BTEC courses that can feed directly into our HEFCE portfolio, so that we can start a relationship with their academics and students to encourage them to come to Bournemouth for future sustainability. This will involve scoping locally and nationally for appropriate colleges.	JH/DS/CF
	• Skills lab use	
	Currently demonstrators are used in nursing, but not necessarily across all programmes. CB will be leading on a project to develop this activity.	CB
	• Workshops on the business of the school and academic worth, particularly around consultancy and enterprise required.	
	Some staff have been confused about what their worth is when undertaking consultancy/enterprise. It is vital that we build trust with partners for free and then work out a cost/deal with them for any further work or where we are given opportunities.	AS/GT
	• Open sessions for BUCRU, CoPMRE, BUDI	
	This is to raise awareness of the valuable work going on in all parts of the School.	GT
	• CPD opportunities	
	The methodology for review via the CQC and Ofsted is changing to include direct observation of practitioners delivering direct care. This may provide an opportunity for us to provide partners with CPD in order that they will be prepared for this in the future. PQSW product is already in existence for this and could be rolled out for health.	KB/SW/MAR
	• Workshop on public engagement in research, using service carer group, using them in research and building that size up.	JP
	• Raise awareness was a theme and an event called ' speed up dating' is being arranged to take place fairly soon.	BD/GT
	• Another project to raise awareness will be undertaken by CB by setting up a School blog. This will have information on opportunities for engaging in enterprise, CPD activities and Research. It will also contain good news stores and share any other information. Kirsty Stanley will also be involved and if any other members were interested they should get in touch with Carol Bond.	CB/KS
	• Stories of our work – how we made a difference.	ALL
	This was about how we capture stories of success where we have evidenced how we have made a difference by the work we have undertaken in order to try to encourage others to identify their areas of good practice. Currently we have the Beacon information is shared. GT will be looking at other ways to highlight this such as the Academic Communities, using the Narrative Group to think about the best way to capture the stores and also using Research Assistants to collect the stories around the School.	GT

	• It has been difficult for people to see how they can release their time to participate in other funded projects. The idea of a bank of people who may be interested in doing PTHP or seconded from their organisations to teach units, etc. has been raised. Also there may be the ability to work with external agencies. Jennifer Catlin and Kim Vine are to collate a list of interested parties by talking to staff about who they might know who would be available to undertake some part time work.	JC/KV/AS
	The Committee agreed that the above captured the main items from the listening events.	
	Ideas were requested on how the notes of the listening events, as well as more general communication about opportunities of projects, initiatives and developments in HSC, could be published rather than via email (as many people seem to miss information sent by email). The following were possibilities: • Blog • Sharepoint site • Dean's Address (published by the lifts in RLH, SH and BH) • Coffee rooms; wherever people congregated.	GT/JD
	The Committee were reminded that many issues had been raised and it was now up to all of us to engage with the projects and opportunities to try and make positive changes.	ALL
3.2	**Technological Enhanced Learning (TEL)** Gelareh Roushan attended as the Theme leader for TEL. Members were reminded that an email had been sent introducing a number of events ongoing during this academic year. The TEL Strategy Forum will use pedagogy as the driver and are looking for engagement from staff in discussions around the tools which can be used to enhance the student learning experience. Schools and ALS are represented at the TEL Strategy Forum and it also reports to ESEC. Staff are asked to raise issues through the Learning Technologist, Maggie Hutchings and Elizabeth Rosser regarding technical issues so that these can be dealt with quickly through working closely with IT. A survey has been circulated and completion will help understanding about how academics can be better supported. The group will try to embed good practice across the University. There will be two main events, publicised through staff intranet, one in December and another in February.	ALL
3.3	**Software for PowerPoint for voiceover** Tim Galling made a presentation to the Committee Members showing uses of Software; Echo 360. Echo 360 could capture full scale lectures or desktop short clips. Software is available through all lecture theatres across campuses and it can be installed on desktop computers PC and Mac. It is a simple system to use via USB plug in and there is a basic editing function. Once uploaded to the service a link is produced which can be circulated via email and placed on myBU. Lecture capture should be arranged with the Learning Technology team who will set up web cam and microphone and record the lecture. For recording a short lecture/presentation then academic staff can do so in their own offices, or elsewhere as long as the software is installed and computer has web cam. The	

software is available via the IT service desk.

Another feature of the software is that it allows uploading of video onto the server. This avoids streaming problems that are often found when video files are uploaded straight to myBU. One of the main strengths of the software is that it is simple to use and provides a simple delivery. The system provides a good experience for students viewing back as they can control it through rewind, etc.

It takes about half an hour to upload a recording to the server

Q&A Session:
Does this go through myBU?
Yes as that is where students expect to find it. It will stay on myBU and will be rolled over for the following year

Some computers appeared to be slow uploading even YouTube.
This should be reported to IT as all machines on campus should be able to play YouTube clips and therefore this system.

Is it a windows programme?
Software is available for PC and Mac. Can view on Ipad but cannot be used for capture - this is a future development.

Will it capture emails and everything that pops up on the p.c. during recording?
Yes but can be edited to cut off start and end

Will it be able to help off site provision?
It is a useful tool for this. However, a lecture taking place in Bournemouth cannot be relayed simultaneously in Portsmouth for example. This would need to be delayed until after the recording.

Can audio just be used rather than web cam?
Yes this can be done.

Is it possible to see who has watched it?
Not through myBU but LT can provide stats on number of hits.

Could this be used if a student was genuinely unable to get into a lecture due to exceptional circumstances?
Yes but would depend on nature of course; it can be used to provide flexibility for those types of issues, although the student would need to discuss their requirements with the programme team.

Can it be accessed externally?
Yes

Is Link Secure?
No. That is why using myBU for a targeted audience is better.

Equipment will be made available if staff would like to use this software. It was

	suggested that loan equipment (cameras and microphones would be appropriate or placing equipment in certain rooms in the main buildings for staff use. Action: AS to investigate.	 AS/JC
4.0 **4.1**	**REPORTS** **Dean's Report** This was available on ESAB. GT acknowledged that BU was the first and only University commended by the QAA in this round of institutional audits and a campaign about how to get this message out to the wider community is being prepared by M&C.	
4.2 **4.2.1**	**Student Representative Reports** **Student Experience Forum** One question from ESAB was around the Student rep event funding, which has been secured. The event will have a discussion forum and drinks and food reception. They are hoping that the reception will be held in the Old Firestation, but this has not yet been confirmed. Action: SUBU will try to progress this confirmation. 21 October is first date of next round of Student Experience Forums. Student Reps are being elected now. All Programme leads to ensure the names are sent to Andrea Lacey.	 SCG ALL
4.2.2	**Student Rep SUBU Report** Those who gave their time to the Fresher's Fair were thanked by SUBU. They reported a lot more interest in the events this year.	
4.2.3	**Deputy Dean (Education) Report** The DDE thanked everyone who has contributed to the PREP activity for the last academic year and that the quality of the feedback was very good. However, there is only a 65% response rate and staff are encouraged to ensure their reports are completed for PREP and sent to DDE by the end of October as it is particularly important that the School contemporariness seen in a good light. Members were requested to agree, in principle, to take Chairs Action MSc Physiotherapy and MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-qualifying) to run alongside the UG programme. This was agreed. GT to take Chairs Action.	 GT
4.2.4	**Deputy Dean (Research) Report** One comment received which was noted by the members.	
4.2.5	**Student and Academic Services Report** The Student and Academic Services Professional Support Service has been split. Student Support Services is headed by Mandi Baron and Jacky Mack is head of Academic Services. Academic Services will have representatives at SAB and a	

	review report will come to this board meeting next time. It was reported that: QAA institutional review – full notes can be accessed through the following link: http://www.qaa.ac.uk/InstitutionReports/Reports/Pages/IRENI-Bourenmouth-13.aspx There is a new and revised series of academic policies and procedure https://staffintranet.bournemouth.ac.uk/policiesprocedures/academicregulations onspoliciesprocedures/ Minor changes and summary of all changes available on the introductory pages. Staff development activities for users of the policies and procedures will be published through AAM. Changes to Standard assessment regulations come into effect on 30 September.	
5.0	**MINUTES OF SUB REPORTING COMMITTEES** Comments from ESAB had been received: - Query re Paramedic Science programme student reps attending student rep events. Student reps have expressed concern at timing issues and there have been discussions about releasing them to attend meetings. Students have also expressed an issue with the timing of Rep training. It was reported that individual trainings sessions were available last year and will be this year so SUBU will promote awareness of this. It was confirmed that online training may be an option to discuss with students. - NSS scores were disappointing for the Paramedic programme and an action plan is in place to improve the student experience.	SCG
6.0	**ITEMS RAISED BY STAFF**	
6.1	**Senate Report** Nothing was raised under Senate report.	
6.2	**Professional lead roles** It was reported that the School was in process of refreshing the leadership roles, last updated Feb 2012. Professional leads and Framework Lead role needs to be clarified. Members discussed what they believed were the differences and it was suggested that the Professional lead role was largely an external liaison role providing links and discussion opportunities with NMC, HCPC and NHS in support of delivery of educational programmes. BD has emailed a paper to all professional leads for comment, in order that some consistency can be achieved as staff had expressed their confusion regarding the roles. The paper will also clarify administration roles and how they help academics in support of the programmes which will be added as an appendix It was agreed that academic citizenship for certain roles/grades was an important factor, such as participation as Chairs of assessment boards.	BD/Professional Leads DS/BD

	It was noted that all academics teaching on frameworks, should inform framework leads and programme leads of their annual leave and sickness in order to help them manage the teaching resources.		
6.3	**HR/Finance changes** Some changes to HR/Finance procedures were noted: - Expense claim form – Expenses are paid weekly and delays can occur because the form is filled out incorrectly. There are two expense claim forms; UK and Overseas. Signatures have to be originals not photocopies. When completing overseas please calculate the exchange rate using the website of OANDA and put the exchange rate on the back of the form. Credit card payments are different and relevant credit card statements can be enclosed with the expense form for this. - Expenses must be claimed within 3 months of the expenditure. If this is a problem because of staff going abroad then prior authorisation must be obtained from Director of Ops or Operations Manager. - Expenses of £20 or less will be paid out of petty cash. An expense form still needs to be completed. Please send to Leann Willis for audit. - PTHP staff have a cut-off date of 15th of the month when they can submit their fee sheets for payment by payroll. Note that there is now a new PTHP claim form. These will be paid into their bank account. - Because of change in pension changes, everyone will automatically be entered into the scheme. Staff can opt out after their first payment and will be refunded any monies taken. - As an employer, we have a responsibility to prevent illegal working in the UK. The law on the prevention of illegal working is set out in the Immigration, Asylum and Nationality Act 2006. These provisions came in to force on 29 February 2008 and cover full time, part time, permanent, fixed term and casual employees. The Act stipulates which documents we have to check in order to be compliant. It is a criminal offence for us to employ someone who is not entitled to work in the UK, to do so could result in a civil penalty of up to £10,000 per illegal worker. Checks must be carried out **BEFORE** the new employee starts work and copies of this documentation must be taken and have the time, date and signature of the individual who took them written on them. If the person has time-limited leave to be in the UK, we will carry out repeat checks at least every 12 months following commencement of employment. Further details on document checking and responsibilities can be found in the following document: [Prevention of Illegal working: Guidance on the Immigration, Asylum and Nationality Act 2006](#)		
7.0 7.1	**FRAMEWORK DEVELOPMENTS** **Preparation for Design Phase** There is a long list of programmes going for revalidation this year including; Midwifery and Health Professions Framework and Public Health.		
8.0	**COLLABORATIVE PROVISION** It was reported that discussions with Pearson's around the potential for a		

	paramedic programme was still ongoing. Units had been designed, but the fit was not clear. A design event is being discussed with EDQ, which is hoped to take place in April 2014. Review for closure will be taking place this year for FDa Early Years in Bournemouth & Poole, Weymouth and UCY colleges. Also a review for closure of top up for Bridgewater is taking place.	
9.0	**ITEMS FOR APPROVAL** Comments from ESAB have been reviewed.	
9.1	**Proposed new Visiting Professors**	
9.1.1	Dr Anba Soopramanien Recommendation for approval to Vice Chancellor.	
9.1.2	Prof Zoe Matthews Recommendation for approval by Vice Chancellor	
9.2	**Proposed renewals of Visiting Professors** It was noted that the following Visiting Profs active engagement had been checked with original proposers.	
9.2.1	Dr David Kerr Recommendation for renewal to Vice Chancellor	
9.2.2	Dr Paul Thompson Recommendation for renewal to Vice Chancellor	
9.2.3	Dr Stephen Allen Recommendation for renewal to Vice Chancellor	
9.2.4	Gary Smith Recommendation for renewal to Vice Chancellor	
9.2.5	Prof Alan Breen Recommendation for renewal to Vice Chancellor	
9.2.6	Tamas Hickish Recommendation for renewal to Vice Chancellor	
9.2.7	Prof Kath Ryan Recommendation for renewal to Vice Chancellor	
9.2.8	Prof Sue Clarke Recommendation for renewal to Vice Chancellor	
9.3	**Proposed new Visiting Fellows and Associates**	
9.3.1	Dr Fraser Witherow	

	Approved	
9.3.2	Adrian Harvey Approved	
9.3.3	Dr Javed Iqbal Approved	
9.3.4	Kevin Turner Approved	
9.3.5	Jonathan Snook Approved	
9.3.6	Dr Adrian Dawson Approved	
9.4	**Proposed renewals of Visiting Fellows and Associates**	
9.4.1	Dr Robert Sawdy Approved	
9.4.2	Elizabeth Mytton Approved	
9.5	**Chair's Actions** Approval for 2 BSc (Hons) Public Health Programmes; UG level of SCHPHN, which had been running at M level, but Wessex now require an UG route, so we need to put on books for future commissions.	
10.0	**ANY OTHER BUSINESS**	
10.1	myBU performance issues Issues of myBU had been widely reported on Monday/Tuesday when the system ground to a halt and staff lost materials that had previously been available. However, it was reported that resources had been increased on RAM, CPU and the system was now stable and had been available since. It is under observation by IT. It was felt that the problem was down to an increase in visitors to the site at the start of term, which doubled. Unfortunately, it seems the system does not support the ability to simulate an increase on traffic with the server to test its capacity.	
10.1.2	The VLE DMS rollover should have inherited content from last year's units, but due to a technical issue unfortunately, for HSC largely, this did not happen as it should. Learning Technology have now looked at all of the HSC units and reinherited content from last year. Any further issues need to be raised with IT service desk. GT reported that this had been raised at the recent Listening Events that had taken place and a meeting with Academics and Learning Technologists will be	

	arranged. Information was being gathered by AAM for a pre-meet.	GT/DS
10.1.3	Problems were also identified regarding splitting and joining of units and a question was raised regarding whether the process for this could be simplified and encourage earlier engagement. Learning Technology will look at a simplified process.	LT
10.2	Fire wardens – A request for volunteers for fire wardens for RLH 6th floor.	ALL
10.3	Notification that the Film, Rufus Stone, is being shown again in early December over lunch time. Announcements with dates coming out. The film is being used for training of Alzheimer's staff and is being shown to healthcare trust nurses next week.	
10.4	It was reported that the Service user/carer website has been updated and staff are encouraged to view it to see what they can do to help their programmes/research.	
10.5	A query was raised regarding a list of visiting faculty so that staff may contact them. The full faculty list is available on Idrive/HSC/Private/School Academic Board/Visiting Faculty Appointment and renewal dates. GT suggested that any approaches to Visiting Faculty should go through the original proposer, whose details are also available on the list, in order to manage the relationship effectively.	
10.6	It was reported that World Mental Health Day was next week. A series of events at Talbot and Lansdowne will take place to talk about mental health. Details will be sent in email and are available on myBU. SUBU also offered to use Twitter to publicise the details.	SCG
10.7	Sue Way reported that she is working with the Centre of Excellence in Learning around work based learning in professional practice. She will be exploring this with colleagues in the near future.	
10.8	It was the reported that the HSC Writing group, led by Dr Bethan Collins, has now been reactivated.	

FUTURE MEETINGS

 6 February 2014

8 May 2014

BOURNEMOUTH UNIVERSITY

MEDIA SCHOOL – SCHOOL ACADEMIC BOARD

UNCONFIRMED MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 2ND OCTOBER 2013

SUMMARY

1. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR APPROVAL

None

2. APPROVALS

None

3. OTHER RELEVANT ACTIONS

None

THE MEDIA SCHOOL   **UNCONFIRMED**

SCHOOL ACADEMIC BOARD (SAB)

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 2 OCTOBER 2013 - 1PM, BOARDROOM

Present:

Stephen Jukes (chair), Richard Berger, Hugh Chignell, Fiona Cownie, Sue Eccles, Sharen Everitt, Karen Fowler-Watt, John Gusman, Keith Heyward, Tracy Hixson, Steve Hubbard, Phil MacGregor, Ian Marsland, Iain MacRury, Phil Matthews, Alastair Morrison, Karen Newsome (Minutes), Paula Peckham, Jim Pope, Jill Quest, Karl Rawstrone, Barry Richards, Mathieu Sanchez, Heather Savigny, Richard Scullion, Phil Spicer, Bronwen Thomas, Richard Wallis, Tom Watson, Chris Williams

	Action
1. APOLOGIES	
1.1. Apologies: Ana Adi, Elsbeth Caswell, Trevor Hearing, Ceri Higgins, Helen Jacey, Julian McDougall, Kate Murphy, Lee Sanders	
1.2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST No attendees had any interests to declare.	
2. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING	
2.1 ACCURACY The minutes of the meeting held on 6 February 2013 were agreed as an accurate record, with one amendment to item 5, changing 'Student Charter' to 'Media School Charter'.	
2.2 MATTERS ARISING There were no matters arising.	
3. DEAN OF SCHOOL'S REPORT	
Stephen Jukes presented the Dean's Report, focusing on: **a. Postgraduate Recruitment:** Noting that PG recruitment has been difficult this year, and is likely to remain so, the Dean encouraged a conversation about how this might be addressed for the future. Provision had been made this year as the position was foreseeable, due to the difficulties in the UK market, and the new UG fee regime. The following suggestions were made: • Consideration of fee reductions and an examination of the fee structure; • A return to the system of requiring non-refundable deposits from PG students (the Dean will take soundings from other Schools to see if the Media School's concerns are shared). It was suggested that data be gathered re new applicants (e.g. applications, drop-outs, no-shows, early leavers) to provide supporting evidence for a proposal from SAB to return to the system of non-refundable deposits (which provided reliable information on likely uptake, feeding in turn into timely decisions about course viability). • Consideration of 4-year integrated Masters degrees, providing a HEFCE funding option for the fourth year from the outset (the Vice Chancellor is seeking feedback from HEFCE about this). **b. Estates:** It was noted that whilst short-term provision has been made this year for the School's requirements, and there is medium-term (4-5 year) Estates plan to provide more generic space and thus free up space in the School for specialist provision, there will be a critical need for more space in 2014-2016. It was suggested that a group be convened to focus on these issues, including the philosophy of the future use of Weymouth House, space for PGR students, studios, etc.	
RESOLUTION: The Board agreed that a review of the PGR fee structure and the proposal to recommend a return to non-refundable deposits for PGR students will be on the School Executive's agenda. Data will be gathered to evidence support for a recommendation from the Media School Academic Board to the Fees Board for a reversal of the policy on non-refundable deposits for PGRs.	**PP/TH**

RESOLUTION: The Board agreed that a group be convened to represent the School and its student community, to focus on the Media School's future space needs and to try to bring pressure to bear on the central discussions taking place about future Estate developments, particularly how to cope with the increased pressures from 2014-2016.	**SAJ**
RESOLUTION: It was agreed that Stephen Jukes, Iain MacRury and Mathieu Sanchez will meet to discuss the problems faced in terms of PGR space.	**SAJ/MS/IM**
4. NSS 2012/13 AND THE MEDIA SCHOOL EDUCATION AND STUDENT EXPERIENCE PLAN (ESEP)	
The Head of Education, Sue Eccles, presented the NSS data for the Media School, and the ESEP. Academic Groups were invited to input to the ESEP, an organic document the School is required to maintain; it was noted that the ESEP is a useful way of highlighting activities which may be eligible for additional funding. The ESEP also allows the sharing of good practice between Academic Groups. Staff members are encouraged to contact Sue Eccles if they would like to provide input to it. A link will be circulated following the meeting, so that staff can access the detailed comments made by students. It was noted that it is crucial that the student voice is heard; the SU representative confirmed that the SU is working hard to encourage students to participate in the surveys and to recognise their importance.	
5. ACADEMIC OFFENCES	
Sue Eccles tabled an additional paper on "Academic Offences and Conduct – 'Grade Grubbing'". It was felt timely at the beginning of the academic year to remind academics of the need for vigilance and for sending out the message to students at Programme level that plagiarism, 'grade grubbing' and 'assignment commissioning' are unacceptable behaviours. Whilst recognising such practices are not widespread at Bournemouth University, academics need to be aware of them and the School must continue to develop good practice in terms of identifying and preventing such behaviour, warning students against it, and being quick to act upon academic offences. It was agreed that work is needed to ensure students understand the concept of 'academic judgement', which often arises as an issue when Appeals are brought. Students must be helped to understand what to expect from university tutors, and that fees do not guarantee a grade. Sue Eccles invited academics to share with her any concerns they had in this area.	
6. BA HISTORY PROGRAMME PROPOSAL	
Hugh Chignell presented the BA History proposal which has been recommended by the School Executive and is progressing through the committee approval process. It was noted that this is an authentic History Degree, to join the suite of humanities subjects being developed by the Media School.	
RESOLUTION: The Board endorsed the proposal for the BA History programme.	
7. CMC – PROPOSED NEW MA IN INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL COMMUNICATION	
Richard Scullion presented the proposal for a new MA in International Political Communication.	
RESOLUTION: The Board endorsed the proposal for the MA in International Political Communication.	

8. CMC – PROPOSED PG FRAMEWORK VALIDATION	
The Associate Dean for CMC, Richard Scullion, presented the proposals for the new PG Framework Validation, noting that PR has now been taken out of the Framework for the time being. It was noted that there is an outstanding Chair's action from ASC which is yet to be resolved.	
RESOLUTION: The Board endorsed the proposals for the new PG Framework Validation.	
9. COMPUTER ANIMATION – PROPOSED YEAR 0 COURSE	
The Associate Dean for Computer Animation, Chris Williams, shared plans for a Year 0 course for Animation, aimed at students not ready for a degree programme but showing sufficient promise to be taken onto a Foundation Degree where they can be prepared for first year study at degree level. This would ensure that promising students are not lost to other establishments; there would be guaranteed entry onto one of BU's programmes for a limited number of students.	
RESOLUTION: The Board endorsed in principle the proposals for a Year 0 course in Computer Animation. Guidance will be sought from EDQ as to how to progress this.	**CW**
10. **VISITING FELLOWS AND PROFESSORS – RENEWALS AND APPPOINTMENTS**	
10a. Visiting Fellow - Appointment – Dr Sue Thomas	
Approved - The Board approved the recommendation submitted by Dr Bronwen Thomas to appoint Dr Sue Thomas as a Visiting Fellow for three years.	
10b. Visiting Fellow – Renewal – Mr Gavin Rees	
Approved – The Board approved the recommendation submitted by Stephen Jukes to renew the appointment of Mr Gavin Rees as a Visiting Fellow for three years.	
10c. Visiting Fellow – Renewal – Mr Tim Wright	
Approved – The Board approved the recommendation submitted by Trevor Hearing to renew the appointment of Mr Tim Wright as a Visiting Fellow for three years.	
10d. Visiting Professor – Recommendation for Renewal – Roger Laughton	
Approved for Recommendation – The Board agreed to recommend to the Vice Chancellor the renewal of Roger Laughton's appointment as a Visiting Professor for three years.	
10e. Visiting Professor – Recommendation for Renewal – Vin Ray	
Approved for Recommendation: The Board agreed to recommend to the Vice Chancellor the renewal of Vin Ray's appointment as a Visiting Professor for three years.	
11. HEAD OF EDUCATION REPORT	
Sue Eccles presented her report, outlining developments and welcoming new staff. Attention was drawn to the induction session scheduled for 9 October for new academic members of staff.	
12. HEAD OF RESEARCH AND KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE REPORT	
Iain MacRury, Head of Research and Knowledge Exchange, presented his report, thanking staff for the encouraging completion rates for the online ethics module. A Media School discussion will be organised for those interested in exploring these issues from a Media School perspective. It was noted that the research pages on the website are being redesigned, which will require some work by Research Centre heads to revise/review the content. The REF evaluations will partly rely on the representations on the website.	

The minutes of the **School Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee** from 21 May 2013 were taken as read. The minutes of the **School Research Degrees Committee** from 26 June 2013 were taken as read.	
RESOLUTION: It was agreed that a Media School discussion about ethics will be organised for interested staff, following on from the completion of the Online Ethics Module.	IM
13. ASSOCIATE DEAN (Corporate and Marketing Communications) REPORT	
Richard Scullion presented the CMC Academic Group report, drawing attention to the activities of the Research Groups and CEB. The Dean congratulated CMC on the 'virtual school' created to facilitate the new joint degree being run by the Media School and the Business School, which it was noted is a potential model for future developments. Attention was drawn to the CMC blog.	
14. ASSOCIATE DEAN (Journalism and Communication) REPORT	
The Associate Dean for Journalism and Communication, Karen Fowler-Watt, presented the J&C Academic Group report, drawing attention to the larger than usual number of J&C students this year and the challenging space issues which have been faced. New staff members have been welcomed; attention was drawn to the J&C blog.	
15. ASSOCIATE DEAN (Media Production) REPORT	
The Acting Associate Dean for Media Production, Hugh Chignell, presented the MP Academic Group report, drawing attention to a successful recruitment round this year, and the challenge of the introduction of BAMP. New staff members have been welcomed.	
16. ASSOCIATE DEAN (Computer Animation) REPORT	
Chris Williams presented the CA Academic Group report, drawing attention to the success of the recent BFX Festival.	
17. CENTRE FOR EXCELLENCE IN MEDIA PRACTICE (CEMP) REPORT	
The Acting Director of CEMP, Richard Berger, presented the CEMP report, drawing attention to the success of the recent conference in Sheffield. It was noted that the keynote speakers' addresses are now available on the website – at http://www.cemp.ac.uk/about/keynotespeakers.php. The first EdD residential is due to be held on 4-5 October and the Dean congratulated CEMP on this encouraging news.	
18. INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS REPORT	
The report submitted was taken as read.	
19. STUDENTS' UNION REPORT	
John Gusman (SU VP – Education) presented the SUBU report, noting that most of the information presented has been previously available. He is working to increase contact with student representatives so that greater engagement with Schools can be encouraged, and aims to address concerns about the SOS reporting system to see how it can best be managed. It was noted that 'Organisation and Management' is a key concern raised by students in this internal data, whereas the external (NSS) data indicates that 'Feedback' is a key concern.	
20. DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 5 February 2014	

Approved as a true and accurate record:

…………………………   Date:……………………………………………….
S A Jukes