

BOURNEMOUTH UNIVERSITY

SENATE

Wednesday 16 March 2011, 2.15pm

The Boardroom, Poole House, Talbot Campus

AGENDA

		Paper	Timing
1	Minutes of the Meeting of 10 November 2010 • Matters Arising	SEN-1011-48 <i>See minutes note*</i>	2.15
2	Report of Electronic Senate Meeting of 23 February to 2 March 2011	SEN-1011-49	
	PART A – Vice-Chancellor’s Communications		2.20
3	BU Vision and Values		
4	Research and Enterprise Committee – Update to Terms of Reference	SEN-1011-50	
5	Electronic Senate Process	SEN-1011-51	
	PART B – Debate		
6	Assessment Turnaround and Feedback (1 hour)	SEN-1011-52	2.50
7	Review of the Graduate School (30 mins)	SEN-1011-53	3.50
	PART C – Matters raised by members		
8	None		
	PART D – Routine Committee Business	<i>See minutes note*</i>	4.20
9	Minutes of Standing Committees 8.1 University Research Ethics Committee, 23 March 2011 8.2 Student Experience Committee, 23 March 2011 8.3 Research & Enterprise Committee, 25 March 2011 School Academic Boards: 8.4 Health & Social Care, 3 March 2011	SEN-1011-54 SEN-1011-55 SEN-1011-56 SEN-1011-57	
10	Any other business		
11	Date of next meeting: 22 June 2011, 2.15pm		4.25

Jenny Jenkin
 Director of Student & Academic Services
 Secretary
 March 2011

**Minutes note: confirmed non-confidential minutes that are routinely published are available on the [Governance – University Board](#) and Senate page of the portal*

BOURNEMOUTH UNIVERSITY

ELECTRONIC SENATE

**REPORT OF A MEETING OF ELECTRONIC SENATE held on
23 FEBRUARY 2011 (9AM) TO 2 MARCH 2011 (9AM)**

STATEMENT ON QUORUM

Nine members of Senate and one Professoriate Observer actively engaged with the Electronic Senate meeting, therefore, the meeting was not quorate.

Chair's Decision

As this is the first Electronic Senate meeting and matters presented were mostly routine, the actions will be progressed based on the comments received.

ITEMS FOR ACTION

1. SENATE COMMITTEE STRUCTURE (SEN-1011-28)

Purpose of the paper: To provide the Vice-Chancellor with comments on the Senate committee structure to support the committee audit.

Decision required: Senate was asked to **consider** and **comment** on the current Senate committee structure and how it could be improved.

Chair's Decision

The comments received will be fed into the committee audit. [Action: Policy and Committees Manager].

ITEMS FOR NOTING

2. SENATE STUDENT EXPERIENCE DEBATE – FEEDBACK (SEN-1011-29)

Purpose of the paper: To present feedback to Senate from the 'Enhancing the Student Experience at BU' Debate which took place at the November 2010 meeting.

Decision required: Senate was asked to **note** the contents of the paper

Chair's Decision

Item noted, no further action. Action and progress against the targets will be monitored by the University Leadership Team (ULT).

3. SENATE ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES – FORTHCOMING VACANCIES (SEN-1011-30)

Purpose of the paper: To inform Senate members of the forthcoming elected members vacancies.

Decision required: Senate members were asked to **note** the forthcoming Senate elected member vacancies.

Chair's Decision

Item noted. Members are asked to communicate the forthcoming elected member vacancies

within their School or Professional Service and consider and approach nominees.

4. E-LEARNING ENHANCEMENT FORUM – TERMS OF REFERENCE (SEN-1011-31)

Purpose of the paper: To present the terms of reference of the E-learning Enhancement Forum which have been approved by Chair's action.

Decision required: Senate was asked to **note** the terms of reference.

Chair's Decision

Item noted, no further action. The comment received will be fed back to the Chair of the E-learning Enhancement Forum [Action: Policy and Committees Manager].

5. EDUCATION ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE – UPDATED TERMS OF REFERENCE (SEN-1011-32)

Purpose of the paper: To present to Senate the updated terms of reference for the Education Enhancement Committee, which were approved by Chair's action in November 2010.

Decision required: Senate was asked to **note** the updated terms of reference.

Chair's Decision

Item noted, no further action.

6. RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE – UPDATED TERMS OF REFERENCE (SEN-1011-33)

Purpose of the paper: To present the updated terms of reference of the Research Ethics Committee which have been approved by Chair's action.

Decision required: Senate was asked to **note** the updated terms of reference.

Chair's Decision

Item noted, no further action.

7. PROJECTS UPDATE (SEN-1011-34)

Purpose of the paper: To provide Senate with information relating to the four strategic programmes and an update on the progress of key institutional projects.

Decision required: Senate was asked to **note** the contents of the paper.

Chair's Decision

Item noted, no further action.

8. STUDENT AND ACADEMIC SERVICES REGULATIONS AND POLICIES REVIEW (SEN-1011-35)

Purpose of the paper: To inform Senate of the Student and Academic Services regulations and policies review that is underway.

Decision required: Senate was asked to **note** the contents of the paper.

Chair's Decision

Item noted, no further action.

MATTERS RAISED BY MEMBERS

9. LANSDOWNE CAMPUS ESTATES MATTERS (SEN-1011-36)

Raised by: the School Academic Staff Representative for Health and Social Care (HSC).

Description of the matter: "There are still various complaints about the accommodation used by HSC at the Lansdowne Campus, including the perennial problem of no writing surfaces in the Wollstonecraft lecture theatre."

How the matter could be progressed: "Although wherever possible problems are solved on an ad hoc basis the solution is agreed to be the proposed new build at the Lansdowne, could we be given a progress update on this plan?"

A response was provided by the Director of Estates and IT Services and presented within the paper.

Chair's Decision

The action and progress in relation to the amendments to the Wollstonecraft lecture theatre will be monitored by ULT (as per Item 2 of this report). No further action.

Members will be informed of the outcomes of the Estates Strategy Review by the Vice-Chancellor.

The School Academic Staff Representative for HSC to feedback outcomes to their constituency.

10. EXAM BOARD REVIEW PROJECT (SEN-1011-37)

Raised by: the School Academic Staff Representative for Design, Engineering and Computing (DEC).

Description of the matter: "We were led to believe that Framework Examination Boards would be part of a three year pilot scheme and if they were successful they would be introduced across the university. However we understand they are being introduced across BU after only two years pilot despite the staff on the Software Systems Framework and their external examiners believing it is not fit for purpose."

How the matter could be progressed: "Particularly now that most schools have only single frameworks we believe that the new boards are no longer necessary and we should return to a system that had been tried and tested and gives confidence to all staff involved that any decision made is based on quality data."

The current action being taken in relation to this project was presented within the paper.

Chair's Decision

This matter is within the terms of reference of the Academic Standards Committee (authority has been delegated by Senate) and the action currently being taken (a report to Academic Standards Committee in July 2011) is therefore the most appropriate approach. The issues raised in the paper and the comments received by Senate members will be fed into this review [Action: Policy and Committees Manager].

The School Academic Staff Representative for DEC to feedback outcomes to their constituency.

MINUTES OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Decision required: Senate was asked to **note** the minutes and **approve** any 'Recommendations for Approval'.

11. ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE – 8 DECEMBER 2010 (SEN-1011-38)

There were no recommendations for approval by Senate.

Chair's Decision

Item noted, no further action.

12. ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE – 16 FEBRUARY 2011 (SEN-1011-39)

There were no recommendations for approval by Senate.

Chair's Decision

Item noted, no further action.

13. EDUCATION ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE – 9 FEBRUARY 2011 (SEN-1011-40)

There were no recommendations for approval by Senate.

Chair's Decision

Item noted, no further action.

14. SCHOOL ACADEMIC BOARD: APPLIED SCIENCES – 20 OCTOBER 2010 (SEN-1011-41)

There were no recommendations for approval by Senate.

Chair's Decision

Item noted, no further action.

15. SCHOOL ACADEMIC BOARD: APPLIED SCIENCES – 24 NOVEMBER 2010 (SEN-1011-42)

There were no recommendations for approval by Senate.

Chair's Decision

Item noted, no further action.

16. SCHOOL ACADEMIC BOARD: APPLIED SCIENCES – 26 JANUARY 2011 (SEN-1011-43)

There were no recommendations for approval by Senate.

Chair's Decision

Item noted, no further action.

17. SCHOOL ACADEMIC BOARD: BUSINESS SCHOOL – 2 FEBRUARY 2011 (SEN-1011-44)

There were no recommendations for approval by Senate.

Chair's Decision

Item noted, no further action.

18. SCHOOL ACADEMIC BOARD: DESIGN, ENGINEERING AND COMPUTING – 9 FEBRUARY 2011 (SEN-1011-45)

There were no recommendations for approval by Senate.

Chair's Decision

Item noted, no further action.

19. SCHOOL ACADEMIC BOARD: MEDIA SCHOOL – 26 JANUARY 2011 (SEN-1011-46)

There were no recommendations for approval by Senate.

Chair's Decision

Item noted, no further action.

20. SCHOOL ACADEMIC BOARD: TOURISM – 2 FEBRUARY 2011 (SEN-1011-47)

There were no recommendations for approval by Senate.

Chair's Decision

Item noted, no further action.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Next in-person meeting: 16 March 2011, 2.15pm

Paper Title	Research and Enterprise – Change to Terms of Reference
Paper Number	SEN-1011-50
Paper Author/Contact	Professor Matthew Bennett (Pro-Vice-Chancellor of Research, Enterprise and Internationalisation)
Purpose	To present to Senate the updated terms of reference for the Research and Enterprise Committee, which will be approved (for Senate <u>only</u>) by Chair's action
Link to the Strategic Plan	Research and Enterprise Strategy
Implications/impacts	Decreased University Board membership (in line with the outcomes of the University Board review)
Audience	Senate members
Decision Required by the Committee	Senate is asked to note the changes to the terms of reference
Additional committees to consider proposal	As this is a Senate committee with University Board representation, the updated terms of reference changes will be presented to University Board at their meeting on 8 April 2011
Status of Paper	Non-confidential

COMMITTEE GUIDANCE 2010/11
Appendix 13

CHAIR'S ACTION FORM

Reason Chair's Action has been requested	<p>Chair's Action is being requested in order for this matter to be reported to Senate on 16 March 2011.</p> <p>Note: as this is a Senate committee with University Board representation this Chair's action is on behalf of <u>Senate only</u> and the matter will be presented to University Board on 8 April 2011 for approval.</p> <p>As the next formal meeting of the current Committee is scheduled for 16 June 2011, there are no additional implications.</p>
Description of Chair's Action	<p>The changes proposed reflect the outcome of a recent University Board review and have been discussed with the current University Board representatives.</p> <p>This change allows the disbanding of the Research and Enterprise Forum which has been operating as an informal Senate committee.</p> <p>The Chair of the Research and Enterprise Committee wishes the committee to meet formally three times a year to review strategy but monthly as the forum does now in order to manage tactical/operational delivery of that strategy. This is reflected in the updated terms of reference.</p> <p>Policy and Committees will provide support for the formal meetings and the Centre for Research and Enterprise will provide support for the informal meetings.</p>
Ratification	<p>This Chair's Action (relating to <u>Senate only</u>) will be noted by Senate at its meeting on 16 March 2011.</p>
Higher Committee(s)	<p>Senate – none.</p> <p>University Board for approval (8 April 2011).</p>
Chair of Committee	<p>Professor John Vinney, Vice-Chancellor and Chair of Senate</p>
Signature of Chair	
Date	

APPENDIX 6

RESEARCH & ENTERPRISE COMMITTEE

Terms of Reference

Purpose: To promote and monitor the University's Research and Enterprise activity.

1. To promote and review Research and Enterprise within the University;
2. To approve policy on all matters relating to the University's Research and Enterprise Strategies;
3. To review School Academic Board research plans, consider specific proposals for University funding, and support and advise on the distribution of funds;
4. To assist the University in general, and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research, Enterprise & Internationalisation) in particular, in the development of a strong and financially sound Research & Enterprise culture and structure within the University;
5. To receive information relating to Research and Enterprise activities within the University;
6. To oversee the tactical/operational delivery of the Research & Enterprise Strategy.

Membership

Vice-Chancellor (Ex officio)
Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research, Enterprise & Internationalisation) (Chair)
Executive Director of Finance
Head of Academic Development (SAS Representative)
Head of Graduate School
Dean Representative
Deputy Deans (Research & Enterprise) or Heads of Research & Heads of Enterprise for each School
University Research Development Manager
Deputy Head of Enterprise
CRE Operations Manager
Representative from M&C
Board Observer (at their discretion)

Notes

Where variation in roles and titles exist within Schools, the Dean of the relevant School should nominate an appropriate person to undertake the membership role. The Executive Director of Finance may attend only the formal meeting should they choose.

It is at the discretion of the Chair to require the presence of particular individuals for any given discussion.

Chair

Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research, Enterprise & Internationalisation)

Secretary

Committee Clerk

Quorum

50% + 1

Usual Number of Meetings

To meet formally 3 times per year to review strategy, and informally on a monthly basis to deal with tactical/operational delivery

Reporting Line

Senate
University Board

Sub-Committees

None

Minutes

Copies of all minutes to be submitted to Senate and the University Board and held by Student & Academic Services. Minutes to be published on University staff and student portals.

Paper Title	Electronic Senate Process
Paper Number	SEN-1011-51
Paper Author/Contact	Nichola Kett, Policy and Committees Manager
Purpose	To present an evaluation of the first Electronic Senate meeting and suggested improvements to the process
Link to the Strategic Plan	None
Implications/impacts	None
Audience	Senate members
Decision Required by the Committee	Senate members are asked consider and comment on the suggested improvements below
Additional committees to consider proposal	None
Status of Paper	Non-confidential

Background

The aims of the Electronic Senate meeting are to allow for timely progression of routine matters and to ensure that adequate time is available at the in-person Senate meeting for discussion and debate.

The first Electronic Senate meeting was held from 9am on Wednesday 23 February to 9am on Wednesday 2 March 2011. The agenda constituted one paper for action, seven papers for noting, two matters raised by members and ten sets of minutes from standing committees (none of which had recommendations for Senate to approve).

An email was sent one week prior to the Electronic Senate asking members to log in and with guidance for the meeting attached. An email was sent when the Electronic Senate meeting opened and another was sent during the Electronic Senate meeting.

Nine members of Senate and one Professoriate Observer actively engaged with the Electronic Senate meeting.

Suggested Improvements

Items for noting:

It became apparent that requiring members to comment 'noted' on the page of each paper may be overly onerous. A suggested improvement would be adding the ability for members to note groups of papers but still allow them to comment on individual papers as required. This concept should also apply to standing committee minutes which require noting also.

Standing committee minutes:

The Decision Required box should detail the 'Recommendations for Approval' by Senate (and detail if there are none).

Matters raised by members:

The guidance suggests that matters raised by members during an Electronic Senate meeting could be posted. Upon reflection, this approach should not (and was not) adopted as it would not allow consideration of the matter for the full duration of the meeting.

Engagement/quorum:

The quorum for Electronic Senate meetings (in line with in-person Senate meetings) is a response from at least 50% of the membership. The full membership of Senate (excluding Professoriate Observers and vacancies) is currently 25. Further exploration into the barriers to engagement is needed.

Paper Title	Debate: Assessment Turnaround and Feedback
Paper Number	SEN-1011-52
Paper Author/Contact	Professor Gail Thomas (Dean, School of Health and Social Care) and Jenny Jenkin (Director of Student and Academic Services)
Purpose	To present a framework for the Senate debate
Link to the Strategic Plan	Student satisfaction
Implications/impacts	Not to be considered by Senate at this stage
Audience	Senate members
Decision Required by the Committee	Senate is asked to debate the topic
Additional committees to consider proposal	None
Status of Paper	Non-confidential

Bournemouth University

Briefing for Senate on Assessment Turnaround and Feedback

Background

A standard was set at BU in 2006 to ensure a consistent, prompt return of summatively assessed work to students; this is referred to as the 'three week turn around'. Largely this has been achieved across BU although it is recognised that it is a challenge to achieve in some instances; in addition, student feedback has not improved significantly as a result. Only 64% of BU students say that they have received detailed comments on their work (see appendix one for a review of a brief 'horizon scan' about assessment turnaround). Therefore it seems timely to consider quality of feedback as well as speed as a means to enhancing student experience.

Current Guidance

The current position at BU is found in Academic procedure D1 which states:

Return of assessed work to students

All written assignments (with the exception of dissertations/projects) must be marked and returned to students within three weeks from the submission date in accordance with the three-week service standard for assessment feedback, unless previously specified in writing to students. All exam scripts must also be marked within three weeks from the exam date although these are not routinely returned to students (see 12.5 below). If the three-week period runs into a student vacation, the students' work must be returned during the first week of the subsequent term. Extensions to the three-week standard should indeed be exceptional. Where extensions are unavoidable, students must be informed in writing of the delay, and the revised return date. Large cohort sizes are not sufficient condition for a lower service standard and appropriate resources must be brought to bear so the marking process can be completed in time.

Proposal

BU has been very successful in moving to consistency of assessment turnaround to students based on the three week model. The challenge now is to improve the quality and consistency of feedback to improve student satisfaction and the value of the feedback to students' learning. Therefore it is proposed that a BU standard be introduced for feedback (e.g. what was good about the work/attracted the marks, what needs improvement/tips for the future, overall summary and justification of the mark or loss of marks). A template could be drawn from existing models (e.g. HSC) and build on feedback from the online assignment handling project. It would apply to written, electronic, face to face or voice feedback.

Therefore, to facilitate adoption of a new feedback standard, it is proposed that, while three weeks would be the normal maximum turnaround, Schools could have the discretion to extend this to four weeks where appropriate, ensuring that this is pre-planned and communicated to students at the beginning of the academic year. The aim would be to improve the quality of feedback to enhance student learning.

Jenny Jenkin, SAS

Prof Gail Thomas, Dean of HSC

Appendix One

Assessment Turnaround Horizon Scanning

Institution	Assessment Turnaround	NSS Score <i>'Feedback on work has been prompt'</i>	NSS Score <i>'I have received detailed comments on my work'</i>
Sussex	3 Weeks	70%	69%
Exeter	4 Weeks	68%	69%
Canterbury Christchurch	3 Weeks	52%	68%
Portsmouth	3 Weeks	58%	64%
Southampton	2 Weeks	58%	55%
Bath	3 Weeks	58%	52%
UWE	4 Weeks	57%	64%
York	6 Weeks (Maximum)	68%	64%
Liverpool John Moores	3 weeks	50%	58%
Bucks New University	3 Weeks	56%	68%
Bournemouth	3 Weeks	68%	64%
Anglia Ruskin	3 Weeks	63%	68%
Leeds	3 Weeks	56%	55%
Lancaster	4 Weeks	62%	68%

Paper Title	Debate: Review of the Graduate School
Paper Number	SEN-1011-53
Paper Author/Contact	Professor Matthew Bennett, Pro Vice Chancellor for Research, Enterprise & Internationalisation
Purpose	To present a framework for the Senate debate
Link to the Strategic Plan	Student satisfaction, research and enterprise strategy
Implications/impacts	Implications and impacts will be considered by the Working Group progressing the review
Audience	Senate members
Decision Required by the Committee	Senate is asked to debate the topic in order to provide the Working Group with comments to feed into the review
Additional committees to consider proposal	None
Status of Paper	Non-confidential

1.0 Aim: To review the needs for PG Support at BU and the potential role of a Graduate School at BU with a view to bring forward proposal with respect to the future of the Graduate School at BU.

2.0 Background

At the Graduate School Academic Board on 12 January 2011 it was agreed that a working group would be convened address the issues raised by the ULT White Paper (November 2010) to develop a series of proposals for a Senate debate on the future role, function and form of the Graduate School within BU. Note that the Graduate School Academic Board is not a formally constituted sub-committee of Senate and its memberships was revised by order of ULT in December 2010 and new terms of reference agreed in January 2011 which are attached for information.

The Working Group is chaired by the PVC (Research, Enterprise & Internationalisation), Deans of Academic Schools, Head of Graduate School, Graduate School Manager, Head of Student & Academic Services. PGR and PGT representatives from the Student Union will also be invited to participate along with other staff as appropriate. The working group will also call on external representatives to give evidence to the review when needed.

3.0 Timeline & Process

The first four meetings were designed to debate a series of propositions or issues leading to the formulation of a set of proposals for debate at Senate on the 16 March 2011. The subsequent 4 meetings will focus on developing an operational plan for decision by ULT in late May. Any changes are intended to be implemented by September 2011.

Date	Meeting/Deadline
1 February 2011	(Date of ULT Meeting)
15 February 2011	(Date of ULT Meeting)
1 March 2011	(Date of ULT Meeting)
15 March 2011	(Date of ULT Meeting)
16 March 2011	Senate Debate
29 March 2011	(Date of ULT Meeting)
12 April 2011	(Date of ULT Meeting)
27 April 2011	(Date of ULT Meeting)
10 May 2011	(Date of ULT Meeting)
24 May 2011	Decision taken by ULT

The propositions for discussion during the first phase of the process are as follows.

Discussion 1: PG Character Portraits - *What attributes would we like to be evident in postgraduate students graduating from BU & to what sort of student experience do we aspire?*

Aim: to identify the characteristics – knowledge, skills & attributes – that we want BU PGR & PGT students to gain from their BU experience through the creation of a series of Character Portraits. In light of these portraits what are the elements of a BU postgraduate student experience that will deliver this?

External evidence: provided via a series of papers including the UKCGE Review of Graduate School; VITAE Concordat; QAA Code of Practice for Research Degrees; PRES and PTES.

Summary outcome: the main conclusion was that there was a core of common skills which could be identified between PGR & PGT students along with the need a shared PG experience. The key to this is the 'value added' obtained by combining delivery of this shared experience making BU PG's distinctive in the market place. This

should be around developing a sense of community and the creation of an imaginative and innovative approach to the development of professional transferable skills for our PG students as a whole; far more sophisticated than the current RGR Skills Training with a focus on professional development of our PG students as a whole. This could be summarised by the development of a BU PG Toolkit designed to develop successful academic/professionals.

Discussion 2: Delivering a PG Experience – How do we achieve this?

Aim: In light of the postgraduate character portraits identified in Discussion 1 how can BU realise these attributes for its PGs especially in the area of overlap identified above

Internal evidence: views will be sought from the Associate Dean (Postgraduate) or equivalent from each Academic School. In addition, the Student Union PGR and PGT representatives will be invited to give evidence.

Summary outcome:

Discussion 3: Explore the Different Models for PG (PGR & PGT) Support (e.g. central, devolved or hybrid Graduate School approaches) advantages and disadvantages – Where should the focus of PG support lie and what models are the pros and cons of the various models?

Aim: debate the advantages and disadvantages of centralised and devolved models of PG support including various Graduate School scenarios. This will also look at the different models in place in other UK HEIs and develop, in principle, models that could meet the requirements for PG support at BU as identified in (1) and (2) above.

External evidence: key external people with experience of different models of PG support will be invited to submit and/or attend the meeting to facilitate debate; ideally one with experience of an HEI with a centralised GS, one with experience of a devolved (or absent) GS and one with experience of a hybrid.

Summary outcome: it is clear that the majority (c.90%) of HEI's in the UK have some form of Graduate School. The nature of this whether devolved or concentrated was a function primarily of size; with devolved models being applied in large faculties. Graduate School approaches in Bath Spa and Bradford are very similar to that running to date within BU traditional models restricted to PGR, QA, and policy development. Most systems involved some form of Research Degrees Committee. Graduate School not involved in discipline or dispute resolution except in an informal way. Variable levels of staffing and no involvement in Supervisor Training directly. A range of funding and resourcing models discussed for Graduate Schools and skills training units. The Graduate Schools invited to contribute to the debate had little involvement in PGT or in developing PG Experience; these are areas which could potentially make BU's approach distinctive and pioneering.

Discussion 4: Models for PG Support at BU– What models might operate at BU?

Aim: to generate at least two clear potential models for PG support at BU and identify how these models may operate and prepare the necessary documentation to inform a senate debate.

Meetings during the second phase will be more operational working up the proposal that emerges from the Senate debate into a clear and costed proposal for discussion by ULT and subsequent consultation with ICE and the relevant staff.

4.0 Outline Ideas

Due to the time lines involved in this project it is not possible to provide a detailed paper in advance of Senate for Senators to consider; the detail will be presented during the Senate meeting.

What has emerged from the debate is that PGT and PGR students share some common needs around transferable skills training and professional development and that they also share key 'BU' attributes emerging in discussion of the BU Student Proposition. The need to develop a strong PG Experience is common to both groups although the outcomes and ongoing journey/trajectories are different for each group. The working party agreed that some form of co-ordinated approach to the PG Student Experience was needed and would benefit both PGT and PGR students as well as helping to fuel the BU research culture. The working group was strongly supported by six invited speakers from other HEI's with different Graduate School models. Around 90% of all HEI's now have Graduate Schools with the majority favouring some form of centralised model; in most cases they are restricted to the QA process around PGR students and the delivery of skills training, so called Roberts Skills, and in some cases

to supervisor training, although this is often distinct being staff rather than student focused. The working group is clear that BU needs some form of Graduate School in the future but its scope and focus remains open to debate. We seek the input of Senators.

On the basis of the evidence received by the working group which will be presented orally to Senators at the meeting on the 16 March what is emerging are two possible alternative and potentially polarised models at different ends of a spectrum. The detail around each model needs to be developed and debated but they can be characterised by the following pen portraits. Note that these represent end members and a model between these extremes could emerge:

1. Administrative PGR *only* Graduate School. A small administrative Graduate School focused solely on ensuring QA compliance, policy development, co-ordination of School Research Committees and appointment of examiners plus ratification of awards. Tracking of QA would be supported via a replacement system for MyBuild; something simple and effective for tracking paper only. This version of the Graduate School would be an administrative function with no need for academic leadership, with no responsibility for PGR Student Experience or Skills training; this would be devolved to individual Schools. Students would be members of the Academic School community only. Streamlined supervisor training would be incorporated into Staff Development. The key advantages are: cost efficient solution to QA; devolved responsibility and enhanced ownership; and QA oversight and policy development. The key disadvantages are: lack of academic leadership and direction; potential for patchy compliance with devolved responsibility; no visibility or real function other than QA, i.e. in developing a sense of community of the PG Experience.
2. PG Graduate School. Academically led Graduate School with the sole aim of leading and delivering the PG Student Experience at BU and supporting the growth of BU research culture. Its scope would be both PGR and PGT with a focus on developing the PG community, student professional development, training in transferable skills and oversight of research methods provision at BU. A key function would be the creation of sense of community in the PG student population at BU and to foster external multi-disciplinary connections and opportunities for our students; i.e. outward facing rather than inward facing with an emphasis on the facilitation of student opportunity. PG Students would have dual citizenship being members of both the BU Graduate School and an Academic School linked to their area of study or programme. Graduate School would not have direct responsibility for the delivery of research methods training nor supervisor training; the former would be delivered by individual Schools or by consortia of Schools, while the latter would be placed within Staff Development as in the first model. It would not have its own teaching staff but would have responsibility for the coordination of an enhanced programme of central skills based training (Robert Skill Plus) which would re-vitalised and extended into the area of providing a tailored package of professional development for each student focused on their individual career development. These would be built into all PG programmes; PGT & PGR. The new Graduate School would need a strong academic Head, with limited administrative support. The Head of the Graduate School would work directly with Schools and Professional Services in a collaborative fashion to make this all happen; i.e. the Graduate School be a catalyst. The new Graduate School would not have direct responsibility for QA; this would rest with a reconstituted Research Degrees Committee Chaired by the Head of Graduate School to develop QA policy, endorse external examiners, ratify awards and monitor admissions and progression. The key advantage is that the Graduate School would become a key focus for developing the BU PG Experience. The key disadvantages are around a potential failure to deliver if the Head of Graduate School fails to get good cooperation from Schools.

As stated above these models are presented as potential end-members along a spectrum and will be amplified and explore further during the Senate debate.

BOURNEMOUTH UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL – SCHOOL ACADEMIC BOARD

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Name	Graduate School (GS) School Academic Board
Purpose	<p>The GS School Academic Board is the principal academic deliberative committee of the Graduate School with the responsibility for the nature and quality of the Graduate School’s academic provision. <i>Unlike other Academic Schools, this is not a Sub-Committee of Senate.</i></p> <p>The GS School Academic Board shall debate the planning, co-ordination, development and oversight of frameworks and research, enterprise, professional practice and education within the Graduate School. It should also work with the Head of the Graduate School, the PVC (Research, Enterprise & Internationalisation) and the School Executive on key aspects of research degree policy and the implementation of University academic policies pertaining to postgraduate researchers (PGRs).</p>
Main responsibilities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To determine the future function and role of the Graduate School within BU, to identify the provision of Academic School resource to support the skills/training and to recommend urgent action to improve progression/completion rates. 2. To take responsibility for the development of Graduate School policy and procedures relating to the admissions, assessment and examination procedures and other matters pertaining to PGR progress; 3. To liaise with Academic Schools to implement and monitor all policy and procedures and other matters pertaining to PGR progress; 4. To inform Academic Standards Committee in a timely manner of matters which may jeopardise the maintenance of academic standards or the quality of learning opportunities for PGRs; 5. To consider and act upon current provision of frameworks and programmes and make recommendations to Academic Standards Committee on future provision of doctoral awards; 6. To make recommendations on the future development and implementation of academic programmes and training provisions for PGRs and research degree supervisors; 7. To maintain an overview of quality assurance through the School Quality Report and other matters relating to the above provisions; 8. To recommend and agree the policies for professional practice, research and enterprise within the School and to identify any associated PGR development needs; 9. To comment and advise, where relevant, on research policies on issues such as research ethics and misconduct 10. To consider the PGR population statistics and make recommendations for action. 11. To liaise with the School Executive to consider and act upon management information data relating to School provision; 12. To consider both the development of the academic activities of the School and the resources needed to support them; 13. To take responsibility for disseminating relevant information to Academic Schools, Research Students and Supervisors, CRKT and Professional Services

	14. To consider and act upon PGR representative reports and Student Union synoptic reports.
Chair	PVC (Research, Enterprise & Internationalisation)
Deputy Chair	<i>Head of The Graduate School (Professor John Fletcher)</i>
Secretary	<i>Dr Fiona Knight – Graduate School Manager (with assistance from Research Administrator on a rolling basis)</i>
Clerk	<i>Dr Fiona Knight – Graduate School Manager</i>
Membership	<p>PVC (Research, Enterprise & Internationalisation) (Chair) Head of Graduate School (Deputy Chair) Graduate School Manager Graduate School Academic Programmes Leader (Supervisors) Graduate School Academic Programmes Leader (PGRs) All Academic School Deans Director of Student & Academic Services</p> <p><i>Co-options</i> Professoriate</p>
Quorum	12 people or 50% +1 (whichever is the smaller)
Usual Number of Meetings	3 times per annum.
Reporting Line	ULT/UET
Sub-group/teams/committees/boards	-
Minutes	Copies of all minutes to be submitted to ULT/UET and held by the Graduate School to be published on the University I:Drive (Graduate School/Public)