

## 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 Silvenoinen (Items 6.2 and 6.4); Ms Y Uddin (Item 5)
- Apologies received: Mr J Andrews; Prof M Bennett; Dr C Chapleo; Prof P Comminos; 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 Item 7.5: Electronic School Academic Board: 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](mailto: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