

ACADEMIC STANDARDS & EDUCATION COMMITTEE (ASEC)

Wednesday 25 May 2022, 14:00-17:00

Attendees Board Members

Professor Tim McIntyre-Bhatty (Chair and Deputy Vice-Chancellor),
Professor Philip Sewell (Deputy Chair and Head of Department, Faculty of Science and Technology (FST)),
Jules Forrest (Secretary and Head of Academic Quality), Mandi Barron (Director of Student Services),
Chiko Bwalya (Vice-President (Education) Students' Union (SUBU)), Dr Carol Clark (Member of Senate),
Professor Katharine Cox (Member of the Professoriate), Professor Christos Gatzidis (Acting Deputy Dean -
Education and Professional Practice (FST)), Samantha Leahy-Harland (Chief Executive, Students' Union (SUBU)),
Jacky Mack (Academic Registrar), Dr Gelareh Roushan (Head of Fusion Learning Innovation and Excellence
(FLIE)), Dr Shelley Thompson (Deputy Dean - Education and Professional Practice (BUBS)), Professor Julie
Turner-Cobb (Member of the Professoriate), Dr Sara White (Deputy Dean - Education and Professional Practice
(FHSS)), Professor Sabeur Zoheir (Member of the Professoriate), Andrew Bird (Head of International Marketing
and Student Recruitment, Paige Norton-Edwards (Student Faculty Officer, (FST)), Dr Karl Rawstrone (Principal
Academic in Media Production)

Apologies

Dr Christa van Raalte (Deputy Dean - Education and Professional Practice (FMC))

Observers

Rosalind Ashcroft (Head of Academic Operations), Professor Carol Evans (Observer), Rebekah Kerslake
(Academic Quality Officer and Clerk)

Meeting Minutes

1. APOLOGIES

Information
Clerk

Apologies were noted as above

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Information
Chair

No declarations of interest were recorded.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

3.1 Accuracy: ASEC 7 April 2022

Decision
Chair

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

3.2 Accuracy: e-ASEC 23 – 30 March 2022

Decision
Chair

The summary of the e-meeting was approved as an accurate record.

3.3 Matters Arising/Actions Log

Discussion
Various

4.1B (07.04.22) – Action will be considered at the June Access, Excellence and Impact Committee (AEIC). An update will be provided via the ASEC action log at the first 2022/23 ASEC.

4.1C (07.04.22) – Complete as this has been actioned and added to the papers for this ASEC.

4.1D (07.04.22) – 4.1D The PRIME Manager confirmed via update in action log that an extra category will be added for students living at home to next year's report. The Chair requested that this be addressed with immediate effect for the current data set so that potentially resultant actions can be considered.

ACTION: Secretary to discuss with PRIME Manager

4.1.2/ 4.1.3/ 4.1.4B (07.04.22) - Revised Faculty Annual Monitoring & Enhancement Review (AMERs) for FHSS, FMC & FST re-submitted.

5.1 (07.04.22) Appeals and Complaints Annual Report, amendments made and will be presented to Senate in June 2022.

6.2 (26.01.22) – The revised timing for this report has been agreed, but the action will remain open to ensure that it is not overlooked.

4.1 A (07.04.22) – Action complete. The Committee discussed whether the term 'disability' proposed by the PRIME Manager was appropriate. The Director of Student Services requested that the term 'declared disability' be used. The Head of Academic Operations observed that Additional Learning Support (ALS) use the term 'shared disability'. The Committee discussed the different ways that students can declare their disability. Discussion was held regarding the importance of the language used to help encourage students to declare their disabilities/support requirements. The Director of Student Services reminded the Committee that this action was in reference to how the data is recorded in SITS.

ACTION: The term 'declared disability' should be confirmed by PRIME for inclusion in the report.

4 FOR DISCUSSION

4.1 Transnational Education (TNE) Proposal for Dual/Double Degrees

Discussion

The Head of International Partnerships presented the Transnational Education (TNE) Proposal for Dual/ Double Degrees. It was highlighted that programmes leading to joint, double, or dual awards, delivered in collaboration by HE partners from two countries, may provide students with the benefits of two or more different institutions and education systems, and a broader cultural experience. Equally these types of proposal can provide advantages to

both Higher Education Institutions (HEI) through offering more collaborative opportunities, such as research and increased marketing opportunities to boost recruitment in new regions. For these types of awards both partners have a shared responsibility in the quality assurance of the programme. It was reported that providing students with the opportunity to have a joint, double, or dual award may enhance employability via greater diversity and breadth of the global experience. These are established models within the UK sector with 39.1% of the 449,690 students studying UK TNE programmes studying through collaborative provision in 2019/20, followed by distance, flexible or distributed learning (31.2%), registered at an overseas partner organisation (21.7%) and overseas campus (6.9%). UK HEIs offering collaborative provision with overseas partners leading to a joint, double, or dual award has increased from 81 institutions in 2015/16 to 96 institutions in 2019/20.

The Chair noted that Bournemouth University had previously had experience of TNE partnerships, but these had closed and there were no recent or current overseas collaborations of this type of model.

The Director of Student Services emphasised how work would be required to ensure clarity for students studying on this type of programmes with regards to which HEI's procedures and regulations apply to the student whilst studying on a joint, dual or double award.

The Academic Registrar questioned how the sector currently viewed TNE, and whether the Covid pandemic had had an impact on the long-term viability of TNE, under this type of model. The Head of International Partnerships noted that in some regions there was a preference for students wanting to stay closer to their home to study. However more time was needed to review the data to consider the impact on levels of UK TNE, which had previously been increasing. It was felt that it was too early to tell whether this apparent student preference (to stay closer to or within their home country) had influenced the nature of the collaborative models that are being looked at in this report. However, broadly speaking it appeared that there was an increase globally with respect to the discussion of collaborative models with more countries wanting an equal stake in programmes.

Overall, the Committee noted that this was a positive proposal, providing academics with the opportunity to engage in more collaborative learning and research opportunities and appealing to a broader pool of students to diversify recruitment.

The Head of Fusion Learning Innovation and Enhancement (FLIE) highlighted that this was a competitive market and asked whether in preparing for this BU would be working with other UK universities who have had success with similar models. The Committee were informed that BU were looking at recent proposals, discussing good practice with other universities with similar experience and working alongside the British Council. It was noted that although each model was bespoke, there were valuable opportunities to learn from the experiences of others.

The Committee discussed delivery of collaborative programmes, and what proportion of the programmes could be delivered online. The Head of International Partnerships noted that it would depend on the partner, the model under consideration and the market at whom recruitment was aimed. In these circumstances, discussions would be held with partners at an early stage to clarify delivery arrangements but a combination of online and flying faculty was a typical delivery model. The operationalisation of these types of delivery tended to be tailored between the two partners, depending on the model and the local jurisdiction (where relevant).

The Committee noted that rather than multiple partners, it was preferable to pursue a smaller number of strategic partnerships to support TNE and other overseas collaborative opportunities. There was discussion over how 'added value' could be leveraged via TNE partnership and agreed that the partnership should allow for multiple dimensions of academic collaboration and associated benefits, including educational, research and practice opportunities.

The Committee discussed the risks of typical TNE models and that historically such endeavours had provided challenges to institutions at the point of a quality audit (such as Institutional Review/Audit by QAA). The Secretary informed the Committee that the challenges around quality and standards were substantial and that there would be work required to mitigate these challenges, including developing a set of standard regulations to govern this type of provision. The Committee were informed that the risks could be managed with the appropriate governance structures to ensure oversight and effective monitoring, as well as through the approval of robust business and academic cases.

5. FOR APPROVAL AND ENDORSEMENT

5.1 AMER 2021/22 Update

Decision
Jules Forrest

The Secretary presented the Annual Monitoring and Enhancement Review: 2021/ 22 Update. The paper reflects on the past year and looks at the institutional themes for the next academic year.

In 2021/22 faculties were asked to consider and monitor AMER action plans at every programme committee, Department Committee, Faculty Academic Standards and Education Committee (FASEC) as well as Faculty Executive. The Inclusivity Health Check (IHC) was held at the departmental level in January 2022 for the first time. Themes for next year include retaining focus on BAME attainment, and BAME continuation will also be added. These themes map to the University's Access & Participation Plan targets.

This paper was approved.

5.2 Institutional Award Outcomes and Progression:
Degree Outcomes Statement 2020/21

Decision
Jules Forrest

The Secretary presented the Institutional Award Outcomes and Progression: Degree Outcomes Statement 2020/21 reflecting on the previous academic year, considering award outcomes over time, including the impact of student demographics and subject mix. The Committee noted that the publishing date of the Degree Outcomes Statement has moved from December to June/July, to align with student outcomes data release.

The Committee asked whether the sectoral uplift of Firsts and Upper Seconds in 2019/20 was a result of the 'No Detriment' policies. The Secretary noted that whilst there were other factors proposed to explain this with the move online offering a more inclusive approach and students having more time to focus, the 'No Detriment' policies employed across the sector are understood to have been a major contributing factor to increases in Good Honours. The Committee noted that the proportion of Good Honours awarded have not yet returned to pre-pandemic levels despite the reduction in 'No Detriment' approaches across the sector in 2020/21. It was noted that the Office for Students has indicated that it is monitoring this position.

The Chair queried the completed status of Action 2 under 5.2 (Actions Identified in Quality and Standards Report 2020/21) relating to student outcomes, asking for further clarification as to the targeted approach which is to be taken in 2022-23 and the significant impact it refers to. The Secretary confirmed that this links with Action 4 which picks up on the broader action identified in relation to assessment practice and the impact on underrepresented groups and overall student outcomes. The Academic Registrar confirmed that there were several related actions that were being overseen through the work of the Access, Excellence and Impact Committee (AEIC). The wording in response to that action would be clarified.

ACTION: Secretary to clarify action update.

The paper was endorsed.

5.3 **Academic Regulations Policy and Procedure Updates**

5.3.1 6A - Standard Assessment Regulations

Decision
Jules Forrest

The Secretary presented the paper proposing to permanently introduce 'In-Year Retrieval' (IYR). The data from the pilot of IYR shows that it had been a positive benefit to some level 4 students who had been able to retrieve failed work during the 2021/22 academic year. The Committee noted the advantages offered to students via IYR meaning those who successfully retried a failed assessment in-year did not have to resubmit work over the summer and there were equally benefits to staff in not having to mark resubmissions over summer. The recommendation was made to the committee that IYR be introduced to both level 4 and foundation year (level 0) students.

The question was asked whether there was a consequence for late submissions with marks being capped. The Secretary clarified that whilst reassessment limits were being removed from the late submission rules, penalties for late submission remained in place including being capped at the pass mark for assessments submitted within 72 hours and being failed if assessments were submitted after 72 hours.

The Chair noted the disparity in the Access and Participation Data (paragraph 2.11) which suggests that BAME students were more likely to fail, and that the resubmission rate for IYR for these students was below the BU average at 43%. It appears that students with declared mental health conditions are not more likely to fail than the BU average but are less likely to use the opportunity for IYR. This suggests that more work needs to be done to ensure all students understand and are able to engage with the support available and the opportunity to resubmit.

The Academic Registrar noted that currently not all assessments are eligible for IYR, and that discussion about BU's future approach to IYR needs to consider that factor alongside the statistics under discussion.

ACTION: The Secretary would refer this data finding to the AEIC to be included with all work relating to progressing the Access and Participation Plan.

The paper was endorsed and recommended to Senate

5.3.2 11A – Academic Appeals: Policy and Procedure for Taught Awards, 11C – Academic Appeals: Policy and Procedure for Research Awards and 11F - Student Complaints: Policy and Procedure

Decision
Jules Forrest

Following an action identified in the Annual Academic Appeals and Complaints Report 2020, the academic appeals and complaints policies have been reviewed to enhance the informal stage of the process with a greater emphasis on seeking early resolution in line with sector practice and the OIA Good Practice Framework. Faculties, Education Service Managers (ESMs) and DDEs have been consulted about these changes. The key changes were the formal embedding of early resolution and streamlining of the process. The effectiveness of the hearing stage was considered and it was noted that students were rarely eligible for progressing to this stage. It was noted that the hearing stage often prolonged the experience without adding any advantage to students and when a hearing was held this often led to a challenging experience for both students and staff. It was felt that often hearings do not lead to positive resolutions and that dialogue between staff and students about issues and complaints is much more likely to be productive at an early stage rather than in the hearing setting after positions have already been quite thoroughly considered through the earlier formal stages of the complaints process. Therefore, much more emphasis would now be focused on early resolution at the informal stage.

With regards to Research Appeals, it was proposed that the formal stage be coordinated by the Heads of the Doctoral College rather than the relevant Faculty Education Service Managers.

The reduction in stages allows the local and review stages to be expanded proportionally to manage the complaint where necessary. For example, the more complex group complaints needed more time in comparison to straightforward complaints that did not need the full 20-day allowance.

The Chair agreed with the need to streamline but questioned whether in losing the hearing stage BU misses out on that opportunity for the cases to be reviewed by an independent party (SUBU CEO). The Secretary noted that the central stage of the complaints process already provided an independent review of the case by the Academic Quality team.

It was noted that the streamlining of the process aligned with the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) Good Practice Framework. It was also noted that in streamlining the process BU had to be confident that the remaining stages were sufficiently rigorous.

The Director of Student Services commented that the central stage was managed by experienced and professional colleagues in dealing with cases, but that an audit could be carried out periodically to provide assurance that the process was robust. It was noted that students can also request that the OIA review their case as an independent body after exhausting the University's processes.

The Committee noted that a dual approach needed to be made from faculties and SUBU to encourage students to seek early, informal resolution. It was noted by the Secretary that BU could not mandate that students engage in informal resolution, and that students can only be encouraged to try informal routes before formal resolution was sought.

The Chief Executive Officer of the Students' Union confirmed that the process was robust but noted that there was a small number of cases where consideration of hearing eligibility had led to case outcomes being reviewed. The Secretary confirmed that the revised process was designed to ensure that the appropriate level of scrutiny would be provided by a thorough central stage review, while avoiding additional time and stages that prolonged internal consideration of the case.

The policies were endorsed and recommended to Senate

The Secretary presented the papers, reminding the Committee that these were initially approved at the March e-ASEC, subject to legal review and amendments to capture the feedback provided by Committee members during the e-ASEC discussion in March.

The Secretary confirmed that these amendments had been made and the revised versions of the policies discussed with the Legal team. As a result, some additional adaptations had been made to 4A and 4B in relation to approval of proposed modifications. Amendments had been made to the definitions of 'exam' and 'coursework' (referenced in 4B and contained in 6C) to more accurately reflect how students experience an assessment, i.e., multiple choice questionnaire and in-class test are included as a subset of the 'exam' category. It was noted that the principles of 6C state that exam assessments have the key principle of being 'unseen'. It was noted that in some circumstances this is not always the case but agreed that this could be dealt with through the guidance rather than re-wording of the policy.

The Committee requested clarity on the modifications policy with regards to consent to material change and whether that had to be reported back to FASEC. The Secretary confirmed that the intention was for FASEC to approve such changes and that Academic Quality will ensure that the policy clearly reflected this. The Chair raised the issue of the ability to vary the student consent threshold and how much variation may be considered appropriate. The Chair highlighted that the policy was currently unclear with regard to the point of authority that could make this decision alongside the Head of Academic Quality.

The Secretary reflected that these were the areas of the policy that had been discussed with Legal Services. The Secretary confirmed that the consent threshold is 50% plus one where a material change is being made. If that threshold cannot be reached, the Legal Services team had accepted that in exceptional circumstances, there could be a rationale for reducing the threshold for consent taking a risk-based approach and reviewing feedback received via the student consultation and the level of consent received. There had not been time to agree the escalation point/point of authority in the policy before it came back to this Committee and there were several actions relating to the Consumer Protection Action plan that are dependant on the updates to these policies progressing. It was also noted that the escalation point/point of authority needed to be considered alongside 3R – *Programme Update Communications: Procedure*, which has been identified by Legal Services as needing to be replaced by a wider organisational policy on published information that will review the current content of 3R and incorporate it into a wider single framework to ensure the accuracy of all published information covered by consumer protection requirements. The escalation point/point of authority in 4B needs to be consistent with the levels of authority required to action changes under this wider policy which will replace 3R in its current form.

The Committee discussed whether the proposed changes to 4A and 4B could be endorsed as there were elements of the escalation point/point of authority that were still dependant on 3R being fully revised/replaced.

The Academic Registrar confirmed that the principles of the policy updates could be endorsed and referred to Senate with this one item outstanding. The Head of Academic Operations confirmed that the proposal for 3R was to incorporate its current content into a broader policy document. This would be an organisational policy rather than part of the Academic Regulation, Policy and Procedures. The intention is to action this before the beginning of the new academic year.

The Chair noted that as the policy updates were not due to come into place until the next academic year 2022/23, the proposals contained within the paper could be endorsed in principle.

ACTION: Head of Academic Operations to work with colleagues to develop the new policy for full approval as appropriate to the format and status of the policy.

The policies were endorsed in principle and recommended to Senate

The Head of Academic Operations presented the paper with amendments proposed to the section on unit feedback and the proposed inclusion of an additional new section on programme feedback.

With regard to unit feedback the proposal is to change from Mid-Unit Student Evaluation (MUSE) to an end of unit evaluation (this has the current working title of Final Unit Student Evaluation (FUSE), with the final survey name still to be determined). The change was in response to feedback regarding MUSE and to enable better alignment to the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) to reflect the key concept of students' 'Educational Gain'. The second amendment will be to introduce provision for annual collection of course-level student feedback. BU's approach to the capturing of, and response to the student feedback has recently been reviewed, and there had been a successful pilot of 'Your Course Feedback' with level 6 students in November 2021. The proposal is to continue this feedback opportunity for level 6 students in November each year, and levels 4 and 5 in Spring. The drive behind the changes was to improve our ability to understand and respond to feedback relating to the student experience at BU.

The Director of Student Services queried whether questions regarding general student support could be added to the programme-level survey. The Committee noted that additional questions could dilute the purpose of the survey and the usefulness of responses. More discussion was needed before more questions are added though further questions on general student support would be considered. Committee members indicated that they would welcome the opportunity to review the questions for both the unit evaluation and programme-level surveys before these are finalised.

ACTION: Head of FLIE/ Director of Student Services/Head of Academic Operations

The Committee discussed the problem of student survey fatigue. It was noted that there is a need for clarity on the questions that were being asked of students and the purpose of the survey via the questions being asked. It was also noted that there were potentially multiple surveys in which students were being asked similar questions and these should be mapped to avoid overlap and survey fatigue. The Head of FLIE confirmed that MUSE was designed to give an indication of students' progress and enable them to reflect on their learning experience, however by the time the academic teaching team could respond, it was sometimes too late for students to experience the benefit of any changes implemented. FUSE is aimed at maintaining a unit level capture of key aspects of the student experience and feedback but is more focused on students' perceptions of their overall learning and engagement with the subject content. FUSE takes into consideration the identified gaps in MUSE allowing a more personalised level of feedback on the students' journey. The Head of Academic Operations informed the Committee that work would be done to ensure that the new programme-level surveys were managed in a way that did not cut across existing student voice/ feedback opportunities.

It was noted that it would be useful to consider to what extent data about student engagement and experience can be obtained from other sources such as online analytics to inform discussions on student experience/progression et cetera. The Head of FLIE confirmed that this academic year, Brightspace has been used to allow insights at the student level. In addition, JISC learning Analytics has been piloted to give more insight into how students are experiencing online learning. The Committee were informed that final questions for FUSE were to be discussed over the next few months.

The policy was endorsed and recommended to Senate

5.3.5 11H- Fitness to Practise: Procedure

Decision
Mandi Barron

The Fitness to Practice Procedures apply to students registered on courses leading to a professional registration, currently the majority of these lie with FHSS. Most of the changes have arisen out of the OIA Good Practice Framework. The main change is that an investigative officer will be introduced for the independent stage.

Minor clarifications have been made regarding penalties, with the introduction of a new penalty, where a student can now be withdrawn from their course of study but be able to continue another course at the University. There was discussion over whether the investigative officer should be a senior member of staff.

The Academic Registrar raised the issue of Apprenticeships and the Fitness to Practice Policy. Currently there is no indication this is required for apprenticeships, but this is an area that is being monitored. The Head of Academic Quality noted that all BU's standard policies will need to be reviewed to ensure that they are appropriate to apprenticeships, to comply with the stated expectation of the Education and Skills Funding Agency that providers delivering degree apprenticeships must tailor their policies to take account of the position and pathway for apprentices where this differs from that of other students.

ACTION: Head of Academic Quality will consider if apprentices needed to be referenced under this policy.

It was noted that the University was awaiting the final outcome of a case which had been referred to the OIA and which could impact on the content of 11H. The Committee agreed that Chairs Action could be taken on any policy amendments required to 11H as a result of the OIA case before 11H was referred for onward consideration to Senate.

The policy was endorsed and recommended to Senate

5.3.6 11J - Support to Study: Policy and Procedure

Decision
Mandi Barron

The Support to Study Procedures apply to all BU students. The purpose of the procedures is to enable the University to manage cases where a student's behaviour or health may indicate a risk to themselves or others, or where there is a concern that the student will not be able to fully engage in university life. In recent years as the need for support has increased for students, the number of students going down this route has also increased. Previously the language had been very formal, and the changes focused on trying to de-escalate the first stage by holding discussion at faculty level first.

The Committee discussed whether in 7.1 repeatedly asking for extensions could be added as a criterion for the application of the policy. It was noted that repeated requests for time extensions would fall within the reference in 7.1(e) of the policy to regular submission of exceptional circumstances requests. The Academic Registrar confirmed that this was an area that was being looked at with regards to the policy for Exceptional Circumstances and Extensions, to ensure that students who repeatedly ask for extensions are monitored and that appropriate intervention and support may be offered, as needed.

The policy was endorsed and recommended to Senate

5.3.7 5D - Academic Advisor Policy

Decision
Dr Shelley Thompson

The DDE of BUBS presented the paper, confirming that this had also been presented to the Extended University Leadership Team (EULT) as a proposal, though it required deliberative endorsement at this Committee before onward circulation to Senate.

In considering feedback from students and faculty, the key change proposed was renaming and re-framing the role 'Academic Advisor' to 'Personal Tutor'. The policy clarifies the nature and scope of the role and the expectations on Personal Tutors with regard to engaging with their tutees. The next steps would be developing a University-level implementation plan and guidance to support faculties with this revision to the role.

The Committee discussed how important the student-facing communications regarding this change to the policy will be and it was emphasised that the principles that underpin personal tutoring (in particular the expected benefits for students) need to be highlighted.

The policy was endorsed and recommended to Senate

5.3.8 3B - Admissions Policy: Taught Programmes

Decision
Jules Forrest

A review of section 9 of the policy has been undertaken. The wording has been updated to clarify that a fee can be changed for subsequent years of study (for clarification the changed fee would be at a reduced level), where a student has omitted to inform the University of any information which may have affected the decision regarding their fee status.

The Chair highlighted the wording in 2.3 in the key risks section commencing "Current practice has been to refund any additional fee....", suggesting it should be amended to include the wording 'for all students that the University is aware of'.

ACTION: The Secretary would action the updated wording for the republished ARPP.

The Vice President (Education) of the Students' Union asked for clarification on how the refund would be processed for students who had overpaid. The Chair confirmed that the loan agreement would be adjusted in retrospect and confirmed with SLC.

The policy amendments were approved

5.3.9 3D - Admissions Policy and Procedure for Applicants with a disability

Decision
Jules Forrest

The Committee were informed this has already been reviewed by The Admissions Group (TAG) but required deliberative consideration and approval at this Committee. Section 8 of the procedure has been amended to update the responsibilities for initial triage of the questionnaire information. The changes reflect evolution of the operational process which has taken place following the implementation of the procedure. These amendments relate to initial management of the information and are not substantive. In particular they do not represent any change to the policy aims or to outcomes from or responsibilities for decision-making under the policy.

[Chair's note on the minutes: this decision to approve policy changes to reflect operational practice reflects the very limited nature of the changes as noted in the minutes, in the context of a granular procedure and should not be regarded as indicating general acceptance of retrospective policy changes].

The policy amendments were approved

5.3.10 3N - Enrolment Procedure

Decision
Jules Forrest

The Committee were informed that this has been reviewed to The Admissions Group (TAG) but required deliberative consideration and approval at this Committee.

The Student Lifecycle Team (SLT) are proposing revisions to the procedure to give a clear overview of what enrolment involves, reflect changes to the enrolment process made during the pandemic which BU wish to retain, and update sections on incomplete enrolment and late arrivals providing greater clarity over the process and clearer language. The revisions also introduce an explicit final deadline for arrival at BU, of one month after the course start date, with arrival not being permitted after this time even on the basis of exceptional circumstances.

The policy was endorsed and recommended to Senate

5.3.11 3K - Engagement Monitoring & Withdrawal

Decision
Jules Forrest

Changes have been made to update wording throughout to reflect the following changes: NHS Bursaries to NHS Learning Support Fund, Tier 4 students to student visa holders, update to processes for overseas students who hold a student route visa and different requirements for the provision of e-mails versus letters in the case of non-engagement.

This policy updates were approved

5.4 External Examiner Appointments and Examination Teams for Research Degrees

Decision
Jules Forrest

Chair requested clarification for QAEG reviewers listed against one examiner nomination. Two names have been added to QAEG Reviewer 1.

ACTION: The Secretary will clarify whether there were two reviewers for this nomination.

The paper was approved

5.5 Programme Development Proposals

5.5.1 MA Criminology & Criminal Justice

Decision
Dr Sara White

The Deputy Dean of Faculty of Health and Social Sciences presented the paper.

The Chair noted that clarification was needed on credit weighting and unit structure, including the order in which units would be undertaken and identification of core and optional units. The Secretary noted that this has been added to the guidance for new programme approvals considered by ASEC.

ACTION: DDE FHSS to clarify credit weighting and unit structure

This paper was approved subject to clarification regarding credit weighting and unit structure to be provided to the approval panel.

- 5.5.2 BSc Computing Science
BSc (Hons) Business Computing with Analytics
BSc (Hons) Data Science and Artificial Intelligence
BSc (Hons) Cyber Security with Digital Forensics
BSc (Hons) Networks and Cyber Security

Decision
Prof Christos Gatzidis

The Deputy Dean of Faculty of Science and Technology presented the paper noting that this proposal for changes to programme titles reflects that computing is an area of fast-paced technological development and programmes need titles which are meaningful in the current context. The Committee were informed that the programmes had undergone a Programme and Review (PAR) Event earlier that day with positive outcomes and only minor conditions.

The Secretary confirmed that although unusual, a PAR event can sometimes occur before the change to programme title.

The paper was approved.

5.6 CAS Exception Requests

5.6.1 MSc Health Research (FHSS)

Decision
Dr Sara White

Recruitment to MSc Clinical Research full-time has been low for some time, and applicant numbers have remained low despite a name change to MSc Health Research in 2019w. Units within this programme are also offered as CPD and from September 2021 have been available to PGR students. All these routes in addition to certain units being common across programmes provide enough students to run units once a year but are not sufficient to support a January intake too.

The paper was approved

5.6.2 MA Advanced Mental Health Practice (FHSS)

Decision
Dr Sara White

The amendments made are practice requirements around admissions reflecting PSRB requirements; , delivery pattern with the programme delivered in six months to meet the needs of the Local Authority's that access the programme; compensation: all units must achieve a pass in order to meet PSRB requirements; and anonymous marking for units A & B only, Unit C, D and E submissions are based on practice and require validation by practice assessors.

The paper was approved

- 5.6.3 MSc Foundations of Clinical Psychology;
MSc Investigative Forensic Psychology;
MSc Clinical and Development Neuropsychology (FST)

Decision
Dr Shanti Shanker

The request is for the January start date version for each of the programmes mentioned above to have a 12-month duration rather than the standard 16-month duration. The Committee were informed that although no CAS Exception form has been submitted until now, there was faculty level permission in place for having MSc Clinical Psychology to be of 12 months rather than 16 months. Following a recent PAR, the external panel noted that a CAS Exception form needed to be submitted formally for the request for all three programmes to run this way.

It was confirmed that the start dates had been passed by visa compliance, therefore would not be an issue for student's attending from overseas..

The paper was approved

5.6.4 BA International Tourism and Business
Management Programmes (BUBS)

Decision
Dr Shelley Thompson

The request was to allow a 40-credit consultancy project to run the whole year.

The paper was approved

5.7 Quality Assurance and Enhancement Group (QAEG)
Nominations

Decision
Jules Forrest

The Quality and Enhancement Group (QAEG) nominations for the following colleagues were **approved**:

Dr Janice Attard-Johnson
Dr Yi Huang
Dr Yonghun Lim
Dr Diogo Montalvão

6. FOR NOTE

6.1 Annual Review of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

Information

The paper was noted

6.2 Pending External Examiner Appointments

Information
Jules Forrest

It was clarified that the vacancy for the Computer Animation Art and Design programme is for an industry external examiner and that there were currently two academic external examiners covering this programme this year.

BA (Hons) Film has a nomination in progress and this is currently waiting for approval from the DDE FMC.

The vacancy for MSc Internet of Things has been covered by an extension which was confirmed by the DDE FST.

The paper was noted

6.3 Outcomes from recent Evaluation Events and
List of Completed Evaluation Events

Information
Jules Forrest

The paper was **noted**

6.4 BUBS FASEC Minutes

Information
Dr Shelley Thompson

The minutes were noted

6.5 FHSS FASEC Minutes

Information
Dr Sara White

The minutes were noted

6.6 FMC FASEC Minutes

Information
Dr Christa van Raalte

The minutes were noted

6.7 FST FASEC Minutes

Information
Prof Christos Gatzidis

The minutes were noted

7 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business to discuss.

8. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

TBC