

Academic Standards and Education Committee

Wed 19 October 2022, 14:00 - 17:00

MS Teams

Attendees

Board members

Prof. Philip Sewell (Deputy Chair and Head of Department, Faculty of Science and Technology (FST)), Jules Forrest (Head of Academic Quality), Mandi Barron (Director of Student Services), Nicole Chee (Faculty Officer (BUBS)), Prof. Carol Clark (Member of Senate), Norah Deka (Vice-President (Education) Students' Union (SUBU)), Dr Lois Farquharson (Executive Dean (BUBS)), Prof. Christos Gatzidis (Acting Deputy Dean - Education and Professional Practice (FST)), Samantha Leahy-Harland (Chief Executive, Students' Union (SUBU)), Jacky Mack (Academic Registrar), Dr Karl Rawstrone (Principal Academic in Media Production), Dr Gelareh Roushan (Head of Fusion Learning Innovation and Excellence (FLIE)), Dr Christa van Raalte (Deputy Dean - Education and Professional Practice (FMC)), Jane Wakefield (Director of Marketing and Communications), Dr Sara White (Deputy Dean - Education and Professional Practice (FHSS)), Prof. Sabeur Zoheir (Member of the Professoriate)

Apologies

Prof. Katharine Cox (Member of the Professoriate), Dr Shelley Thompson (Deputy Dean - Education and Professional Practice (BUBS))

Observers

Rosalind Ashcroft (Head of Academic Operations), Rebekah Kerslake (Academic Quality Officer and Clerk)

Meeting minutes

1. APOLOGIES

Clerk

Apologies were noted as above.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Chair

The following declarations of interest were declared:

Head of Academic Operations: Item 6.11.2 Kingston Maurward College Annual Monitoring and Enhancement Review (AMER)

The Deputy Chair: Item 6.13 Programme Development Proposal (PDP): Engineering Programmes

The Secretary: Item 6.17 Quality Assurance and Enhancement Group (QAEG) Nominations for Academic Quality Team members

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

3.1. Accuracy: ASEC 25 May 2022

Approval

Accuracy: ASEC 25 May 2022 - The minutes of the meeting were approved as an accurate record

Chair

 3.1 ASEC Unconfirmed Minutes 25.05.22.pdf

3.2. Summary: e-ASEC 13-17 June 2022

Approval

The Deputy Chair drew the attention of the committee to the response from the Secretary on the e-ASEC summary regarding the suggested improvements required for the Self-Assessment Report. It was noted that these had not been actioned.

Chair

The summary of the meeting was approved as an accurate record,

 3.2 e-ASEC Summary 13-17 June 2022.pdf

3.3. Summary: e-ASEC 30 August - 6 September 2022

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

 3.3 e-ASEC Summary 30 Aug - 6 Sept 2022.pdf

Approval
Chair

3.4. Matters Arising/ Actions Log

Various

5.3.4 (25.05.22) **ARPP 5B Student Engagement and Feedback** – The Director of Student Services confirmed that there had been discussions relating to this action. There was a desire to obtain feedback on general student support but an awareness that this needed to be balanced against an avoidance of excessive surveying of students. The Deputy Chair questioned whether the action in the log was still the correct one, or whether considering discussions it needed to be amended. It was felt that there were two issues, the development of MUSE/ FUSE timings and how feedback was obtained for issues that do not come through those routes. The action was noted as ongoing.

4.1D (07.04.22) **Student Outcomes Data** – The PRIME Manager confirmed that the extra category will be added to January 2023 Report. **Action closed.**

6.2 (26.01.22) **Arrivals and Induction Report** – The report will be circulated in December. This action to be closed following circulation.

 3.4 ASEC Actions Log 2021-22.pdf

3.5. ASEC Terms of Reference and Membership

Approval
Chair

The Deputy Chair noted that the ASEC and FASEC terms of reference will be presented to Senate.

The Secretary highlighted that the ASEC terms of reference will be reviewed following outcomes from the Independent Governance Review and the introduction of apprenticeship committees.

 3.5 ASEC Terms of Reference Sept 2021.pdf

3.6. FASEC Terms of Reference and Membership

Approval
Chair

The terms of reference were approved.

 3.6 FASEC ToR 2022-23.pdf

4. FOR RATIFICATION

4.1. Chair's Action: Termination of PGR Panel & Re-appointment of new Panel and Chair

To Ratify
Chair

The committee were asked to approve the termination of a PGR Examination Panel and the re-appointment of a new Panel.

The Chair's Action was ratified.

 4.1 Chair's Action Termination of PGR Panel Re-appointment of new Panel.pdf

5. FOR DISCUSSION

5.1. Reflecting on the academic aspects of student experience data 2022

Discussion
J Forster

The Vice Chancellor's Policy Advisor was invited to present the paper. The committee were informed that the paper was provided as a summary for the committee, highlighting the results which were relevant to ASEC's remit in order to facilitate a discussion.

The paper highlighted feedback provided by the sector-wide student experience surveys that took place at Bournemouth University (BU) in 2022. The paper considered three sets of National Student Survey (NSS) questions: *Teaching on my course*, *Learning opportunities* and *Learning community*. Sector data fell into pre-pandemic and post-pandemic sets. It was noted that BU scores fell during 2020-21 in all three NSS questions. BU scores had recovered in 2021-22 across all sets but were still below 2019-20 scores.

It was noted that BU scores were most impacted in what were traditionally strong areas for BU (*Learning Opportunities* and *Learning Community*) and the drop in satisfaction was greater than that experienced across the sector. The committee were reminded that the results differ across departments and that there was good practice to be celebrated in BU.

The Deputy Chair invited the committee to discuss.

A member of the committee noted that it was interesting to hear that BU's recovery has not been as quick as others in the sector. An observation was made that where a team was working well together, a student would generally thrive. The question was asked whether there was information from the staff survey that examined staff resilience and whether there was a correlation between this and lower NSS scores. The committee were informed that no correlation had been found.

It was highlighted by a committee member that where there was a highly functioning team, the NSS feedback was positive. Where there was a coherent collaboration with clear communication and a clear programme, the students were happy. Where there was a lack of coherency in a team, the students were less likely to know the narrative and could then feedback negatively. It was noted that often the smaller the team, the better they worked collaboratively, as with a compact team coherency was easier to achieve. It was agreed that there were challenges for bigger programmes with bigger teams.

The committee agreed that teams were important, and that resources were needed to build and develop strong, cohesive teams. It was suggested that this could be a focus to support a better student experience.

It was noted that within *Teaching on my course*, there was a clear difference between those that are taught in classroom and those that are taught in practice situations. Those that were taught in practice were not always getting the parity or quality as those in the classroom.

The Head of Academic Operations suggested that questions could be formulated for students to tease out answers regarding the many issues raised in this discussion. The Chief Executive Students' Union suggested that discussions take place outside of this committee to look at where collaboration with SUBU can be built in to support this work.

It was noted that the NSS results at BU appeared to lag behind the sector average. The point was made that BU had a large number of programmes which were practical in nature, with students having to undertake practical skills work. Students on this type of programme seemed more adversely impacted and appeared to struggle more during the pandemic years. It was suggested that the high proportion of practice-led work had had an impact on the results, and whether the comparisons made were with other institutes that have similar programmes. It was noted that this would be reflected in benchmark data at subject level.

The committee discussed the quality of delivery and the environment. It was recognised that the coherence of teams was paramount, but that the quality of delivery was also important. Further enhancing the quality of delivery in the post-pandemic era was an area that should be assessed and addressed. There was discussion around the topic of the quality of the teaching environment. It was recognised that this needed to be in place for all programmes. It was felt that it was important to give the students something to own that was unique to their programme/sense of ownership as this created a positive learning environment.

The point was raised that faculties were not good at celebrating what they are good at and communicating this to students. The Deputy Dean of Health and Social Sciences (HSS) highlighted that often students are not aware until they graduate the areas that BU did better than other institutions. It was noted that BU needed to engage students and communicate good news stories. It was suggested that this was an area that the Director of Marketing and Communications and the wider team could help with.

The Deputy Chair noted that as the paper was submitted late, comments could be submitted until Friday 21 October.

 5.1 ASEC Committee Report Student Experience October 2022 updated (1).pdf

6. FOR APPROVAL/ ENDORSEMENT

6.1. Annual Report on Student Services, Student Welfare and Wellbeing

The Director of Student Services presented the paper. Attention was drawn to Section 10 *Information Sharing* – the UK guidance on information sharing hadn't been published when the report was written.

Section 16: *Safeguarding*. Universities do not fall under statutory safeguarding legislation in the same way as schools and colleges, however apprenticeships do. The next year's Student Services Report would reflect this.

Section 19 – *Student Suicides and Suicide Prevention*. BU are sector-leading in this area, with a great deal of good practice taking place. The University Retreat was highlighted as a safe space for students to go to. This would be introduced in January 2023.

The Deputy Chair noted that the demand for accommodation moving forward was an issue.

The paper was endorsed

 6.1 Annual Report on Student Services, Student Welfare and Wellbeing.pdf

Endorsement

Mandi Barron

6.2. Quality and Standards Report 2021/22

The Secretary presented the paper. The Secretary highlighted following consultation across the sector, the revised conditions of registration relating to quality and standards had been introduced. Attention was drawn to the changes to the B Conditions 1, 2, 4 and 5.

Endorsement

Jules Forrest

The revisions to the quality and standards B conditions had led to a reconsideration of how the annual report was presented to ensure that full coverage of the revised conditions was demonstrated and an assurance statement provided for each condition.

Work was being undertaken with PRIME regarding B3 student outcomes to ensure that BU were aligning to the new thresholds introduced this year.

There were two new requirements within the B conditions which need to be incorporated within policy and procedure.

The first related to assessment of English language proficiency identified in the mapping to the revised conditions (B1.4 and B4.2). Work was ongoing with Head of Fusion Learning Innovation and Excellence (FLIE) to consider amendments to the Generic Assessment Criteria to support this change. There would be further consultation with DDE's before a proposal was submitted to ASEC in January 2023.

The second area of policy revision related to retention of student work. Under current BU retention policy, a sample of student assessment had to be retained for 'current academic year + 1 year'. In assessing compliance with condition B4, the OfS refer to the possibility of accessing students' assessed work and therefore expect providers to retain appropriate records for a period of five years after the end date of a course. The impact of shifting to retain assessed work for all students for an extended period of time would mean updates to policies and processes, and potential investment in digital processing infrastructure and storage which is currently not planned or costed for at a university or Faculty-level. Following similar feedback from the sector, it was noted that the OfS are due to publish further supporting information and guidance about this requirement, though this had not been shared yet.

Condition B2 had been reworded and broadened in scope, now it specifically includes resources for students and student engagement, as well as academic support. The current data set was based on previous annual reporting, but further work was being undertaken around data sets and data indicators to identify appropriate measures to test assurance against the revised B2 condition. Academic Quality (AQ) were working with PRIME and Student Services to come up with a set of indicators that reflected the broader scope of B2.

In terms of areas of potential risk, attention was drawn to the continued growth in Academic Offences. Changes have been made to policy but this would not deal with the volume in certain areas or type of offence.

Discussion was opened to the committee. The Deputy Chair suggested that the academic skills hub could have a role in proficiency of English. The Secretary would follow this up.

The question was asked whether there was a PSRB requirement for the length of time that work was retained

There was discussion over the link between Academic Offences and English proficiency. The point was made that support can be provided to students but that there could be a problem where it was optional and students were not required to engage.

ACTION: Secretary to look at Academic Hubs helping with English Proficiency

The paper was endorsed for onward consideration at Senate

 6.2 2021 -22 Quality and Standards Report.pdf

6.3. Doctoral College Annual Report

The Heads of the Doctoral College presented the paper. The report provided an overview on statistics and performance related to Postgraduate Research (PGR) monitoring and progression during 2021/22. A narrative was provided in the report of activities and actions which supported PGR provision at a central and faculty level. Trends were identified to help with planning and informing decision-making. Key points highlighted were:

- BUs Overall satisfaction in PRES 2022 was 82.2%, and BU had risen above the sector average.
- Research degree awards conferred in 21/22 increased by 5.6%
- Institutional FT Completion Rate (KPI) 2022 increased to 40.4%, which was still below the institutional target of 70%
- 18 BU academics had been awarded Recognised Research Supervisor status by UKCGE
- 100% of attendees rated the Annual PGR Conference as Good, Very Good or Excellent.

The Deputy Chair asked for an update on the introduction of ProGRes. The Committee were informed that the system had launched on 31 August 2022. The system was very user-friendly and intuitive. Currently work was being undertaken with IT to smooth out any issues that had been highlighted, and on the reporting aspect of ProGRes. The Heads of the Doctoral College noted that the roll-out of ProGRes had been smoother than other previous systems. They acknowledged the hard work of IT and Louise Bryant (Postgraduate Research Administration Team Leader) in implementing the new system.

The Committee asked about the implementation plan for completion rates. The Committee were informed that working with faculties was a priority in this, to look at monitoring student progression and considering what areas of the examination process could be streamlined.

The paper was approved

Approval
Dr J Taylor/ Dr F Knight

6.4. Fusion Learning Innovation and Excellence (FLIE) Report

Approval
Dr G Roushan

The Head of FLIE presented the report.

The key item on the report was the JISC learning analytics. Initial anecdotal feedback from staff was positive. FLIE were working with PRIME to see how data was provided to BU from JISC and how that could be converted into something useful. There was currently work happening on how to respond to the live queries.

The Deputy Chair highlighted the section on Peer Reflection on Education Practice (PREP) asking about completion dates and whether there was any information from the learning analytics. The Head of FLIE noted a key point from last year's PREP was the move to Brightspace, which meant that people who had access could get a report at department-level. This report highlighted those who had completed their reviews and whether there were any matters arising from the review process. It did not provide the detail regarding the matters arising. Amendments to the PREP policy were underway as it did not include peer observation. Faculties had requested guidance for the PREP process, to ensure that even a new Head of Department (HoD) would know the process. The Head of FLIE reported that the guidance provided now outlines the basic process and provides clear expectations.

The paper was approved

 6.4 ASEC Annual Report - FLIE2021-22.pdf

6.5. Annual Report on Accuracy of Public Information (Consumer Protection Compliance) for academic year 2021-2022

Approval
Jane Wakefield

The Director of Marketing and Communication presented the paper. The Committee were informed that this year was positive with accuracy of information being good, particularly around the Consumer Action Plan. It was highlighted that accuracy of consumer information should not be a one-off, work was ongoing in this area which was important not just from a legal perspective but also morally to ensure the information presented to current and prospective students accurately reflects what is intended.

The Committee were asked to consider the annual report and whether they felt more regular reviews would be beneficial.

There was discussion regarding ongoing policy and the need for a clearly defined route for updating information. It was felt that the process could be too long which resulted in updating information too late. This could leave BU disadvantaged in the market. The committee were informed that clear routes for updating information were a core reason for developing this new policy as it was recognised that there were multiple places in the process that required information to be updated which meant the process became very arduous. The case for a unit catalogue was raised. The Academic Registrar confirmed this was on the development plan for this year but would need additional resourcing therefore the business case was still under development.

The Deputy Chair noted that as the paper had been submitted late, comments could be submitted until Friday 21 October.

The paper was approved

 6.5 ASEC Annual Report Accuracy of Public Information (Consumer Protection Compliance).pdf

6.6. Degree Outcomes Statement

Endorsement
J Forrest

The Secretary presented the paper. Providers had been asked to respond to the areas highlighted in Section 2.1 of the report. These were:

- A review of progress against actions set out in degree outcome statements of 2020 and 2021
- A commitment to restart any outstanding actions paused during the pandemic with revised timelines where they are still relevant.
- An assessment of pandemic-related changes and the impact on degree classification, using pre-pandemic data as a benchmark, setting out how they will return to pre-pandemic levels by 22/23.
- A commitment to further actions to address any areas where there is unexplained inflation.
- An explanation of how sector supported principles on degree algorithms and external examiners (EE) were being followed.

The Academic Registrar reminded the committee that content from this report would be part of a published statement, therefore now was the time to feedback or comment.

The Deputy Chair commented that 7.4 should be expanded on. The wording of the response to this section of the statement would be reviewed again, before final publication.

The paper was endorsed

6.7. Update to ARPP 6N for External Examiner Process

Approval
James Eva

The Secretary presented the paper. This proposed a change to procedure with the aim of streamlining the external examiner appointment process.

The current process requires approval of the Faculty Executive Dean, the Head of Academic Quality or their nominee, as well as two members of the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Group (QAEG). The process requires a nomination form to be completed and forwarded by the faculty proposer to the Faculty Executive Dean who reviews the proposal and evaluates the academic suitability of the nominee. Following this, the nomination form is sent to two QAEG members who then make recommendations to the Head of Academic Quality for final approval.

Academic Quality had looked at the wider sector and sought further guidance. The result of this was to retain the two areas of the process that were required to properly consider an application or reallocation (the academic suitability of the candidate and compliance with policy and procedure). It was felt that the approval of two QAEG members could be removed given the academic experience and institutional authority of the Faculty Executive Dean, and the prior scrutiny of the faculty proposer and the expertise of the Academic Quality Team. This would also then align to the PGR Examiner sign off process and would release QAEG members' time to other more value-adding procedures such as Academic Offence panels and Programme Approval and Review panels.

The paper was approved.

 6.7 Update to ARPP 6N for External Examiner Process.pdf

6.8. Apprenticeships Governance Model

Approval
J Forrest

The Secretary presented the paper. The growth of the apprenticeship provision at BU highlighted that current governance structure needed to be reconsidered. A great deal of work had been done over the past 6 months within the apprenticeship area, working with other universities to look at how they incorporate apprenticeship monitoring into their structure.

Three groups have been identified:

- Faculty Apprenticeships Oversight Group – already meeting regularly
- Apprenticeships Operations Board – a central operations group that already existed in an informal way
- Apprenticeship Board – a high level Academic Board to feed into other committees

The draft terms of references had been compiled following discussion with faculties who already have apprenticeship provision. However, the Secretary informed the committee that feedback from all committee members was welcomed.

The Academic Registrar noted that following recent meetings, it was recommended that one of the Business Engagement Knowledge Exchange (BEKE) Managers should be on the Apprenticeship Operations Board.

The Deputy Dean of Education (DDE) for the Faculty of Science and Technology (FST) suggested Finn Morgan who was a BEKE and was in Dorset LEP

It was suggested that the Designated Safeguarding Lead (DSL) should be on all three groups considering the importance of Safeguarding in this area. It was recognised that it was a big commitment to be on all three, so it was proposed that the DSL could attend the faculty-level group as and when required/ or at regular intervals.

It was noted that the incorrect job title was listed for the Director of Student Services and this would be corrected.

The Director of Student Services noted that safeguarding was not explicitly mentioned in the terms of reference and should be added.

The committee were informed that the paper was being referred to Senate for approval where the Secretary would provide a verbal update of the discussions from ASEC.

The paper was endorsed.

Action: Correct the Director of Student Services job title

 6.8 Apprenticeships Governance Model.pdf

6.9. Outcome of the GTA Partner Review

Approval
J Forrest

The Secretary presented the paper and highlighted that from the initial review there was no significant concern and the recommendation was to continue with the partnership. The Secretary flagged that the financial statement was recently received and was currently being reviewed. It was emphasised that the partnership was a low-risk partnership and that ASEC would be notified if the financial statements flagged anything of concern.

The Deputy Chair noted that there were several recommendations for the Faculty. The Secretary confirmed that Academic Quality would develop an action plan and would work with Faculty to close the actions down. This would be reflected in the annual report back to ASEC next year.

The paper was approved

 6.9 GTA Review.pdf

6.10. Faculty Annual Monitoring and Enhancement Review (AMER)

6.10.1. Bournemouth University Business School

Key faculty themes based on NSS were: Academic Support, Inclusivity, Assessment & Feedback and Learning Community. A key area for BUBS was continuation. The themes identified were to address continuation and attainment for all students, including racially diverse student groups.

The PREP themes focus on inclusive learning, teaching and assessment. All departments would be expected to engage with this theme. Additionally, departments had identified themes for emphasis in PREP based on their AMER data, which would be discussed in detail in Departments Committee meetings.

The BUBS AMER was approved

 6.10.1 BUBS Faculty AMER Plan.pdf

Approval
Dr S Thompson

6.10.2. Faculty of Health and Social Sciences

The FHSS DDE noted that this had been a difficult year with NSS scores decreasing. Work was ongoing with departments and programme leaders to unpick the issues that caused this, also drawing on the departments that did well.

There were still additions to make to the Faculty AMER plan. Issues currently faced included the Apprenticeship provision and a significant jump in extensions and academic offences. There was ongoing work with students to understand why this increase had occurred and why some students felt that plagiarism was acceptable.

There was student dissatisfaction with timetables in programmes with mandatory practice placements. HoDs had liaised with the timetabling manager and looked at timetabling issues. It was hoped that this would show an improvement from the student perspective.

BAME attainment gap was varied across FHSS but AMER actions aimed to minimize the gap. The appointed Inclusivity Lead was carrying out work across the faculty.

NSS feedback indicated a lack of satisfaction in the quality of placement provision for students on PSRB-regulated programmes, with students feeling undervalued. Work was ongoing in this area to counteract this perception of the student experience for these programmes.

The FHSS AMER was approved

 6.10.2 FHSS Faculty AMER.pdf

Approval
Dr S White

6.10.3. Faculty of Media and Communication

Across FMC the greatest concerns were Student Voice, Assessment and Feedback and Organisation and Management.

There were concerns within NCCA, specifically wider concerns about UG students' satisfaction. This was currently being addressed within department and programme action plans.

BAME continuation across the Faculty generally equals or exceeds that for non-BAME students; there were however negative gaps for completion, pass rate and attainment.

All Departments wanted to take action in relation to Assessment and Feedback. There were issues around turnaround times and the quality of feedback. There were a number of initiatives being implemented to improve the timeliness of assessment, clarity of the brief and assessment criteria, helpful feedback, and student assessment literacy. There were concerns around Student Voice, and the score was disappointing considering the amount of work staff had put into seeking, responding to and acting on student feedback.

FMC have an ambitious revalidation schedule this year.

The FMC AMER was approved

 6.10.3 FMC Faculty AMER.pdf

Approval
Dr C Van Raalte

6.10.4. Faculty of Science and Technology

The FST DDE reported a 100% completion rate in AMERs, with a marked improvement in the quality of action planning which was to be commended. FST had given departments (and programmes) the freedom to identify themes pertinent to them.

Key faculty themes were focused on seven different selected themes:

- BAME Attainment/ continuation
- NSS Overall Satisfaction
- Quality Assurance: Programme Approval or Review
- Other (e.g. Appeal or Complaint outcomes)
- NSS Student Voice
- Quality Assurance: Appeal or Complaint Outcome
- NSS 2022 Assessment and Feedback

BAME continuation and attainment continue to be an area of high priority for FST. Some of the actions proposed here had already been implemented at the end of the last academic year. One action was a FLIE-led session for the Faculty focusing on inclusivity in assessment. A new forum of BAME academics had been proposed within FST to inform initiatives on this matter.

Within Overall Satisfaction it was noted that there was inconsistency in how students were supported across departments. Work needs to be done here with the HoDs and Programme Leaders to normalise the level of support students get for final year projects.

The Faculty had seen a significant increase in academic offences in the past few years, particularly in PGT and specific departments. The Faculty were looking at preventative actions and seeking support from BU in terms of current policies and guidelines. The FST DDE provided feedback in the recent e-ASEC for 6H Academic Offences: Policy & Procedure Update.

The Secretary noted that whilst there was sympathy for the issues that FST were having, no matter how streamlined the process becomes it would not solve the volume of academic offences currently being seen by FST. The Chair recommended this discussion to be continued outside this committee.

The FST DDE reported that despite great efforts last academic year, Student Voice scores for the faculty remained lower than expected.

There was a big increase in appeals in FST, currently with the highest across all Faculties. The number of appeals was becoming unsustainable in terms of workload. Proposed actions included ensuring students were educated during their studies on academic regulations, but also on all means of academic support available to them as well as exploring additional staffing to help within the appeals process

Good practice identified included a good PTES score which was higher than sector average. The Archaeology and Anthropology Department was over the sector average of overall satisfaction achieving 82%.

The FST AMER was approved

The Deputy Chair summarised and asked whether the common themes across all AMERs be consolidated and used as a piece of work. The Secretary highlighted the section in the Quality Standards Annual Report which was dedicated to AMER and identified common themes.

 6.10.4 FST Faculty AMER Plan.pdf

6.11. Partner Annual Monitoring and Enhancement Review (AMER)

6.11.1. Bournemouth and Poole College

The Secretary presented the partner AMER noting that it was comprehensive and demonstrated strong analysis of the data available.

The reduction in continuation and completion rates on full-time provision had prompted new processes around induction and the tutorial. Themes identified were Organisation and Management, Student Outcomes Data, Learning Opportunities and Academic Support.

Good practice identified included strong achievement rates on part-time and apprenticeship provision, excellent embedding of professional skills throughout all programmes and enhanced development of learner skills and knowledge as evidenced by NSS.

The Partner AMER was approved

6.11.2. Kingston Maurward College

The Secretary presented the partner AMER. The partner is currently on 'Teach-out' for last remaining collaborative programmes; therefore, the focus was on protecting the student experience as the programmes teach out.

The Partner AMER was approved

 6.11.2 KMC AMER.pdf

Approval
J Forrest

6.12. CAS Exception Requests

6.12.1. CAS Exception: MSc Corporate Governance

MSc Corporate Governance is a part-time online PG programmes with non-standard delivery over 27 months. The exception request was to allow the induction to be outside the normal induction week, and that delivery and assessment of some units to span more than one semester.

The CAS Exception was approved

 6.12.1 CAS Exception Request MSc Corporate Governance.pdf

Approval
Prof H Yazdifar

6.12.2. CAS Exception: Archaeology & Anthropology

The CAS Exception for UG courses requests a re-exemption for Independent Research project (Level 6) which was currently delivered across two semesters. The department would like to continue to deliver this unit across two semesters in UG and three semesters in MSc Bioarchaeology. This has been successfully implemented since the initial validation of the courses and the department would like to continue with this.

The CAS Exception was approved

 6.12.2 CAS Exception Request Archaeology & Anthropology Programmes.pdf

Approval
Prof C Gatzidis

6.13. Programme Development Proposal: BEng (Hons) Engineering (Mechanical Design) BEng (Hons) Engineering (Electronic Design) BEng (Hons) Engineering (Manufacturing Management)

The Proposal was to develop three variations of the BEng title mapped to the foundation degree titles whilst also maintaining the original BEng title for those who still wish to have flexibility in the content. Approval has been sought from the accreditation bodies, the Institution of Engineering Designers (IED) and the Institution of Mechanical Engineers (IMechE). The IED have approved this and the IMechE are currently reviewing the proposal. There were no new units being created.

A committee member asked whether this was a degree apprenticeship. It was confirmed that the apprenticeship lead provider was Bournemouth and Poole College and BU are sub-contracted to deliver level 6 of the degree apprenticeship.

The Programme Development Proposal was approved

 6.13 Programme Development Proposal Engineering.pdf

Approval
Prof P Sewell

6.14. Programme Development Proposal: Enhanced Clinical Practitioner: Grad Dip Award

The Advanced Clinical Practitioner had been delivered for a few years and, this seeks to gain approval for the programme to be offered at Level 6 and Level 7. Completion of the award at Level 6 will lead to a Graduate Diploma and completion at Level 7 will lead to a Post Graduate Certificate. Practice partners support this new apprenticeship. Based on recent experiences, the Faculty have decided to continue with the validation but to delay the beginning of the programme until September 2023. This allows the Faculty time to ensure all the details required for an apprenticeship model are in place.

The Programme Development Proposal was approved

 6.14 PDP Enhanced Clinical Practitioner Grad Dip Award.pdf

Approval
Dr S White

6.15. FHSS Programme Review Deferral Request: MSc Public Health

This programme should have been revalidated a few years ago. It was intended that it would be re-validated for September 2023 start. However there have been issues that the team have faced which mean that this may not be

Approval
Dr S White

possible. A year's extension has been requested to help them address some of the issues.

The Programme Review Deferral Request was approved

 6.15 HSS Programme Review Deferral Request MSc Public Health.pdf

6.16. External Examiner Nominations and Examination Teams for Research Degrees

The paper was Approved

 6.16 External Examiner Nominations and Examination Teams for PGR.pdf

Approval
J Forrest

6.17. Quality Assurance and Enhancement Group Nominations

The following nominations were **approved**:

Dr Catherine Angell, Head of Department, HSS Midwifery and Health Sciences

Dr Paul Fairbairn, Lecturer in Nutrition and Exercise Science, HSS Rehabilitation and Sport Sciences

Dr Ruijie Wang, Lecturer in Psychology, FST Psychology

James Eva – Academic Quality Manager, Academic Services

Stephen Rigotti – Academic Quality Team Leader, Academic Services

Georgina Fluke – Academic Quality Team Leader, Academic Services

Judy Lou Smith – Academic Quality Team Leader, Academic Services

 6.17 QAEG Nominations.pdf

Approval
J Forrest

7. FOR NOTE

7.1. NSS Results 2022

The report was noted

 7.1 NSS Results 2022.pdf

To Note
R Pottle

7.2. PTES Results 2022

The report was noted

 7.2 PTES Results 2022.pdf

To Note
R Pottle

7.3. PRES Results 2022

The report was noted

 7.3 PRES Results 2022.pdf

To Note
R Pottle

7.4. Completed Programme Reviews, Approvals and Reviews for Closure and Outcomes

The report was noted

 7.4 Outcomes from recent Evaluation Events.pdf

To Note
J Forrest

7.5. Pending External Examiner Appointments

The Chair and Secretary reminded the DDEs to continue following up the outstanding EEs.

 7.5 Pending External Examiner Appointments.pdf

To Note
J Forrest

7.6. Partner Review Schedule

The report was noted.

 7.6 ASEC Partner Review Schedule.pdf

To Note
J Forrest

7.7. Signed Partner Agreements

The report was noted.

 7.7 Partnership Activity Report ASEC October 2022.pdf

To Note
J Forrest

7.8. BUBS FASEC Minutes: 04.05.22

The minutes were noted

 7.8 BUBS FASEC Minutes.pdf

To Note
Dr S Thompson

7.9. FHSS FASEC Minutes: 11.05.22

The minutes were noted

 7.9 FHSS FASEC Minutes.pdf

To Note
Dr S White

7.10. FMC FASEC Minutes: 04.05.22

The minutes were noted

 7.10 FMC FASEC minutes.pdf

To Note
Dr C Van Raalte

7.11. FST FASEC Minutes: 04.05.22

The minutes were noted

 7.11 FST FASEC Minutes.pdf

To Note
Prof C Gatzidis

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

No other Business

9. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Wednesday, 25 January, 2023 14:00 - 17:00

Location: MS Teams