

Academic Standards and Education Committee

Wednesday 5 April 2023, 14:00-17:00, MS Teams

Attendees

Committee Members

Professor Philip Sewell (Acting Chair and Apprenticeship Lead (Interim)), Jules Forrest (Secretary and Head of Academic Quality), Professor Keith Phalp (Pro-Vice Chancellor Education and Quality (Interim)), Professor Katharine Cox (Member of the Professoriate), Norah Deka (Vice-President (Education) Students' Union (SUBU)), Professor Zoheir Sabeur (Member of the Professoriate), Professor Christos Gatzidis (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)), Prof Sara White (Deputy Dean - Education and Professional Practice (FHSS)), Jane Wakefield (Director of Marketing and Communications), Nicole Chee (Faculty Officer, (BUBS)), Oliver Wildey (Faculty Officer (FHSS)).

In Attendance

Dr Holly Crossen-White (Programme Lead for MSc Public Health), Jack Guymer (Academic Quality Policy and Project Manager),

Apologies

Dr Melanie Gray (Deputy Dean – Education and Professional Practice (FMC)), Rosalind Ashcroft (Head of Academic Operations), Prof Carol Clark (Member of Senate), Andrew Bird (Head of International Marketing and Student Recruitment)

Observers

Rebekah Kerslake (Academic Quality Officer and Clerk)

Meeting Minutes

1. APOLOGIES

**Information
Clerk**

Apologies were noted as above.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

**Information
Chair**

The following declarations of interested were declared:

The Chair declared an interest in Agenda Item 7.3 and 7.4.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

3.1 Accuracy: ASEC 25 January 2023

Decision
Chair

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

3.2 Matters Arising/Actions Log

Discussion
Various

Actions Log

4.1A (25.01.23) Student Outcomes Data: discussions exploring BTEC versus A-Level achievement – Secretary to consult with Chair of ASEC for this to be discussed at ASEC in the next Academic Year.

4.1B (25.01.23) – Student Outcomes Data: PRIME to include Apprenticeship Data in future Student Outcomes.

4.1.C (25.01.23) – Following a verbal report this meeting a written In-Year Retrieval Paper would be submitted to ASEC in May.

4. FOR RATIFICATION

4.1 Chair's Action: MSc Human Centred Artificial Intelligence Cluster

For Ratification
Chair

The Programme Development Proposal (PDP) had been submitted to ASEC in January. The Committee requested that the PDP be updated and clarified. The committee had requested from the faculty that there should be only one programme title per proposal form for clarity. The PDP forms also now indicated which units counted towards each programme title.

Decision: Approved

5. CHAIR'S BUSINESS

5.1 Apprenticeship Update

For Information
Chair

The Chair presented an update on apprenticeship provision. It was noted that minutes from the Apprenticeships Board will be received by ASEC to ensure oversight of apprenticeship provision is maintained by ASEC.

The key points of the report were highlighted, noting the Ofsted Monitoring visit in December 2022 which was now published on the Ofsted reports website. The report judged that BU had made 'reasonable' progress. It was emphasised that the monitoring visit was not an indication of how Bournemouth University would perform at the next Ofsted visit. The full inspection could be anytime from 6 months after the new provider monitoring visit.

A revised governance structure had been implemented that supported improved oversight of the provision and more frequent monitoring of key data sets. The new committees consisted of Faculty Apprenticeship Oversight Group, Apprenticeship Operations Group and Apprenticeship Board. A number of new central posts to support apprenticeships had been introduced into Academic Services to provide dedicated resource and expertise to support compliance activities and to develop the required infrastructure to deliver high-quality apprenticeship provision.

The audit of the University's compliance with ESFA funding rules, conducted by PricewaterhouseCoopers, identified that in a number of areas of non-compliance. This resulted in a set of actions being identified to address these findings. Three of the actions identified had yet to be completed due to it not being possible to contact apprentices once they had withdrawn from the programme, those who were on breaks from learning in order to collect the required documents. The issues regarding non-compliance have been reported to the Office for Students (OfS) as a reportable event.

The Faculty of Science and Technology (FST) Deputy Dean of Education and Professional Practice (DDE) asked whether, considering the level of resource required to support apprenticeships, it is viable for Faculties to pursue more apprenticeship opportunities. The Chair noted that at present the strategy for apprenticeships was in the process of being clarified, policies and procedures were being developed to ensure that BU was fully compliant and an adequately resourced central team was being established to support more apprenticeships. It was acknowledged that there needed to be a better understanding of the overall cost of apprenticeship provision, and whether there was any return to be made on that investment. It was noted that partners providers (FE colleges) were interested in expanding the number of apprenticeship standards offered but it was also acknowledged that there was the potential for apprenticeships to impact recruitment to other programmes and would therefore need careful consideration.

There was discussion over the role of End Point Assessments (EPA) in apprenticeship provision. It was highlighted that ASEC needed to be aware of arrangements regarding the End Point Assessment, as a form of assessment covered under condition of registration B4, and one that is subject to external quality assurance via the Office for Students in the case of BU being the End Point Assessment Organisation (EPAO) for integrated apprenticeships.

6. FOR DISCUSSION

6.1 Student Outcomes Data

6.1.1 BUBS Student Outcomes Data & Faculty AMER Action Plan

For Discussion
Dr S Thompson

The Bournemouth University Business School (BUBS) DDE presented the Student Outcomes Data Annual Monitoring & Enhancement Review (AMER) response. The DDE mentioned that there was a more updated Action plan than the one contained in the paper pack, detailing new actions, and showing where progress had been made in existing actions.

The key headline for BUBS was around continuation. Overall, the rate of non-continuation had declined to 86.55%. Whilst the three-year average was 88.07%, it was concerning that there had been successive recent declines. There was concern over disparities between students based on their entry level qualifications. Students with A/AS Level qualification were far more likely to continue after their first year, in comparison to those with a level 3 Diploma (including BTEC). The DDE highlighted that this was an area that the faculty were prioritising, considering the role of personal tutors and looking again at Assessment and Feedback practices. It was highlighted how the changes in definition of assessments had uncovered areas where there were 'hidden' exams. It was felt there was further opportunity to reflect on assessment strategy.

In terms of Undergraduate (UG) Award classifications, it was highlighted that BUBS were awarding fewer 1sts and 2:1 classification than other faculties. In the two departments that this was most pronounced, it had been addressed in their departmental action plans.

The DDE noted how it would be more helpful to benchmark against other Business Schools rather than against other BU faculties.

It was highlighted that the Business School had a high proportion of students completing their master's degree. In 2020/ 21 there was an uptick in numbers of students receiving no awards. Anecdotally there was a higher number of students withdrawing due to non-payment of fees. With regards to classification, there was a lower proportion of merits and distinctions in postgraduate provision. This was something that would be explored further to see whether this would be a continuing trend.

The SU VP Education commented that there was a common trend when programmes did not have final year representatives, this was then reflected in the National Students Survey (NSS) completion rate. The SU VP Education offered support to BUBS if the faculty were struggling to obtain final year reps. The DDE agreed that there was a cycle where if a programme did not already have an existing rep, it was hard to recruit a new one so would be happy to work alongside SUBU.

ACTION: BUBS DDE to liaise with SUBU to recruit final year reps

It was noted that the phenomenon of 'hidden' exams was not unique to BUBS alone. There was ongoing work by Fusion Learning Innovation and Excellence (FLIE) looking at the continuation rate and how exams could exacerbate the difference between BTEC student continuation and A-Level student continuation. It was flagged that BU still appeared to have exams that had the potential to disadvantage different groups of students. It was agreed that this area needed further exploration, and scrutiny applied to those programmes that continued to retain exams.

The Secretary noted that the report provided excellent analysis of the outcomes data, with clear motivation and rationale for the action being taken. However, it was not always clear whether the targets that had been originally set were being evaluated against the most recent data sets. The Secretary commented that it would be helpful for all faculties to show evaluation of the actions against the Student Outcomes Data, and how the data translates through to actions set at the beginning of the academic year.

6.1.2 FHSS Student Outcomes Data & Faculty AMER Action Plan

**For Discussion
Prof S White**

The Faculty of Health and Social Sciences (FHSS) DDE presented the report and suggested that a link to the AMER action plans be used rather than downloading the document as the AMER plan included in the ASEC paper pack was not the most up to date. It was documented by the Secretary that hard copies were required for the record.

Continuation rate had shown a decrease over the last three years down to 90.4%. The rate was varied across departments. Continuation in the Department of Rehabilitation and Sport Sciences and Department of Social Work and Social Sciences for BAME students showed a higher proportion not completing. The Faculty Inclusivity Lead was working with department teams to address this. FHSS also noted that there was a difference between those entering with A/AS Levels compared with other entry level qualifications.

It was highlighted to the committee how students within FHSS had experienced particular challenges during the pandemic, with NSS student feedback indicating a lack of satisfaction in quality of placement provision. It was noted that there had been a shortfall of qualified practitioners as supervisors.

The FHSS Faculty Student Representative Student Rep questioned whether students, particularly on Social Science courses felt 'left out' of the student experience, which in turn contributed to the overall dropout rate and the lack of sense of belonging.

6.1.3 FMC Student Outcomes Data & Faculty AMER Action Plan

**For Discussion
Prof K Cox**

The report was presented by a member of FASEC from the Faculty of Media and Communication (FMC) in the absence of the FMC DDE.

The need to understand students as individuals from different demographics was emphasised. FMC aligned with other faculties in noting that students entering with A/AS Levels were more likely to complete their degree, with those entering with BTEC, HE Access course having the lowest completion rate. To counteract this the faculty were reviewing entry tariff points across all programmes and reviewing support structures for students with lower tariff entry points.

Training had been set up with FLIE regarding inclusive assessment and inclusive delivery, working alongside Heads of Departments (HoDs) to look at the use of rubrics.

6.1.4 FST Student Outcomes Data & Faculty AMER Action Plan

**For Discussion
Prof C Gatzidis**

The Faculty of Science and Technology (FST) DDE presented the report noting that the big headline was continuation, which appeared to be on a declining trend. It was highlighted that this seemed to be an institutional issue rather than just a faculty issue.

The DDE informed the committee that the Departmental observations and actions were contained in the Departmental AMER due to the distinct and diverse nature of the six departments.

Faculty Level actions include an emphasis on carrying credit. The FST DDE will be attending assessment boards this year to ensure that the policy was being applied as intended.

The FST DDE noted that the timing of the Student Outcomes Data in the annual monitoring cycle that the meant that faculties needed to be very proactive in how this was used.

There was discussion over the increase in academic offences (AO) in the past few years. AO Panels were emerging, and the faculty were coping better with the numbers.

6.2 Continuation: Carrying credit and In-Year Retrieval Update including 6A *Assessment Regulations* and 6L *Assessment Board Decision Making* Procedure Update

For Approval
J Forrest

The Secretary presented a verbal report confirming that a written report would be presented in May. The report would cover:

1. In-year retrieval data which had run for level 4 students in the last academic year. In-Year Retrieval had now been extended to level 0. The data analysis had shown that students who took in-year retrieval opportunity progressed better than those who did not take the option to retrieve a failure mid-year.
2. There were potential changes proposed in relation to carrying credit policy. The Secretary had met with DDE's and Education Service Managers (ESM) to consider the wording of the policy and how to ensure it use as intended in the regulations. Carrying credit was meant to be the default, however it has become apparent that this was not always the case and the reasons for students not being offered this was not always clear in either assessment board minutes or unit specifications. It was noted that the use of language around 'underpinning learning' may have caused issues, therefore the wording of the policy was being reviewed to ensure transparency and clarity for staff and students.

There was discussion over whether the experience of carrying credit not being offered to all eligible students was common across all faculties. The data indicated that the policy was not consistently applied across all Faculties and that there were a small number of programmes and departments that were less likely to use the carrying credit policy. The Secretary confirmed that the annual Assessment Regulations training for Chairs of Assessment Boards was being offered, and the Academic Quality team would emphasise the importance of carrying credit and where it should be used. The message would be reiterated that this should be the default position.

It was reported that within FHSS some students did not take up In-Year Retrieval, at the advice of personal tutors. The Secretary agreed that Academic Quality would work with programme teams to provide clarity.

ACTION: FHSS to liaise with AQ regarding In-Year Retrieval training for Programme Teams

There was discussion over whether there were regular communication channels with personal tutors where in-year retrieval could be reinforced. It was noted that there was information on SharePoint regarding in-year retrieval but that this could be highlighted further.

A committee member observed that there was a workload implication for staff. It was agreed that staff should be resourced to support in-year retrieval and this should not be a barrier to students being encouraged to take up in-year retrieval opportunities. It was felt that in-year retrieval should be looked at holistically, the benefits to staff realised in their workloads, and staff should be encouraged in this area.

It was reported that within FST, there was a belief that the integrity of an assignment was compromised if students were given the in-year retrieval opportunity. The FST DDE advised the committee that this was a belief that was being challenged.

7. **FOR APPROVAL/ ENDORSEMENT**

7.1 Annual Report: Appeals and Complaints 2022

For Endorsement
J Guymer

The Academic Quality Policy and Project Manager presented the report, noting headlines included appeal numbers increasing from 296 to 422, driven by an increase in appeals relating to exceptional circumstances. This was reflective of the sector with other providers reporting similar trends. The impact of the rise had shown in response scales, with faculty and central resources stretched during peak periods, 80% of all appeals were received between July and September, with an increase also now between February and April for January starters. There had been actions identified within the area of exceptional circumstances, with a working group set up to look at the policy and templates used.

The data for complaints was smaller suggesting general satisfaction across BU with academic services and provision. The number of group complaints had declined. Response timeframes have improved but moving forward this would remain a priority. Recent amendments to policy meant that more emphasis would be placed on early resolution before escalation to the formal stage. Training for case handlers dealing with appeals and complaints was planned for relevant staff. Early resolution training was due to be published imminently, with training for case handlers scheduled for May.

The committee were informed that Senate would receive an updated version of the report with most recent data get shared by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) once that data was published in May 2023.

Decision: Endorsed

7.2 Academic Integrity Update including *ARPP 6H Academic Offences: Policy and Procedure* Update

For Endorsement
Dr G Roushan/ J Forrest

The Secretary presented the report noting that there was an increase in academic offences, and this was a trend observed by the rest of the sector. The Secretary underlined that this report was an update of what went to the Integrity Working Group. The working group were tasked with considering the most recent data in relation to academic offences, to try to understand the nature and the cause of the increase. The working group were also looking at what actions if any was required at a departmental, faculty or University level.

The recent emergence of ChatGPT had dominated the sector's Academic Integrity forums. There had been focus on short-term actions across the sector including guidance and training for staff and messaging to students to communicate the potential to commit an academic offence (AO) if Artificial Intelligence (AI) was used unsanctioned during an assessment. Fusion Learning Innovation and Excellence (FLIE) had coordinated messages to students and staff to support this message. The committee were informed that another short-term urgent task was to include reference to AI within *6H – Academic Offences: Policy and Procedure*. It was acknowledged that there was a clear need to communicate a clear position on any current use of AI that meant with the exception of a small number of assessments in FMC, would be construed as an academic offence under current BU regulations. Longer term actions identified included reviewing how assessments had been designed to ensure that AI could not be used within the assessment process to gain advantage and looking at how AI could be used as a tool to support learning.

The BUBS Faculty Officer notified the committee of a recent video and radio interview regarding academic integrity, reaching out to students to help inform them regarding usage of ChatGPT.

A committee member asked whether with regards to the Integrity Report any causal factors had been identified, stating that there was a need to understand what was driving the data, rather than just a reactive response. Reference was made to new software GPTZero which had emerged from Princeton. The software could use measurable parameters to distinguish machine from human content. A second version had been released in February 2023.

It was highlighted by a committee member that whilst the updated wording was flexible for academics, that it would be helpful to add a separate academic offence category on AI underpinned by BU's philosophical approach, so it was clear to students reviewing these categories, or to update the Commissioning section with points of clarification. The Secretary would review this with the Head of FLIE and re-circulate if changes were made. It was also noted that AI could be highlighted under Misconduct in examinations or tests.

ACTION: Secretary to discuss with Head of FLIE whether to add a separate academic offence category or provide further points of clarification under Commissioning Section

The SU VP Education underlined that in terms of AI, Microsoft were rolling out their own generative texts, therefore BU needed to be clear on what was allowed to ensure students were not caught out.

A committee member observed that there was no recommendation specifically regarding findings for BAME students, it was suggested that more work be carried out in this area to help understand better why higher proportions of BAME students were represented in suspected cases. If this could be understood better, then

BU could tackle the root causes. It was suggested that this could be added as another recommendation that perhaps REC could pick up.

There was discussion regarding plans to update Turnitin. The Head of FLIE advised that they had been reactive in terms of seeing what other universities were doing. The Head of FLIE noted that BU had previously no policy on AI tools therefore FLIE had looked at what the wider sector was doing. FLIE had been anticipating the Turnitin tool, however at present it was untested and very little guidance existed for it so there was a reluctance to introduce it. The committee were informed how there were a number of universities that currently were not using the beta version, they too were waiting for the more complete version to be released. FLIE were reviewing GPTZero too and were considering what the most robust options were.

The FHSS Faculty Officer commented that when looking at AI, it needed to be clear in policy what was considered an academic offence, as ChatGPT could be a helpful study tool. It was noted that when a student did not understand what a lecturer had said, ChatGPT could help with that. The Head of FLIE confirmed they were happy to review the wording of the policy with the Faculty Officers and SU VP Education.

The BUBS DDE acknowledged appreciation of the work being undertaken around assessment design but identified how BU needed to evolve their thinking around AI. AI could be a useful study tool and authentic assessment, therefore BU needed to look at how this was embedded authentically and appropriately. It was highlighted that there was the potential to move outside the traditional idea of assessment, with a radical shift in how assessments were done, what assessments were used and to what purpose. Programmes that were using essay-based assessment as the majority of their assessment needed to think carefully.

The committee were informed that once this report was endorsed and approved by Senate, *ARPP 6H Academic Offences: Policy and Procedure* Update would be applied with immediate effect. The committee were informed that due to the significance of this paper it would be forwarded for onward consideration by Senate.

Decision: Endorsed

7.3 Apprenticeship Approval Process

For Approval
J Forrest

The Secretary presented the report stating that given the greater regulatory burden of apprenticeships compared to standard degrees, a review of processes and documentation for the approval and review of apprenticeships had been undertaken. ASEC were being asked to approve the revised set of document templates and approval process, and a proposal to pilot these with the approval of a new Enhanced Clinical Practitioner (ECP) apprenticeship from FHSS for delivery in 23/24.

It was requested that University Executive Team (UET) approval be added as part of the Executive Stage for approval of a new apprenticeship programmes. The Secretary confirmed that this had not been part of the process but would now be built in.

ACTION: Secretary to add UET approval as part of the Executive for approval

of new apprenticeship programmes

The SU VP Education informed the Secretary that Students' Union Bournemouth University (SUBU) were happy to help with looking at improving feedback from apprentices.

Decision: Approved

- 7.4 2021/ 22 Self-Assessment Report and Quality Improvement Plan
For BU Apprenticeship Provision

For Endorsement
Prof S White

Following a previous update to ASEC in October 2021, where it was confirmed that several BU programmes came into scope for Ofsted inspection, BU developed a Self-Assessment Report (SAR) for current apprenticeship provision. The 2021/22 SAR was approved through e-Senate in June 2022. Following an Independent Apprenticeships Readiness Review, it was found that the existing SAR did not reflect accurately the provision. The SAR has now been amended to reflect the provision and cover all areas of the Ofsted Education Inspection Framework (EIF). The revised version will forward for onward consideration by Senate.

Decision: Endorsed

- 7.5 Termination of External Examiners Appointments

For Approval
J Forrest

The committee were asked to consider the early termination of three External Examiner Appointments due to a lack of engagement from the examiners. The committee were informed that replacement external examiners had been allocated to cover all units.

The Chair noted that the process appeared to be a drawn-out considering the last engagement of one of EE was March 2022. A timelier response would help as a replacement could be sought earlier. The Secretary noted that cases were dealt with case by case as sometimes it took time to establish whether an EE had really stopped engaging.

Decision: Approved

7.6 Programme Development Proposals

- 7.6.1 BUBS MSc Tourism Programmes Review Deferral Request

For Approval
Dr S Thompson

The report was presented to the committee confirming that the PGT Programmes for Tourism and Hospitality were due for programme review in 2022/23, but that approval was requested to defer until next year to enable strategic review by the BUBS Executive Team. The committee were informed that this would have no negative impact on accreditation.

Decision: Approved

- 7.6.2 Programme Development Proposal (PDP) MA Virtual Production

For Approval
Dr K Cox

The PDP was presented, informing the committee that it was proposed as cross department and cross faculty, providing practice skills for students, opportunity for wider access and potential participation to the Epic Games Mega Grant. The course would be a collaborative course. With regards to marketing intelligence, the course was not comparative as it was the first of its kind therefore there were currently no competitors to compare with.

The FST DDE highlighted two areas of concern; the facilities required for this course were highly specialised which meant more teaching space was required to house these facilities, which led to the concern that the additional requirements could impact other programmes; secondly, there were financial implications of having to purchase specialist equipment. The committee was informed that there was a grant available for some of the equipment required. The FST DDE confirmed that FST had been approached for financial contribution but were unable to contribute. It was highlighted that despite the absence of course costings the Faculty Executive approval had been given for the proposal to proceed. Although financial considerations, and profitability, were not within the remit of ASEC's approval for new programmes, it was noted that the approval of the costings needed to be robust as there have been occasions where academically a course had been approved but then suspended due to financial and resourcing implications. The committee's concerns regarding the lack of financial costings or detailed resource consideration for these highly specialised programmes would be fed back to the Faculty Executive team.

It was noted how the approach to delivery in section 1.3 of the PDP had not yet been agreed between the different departments, which raised questions regarding how ready this proposal was for progressing to the next stage of approval.

It was also noted that the market research report was two years old therefore before ASEC could consider this, the market research needed to be updated.

Decision: Not approved

7.7 CAS Exception Requests

7.7.1 CAS Exception Request MSc Public Health

For Approval
Prof C Gatzidis/
Dr H Crossen-White

The MSc Public Health Programme was requesting CAS Exception approval on two points:

1. Final Year dissertation/ project units which span more than one semester.
2. The MSc Public Health will not offer a January start.

There were no concerns or questions from the committee.

Decision: Approved

7.7.2 CAS Exception Request: PG Specialist Nursing Programmes:
PG Dip Specialist Community Public Health Nursing - Health Visiting
PG Dip Specialist Community Public Health Nursing - School Nursing
PG Dip Specialist Community Nursing - District Nursing

For Approval
Prof C Gatzidis/
Dr H Crossen-White

The PG Specialist Nursing Programmes were requesting CAS Exception approval on the following points:

1. Non-standard delivery due to PSRB requirements and professional practice units.
2. The programmes will not offer a January start.
3. Units which span more than one semester.

There were no concerns or questions from the committee.

Decision: Approved

7.8 Quality Assurance and Enhancement Group (QAEG) Nominations

**For Approval
J Forrest**

Dr Holly Henderson

Decision: Approved

7.9 External Examiner Appointments and Examination Teams for Research Degrees

**For Approval
J Forrest**

It was identified by a committee member that there were a number of single gender examination teams for Research degrees. It was also reported that due to the way that Chairs and examiners were appointed early career academics may be at risk of not being included.

It was agreed that work needed to be carried out around equality, diversity and inclusion. The Secretary confirmed this would be discussed further with the Doctoral College and FRDC.

ACTION: Secretary to discuss equality, diversity and inclusion on panels with the Doctoral College and FRDC

Decision: Approved

7.11 Partner Annual Monitoring and Enhancement Review (AMER)

7.11.1 Wiltshire College

**For Approval
J Forrest**

The committee were informed that the AMER was late due to a change of personnel and ill health.

Decision: Approved

8. For Note

8.1 Pending External Examiners Appointments

**For Approval
J Forrest**

It was noted that the two urgent outstanding examining appointments on the list now had two examiners lined up. The remaining appointments on the list were for a September staff and faculties were already looking into these. The DDE BUBS requested that the programme titles for BUBS be looked at as one listed on the report no longer existed and some programme titles were phasing out. The Secretary confirmed this would be reviewed.

This paper was **noted** by the committee.

8.2 Outcomes from Recent Evaluation Events and
List of Completed Evaluation Events

For Note
J Forrest

It was noted that a correction should be made to SCPHN Health Visiting and SCPHN School Nursing as a date for closure had not been agreed.

This paper was **noted** by the committee.

8.3 Minutes from other Committees

8.3.1 BUBS FASEC Minutes 12/01/23

For Note
Dr S Thompson

The minutes were **noted**.

8.3.2 FHSS FASEC Minutes 12/01/23

For Note
Prof S White

The minutes were **noted**.

8.3.3 FMC FASEC Minutes 12/01/23

For Note

The minutes were **noted**.

8.3.4 FST FASEC Minutes 12/01/23

For Note
Prof C Gatzidis

The minutes were **noted**.

8.3.5 Apprenticeship Board Minutes

For Note
Prof P Sewell

The minutes were **noted**.

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS:

The BUBS Faculty Officer informed the committee about an upcoming event happening on 11 May at 10am-12pm, where local businesses and one larger company would be coming in to talk about how they overcame the challenges of Brexit, the Covid pandemic, recession and the living crisis. The event would be mainly aimed at BUBS students, but all were welcome.

The SU VP Education raised the issue of the student debt process. SUBU and BU were currently looking at how to work with faculties to help them understand that students who may have had their Brightspace taken down for 72 hours were still considered students, and how to support students best during this time.

The FHSS Faculty Officer invited committee members to make contact if they wished to be involved in discussions around the use of Jisc learning and learning analytics, and the issue of it being used as a punitive system rather than a productive discussion starter. The Head of FLIE commented that work is ongoing looking at JISC and how it is used.

10. **DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING:**

Wednesday 24 May 2023: 14:00-17:00, MS Teams