

## **Academic Standards and Education Committee**

**(Wednesday 24 May 2023, 14:00-17:00, OVC Board Room, Talbot Campus)**

### **Attendees**

#### **Committee Members**

Professor Keith Phalp (Chair and Pro-Vice Chancellor Education and Quality (Interim)), Professor Philip Sewell (Deputy Chair and Apprenticeship Lead), Jules Forrest (Secretary and Head of Academic Quality), Dr Shelley Thompson (Deputy Dean – Education and Professional Practice (BUBS)), Professor Sara White (Deputy Dean – Education and Professional Practice (FHSS)), Dr Melanie Gray (Deputy Dean – Education and Professional Practice (FMC)), Dr Carly Stewart (Deputy Dean – Education and Professional Practice (FST)), Dr Gelareh Roushan (Head of Fusion learning Innovation and Excellence (FLIE)), Andrew Bird (Head of International Marketing and Student Recruitment), Rosalind Ashcroft (Head of Academic Operations), Professor Zoheir Sabeur (Member of the Professoriate), Jacky Mack (Academic Registrar), Norah Deka (Vice-President (Education) Students' Union (SUBU)), Nicole Chee (Faculty Student Rep (BUBS))

#### **In Attendance**

Dr Liam Sheridan (PRIME Manager Academic Planning and Insight), Jack Guymer (Academic Quality Policy and Project Manager), Christa Lippold (Head of Leadership and Talent Development), Jo Freeman (Head of Student Administration), Dr Diogo Montalvao (Acting Head of Department – Design and Engineering (FST)), Dr Roya Haratian (Principal Academic in Electronic Science and Engineering (FST))

#### **Apologies**

Professor Carol Clark (Member of Senate), Professor Katharine Cox (Member of the Professoriate), Samantha Leahy-Harland (Chief Executive, Students' Union (SUBU)), Mandi Barron (Director of Student Services), Oliver Wildey (Faculty Student Rep (FHSS))

#### **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

There were no declarations of interest.

---

### 3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

#### 3.1 Accuracy: ASEC 5 April 2023

Decision  
Chair

The minutes of the meeting were approved as an accurate record, except for:

Item 6.1.1 paragraph four should read, '*In 2020/ 21 there was an uptick in number of students receiving no awards*'.  
First line of the last paragraph of Item 6.1.1 should read '*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.*'

---

#### 3.2 Matters Arising/Actions Log

Discussion  
Various

##### Actions Log

05.04.23 Item 6.1.1 It was noted that BUBS would like to recruit SUBU reps where historically there have been gaps. BUBS were experiencing similar issues recruiting PAL leaders. The Associate Dean Student Experience (ADSE) would be coordinating work in this area with the aim of improving recruitment to student rep positions in the Faculty.

25.01.23 Item 4.1A Student Outcomes Data further discussions. The Chair and the Secretary would ensure this was covered at an appropriate point on the agenda next academic year, 2023/24.

---

### 4. FOR DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL

#### 4.1 Chair's Business

For Information  
Chair

The Chair underlined the following points to the committee and encouraged the committee to re-emphasise this message regarding the operation of assessment boards:

1. The Chair reiterated the role that Unit Boards have in unit monitoring. It was within the remit of the Unit Board to address issues with units such as high failure rates, low continuation, and review assessment where appropriate.
2. Programme Boards should be focused on progression and exceptional decision-making, rather than reviewing individual marks.
3. Carrying credit should be the default and students should be encouraged to do this rather than this be the exception.
4. Assessment Boards have within their remit the opportunity to set alternative assessments. ARPP 6L stated that reassessment should normally be the same method and format but where this was not possible, "*the Board should agree an alternative approach which will assess the relevant ILOs in deciding on the particular form any reassessment should take. Students may be required to submit a new assessment or an amended version of the original assessment as appropriate*" (6.9.11)

The committee discussed the difficulties with the timing of Assessment Boards, and the complications caused by common or shared units. It was suggested that Board minutes be used to flag units that were problematic, to allow other avenues for the issue to be raised, such as Programme Assessment Review (PAR) or

Programme Team meetings. It was recognised that Education Service Managers (ESMs) worked hard at trying to address issues with units but that it would be helpful to have a clear indication of units that were problematic. It was suggested that Programme Boards could be useful in ensuring that actions were directed back to faculty, via PAR or identifying whether a modification to the unit was required.

The committee discussed the training that was undertaken by Chairs and the lack of oversight the Faculties reported about knowing who had completed the training that academic year. The Secretary confirmed that training for Chairs was mandatory and would circulate a list of those who had attended this year's sessions directly to Deputy Deans (DDE) and ESMs.

**ACTION: Secretary to provide attendance lists from Assessment Board Training for Chairs**

The Secretary confirmed that a further training session was planned for June 2023 and that this should be promoted to those colleagues who had not yet attended a training session.

#### **4.2 OfS Condition of Registration B3**

**For Discussion**  
Liam Sheridan

The PRIME Manager Academic Planning and Insight presented the paper. The Office for Students (OfS) condition of registration B3 stated that “a provider must deliver positive outcomes for students on its higher education courses.” Institutions’ performance would be reviewed against indicators and split indicators across three measures Continuation, Completion and Progression. In addition to the headline indicators, there were split indicators which for Bournemouth University (BU) resulted in 1,113 split indicators across the three measures. The OfS has set a minimum threshold for each indicator and also identified priority areas within the split indicators for 2022. This paper highlighted out of the 1,113 split indicators, BU had 46 which were below the threshold, of these, 3 were in 2022 priority areas or 2023 provisional priority areas. However, none of the 3 were at the minimum statistical confidence level that the OfS had set. Due to the OfS definitions of continuation and completion, it would be difficult to use these as lead indicators. OfS definitions of continuation and completion were more generous than internal measures, as BU cannot distinguish transfers from other withdrawals. However monitoring of continuation and completion can be changed to mirror some of the OfS definitions. The committee were informed that the 2023 OfS subject priorities were yet to be determined, so all subject splits within the priority areas were highlighted as OfS priority areas. The PRIME Manager advised that BU were not able to, in advance, try and replicate what the OfS would say or use BU internal processes to try and predict, the OfS indicators. It was noted that the data in terms of progression, whilst some showed BU as below the OfS threshold, overall did not compare badly with the wider sector. The question was asked of the committee how BU should monitor the withdrawal data going forward.

The BUBS DDE commented that it would be useful to have a clear sense of where a student had failed/ withdrawn as opposed to withdrawn for other reasons. This would allow strategic planning to ensure that the BU assessment strategy was right. It was recognised that students who withdrew for other reasons than failure, needed to be looked at separately, for example those who withdrew due to non-payment should be tracked differently. It was observed that BU should focus on the areas that could be controlled, being proactive in looking at the students who fail/ withdraw, for example putting into place support mechanisms for students to help them pass the first time rather than trying to retrospectively manage high failure rates or attrition due to failure, or waste resource trying to address areas that BU had no control over. It was commented that if BU's internal measures were worst-case scenarios, overall, it would reduce the risk of underperforming against the OfS' more lenient thresholds for completion, continuation, and progression.

In terms of completion, the committee discussed how the OfS measures do not recognise a negative if students withdraw with an interim award. A committee member asked whether, in terms of data, BU needed to ensure students were getting interim exit awards. The committee felt that most students were eligible and received an interim award if they withdrew before the completion of their course.

Clarification was sought over programmes that had embedded pathways, and whether when students transferred between pathways this was included in the withdrawal statistics. The PRIME Manager confirmed that this was not included in the withdrawal statistics. If a student withdrew from a course and started a new unrelated course, this would be flagged as a negative.

Table 3.1 in the report included 'apprentice' as a mode of study. A committee member asked whether this was referring to BU as a provider. The PRIME Manager confirmed that this was where BU was registered as the lead provider. It was confirmed that the UG with PG components included Masters, which could make the statistics volatile. There was discussion over the Foundation level, with the PRIME Manager confirming that whereas BU might monitor it by programme level the OfS would not split it in the same way. The committee discussed whether BU needed to look at the structuring of Foundation years and what would be the strategic intention.

The Academic Registrar observed that on page 5 of the report (page 25 of the board book) it stated that a number of the split indicators were below the threshold and requested clarification as to what this meant. The committee were informed that the OfS look at three questions, whether an indicator was below the threshold, whether it was statistically significant, and whether it was an OfS priority area. None of the indicators marked as below the threshold met all three categories; three indicators at BU met two of these categories. These would not feature on the AMER dashboard as they were not benchmarked. Committee members, however, felt that this would be data that would be helpful for Heads of Department (HoDs) to be informed and engaged with this level of data. There was further discussion as to how BU could look at the indicators and try to anticipate those that might be an issue in the future. The PRIME Manager reflected that this was the first attempt at trying to understand these conditions in this way and in the future reports would be developed further. It was agreed that work needed to happen to help convert this data into clear action points that would help Faculties. It was agreed that BU needed to be mindful of their withdrawal rates but that Faculties could not be expected to respond to data that they had not had access to, therefore there needed to be a clear plan for how this was communicated to staff.

**ACTION: PRIME to consider how to present BU data in the context of B3 so that any potential risk could be monitored by Faculties**

#### **4.3 OfS Condition of Registration B3 and B4: Institutional Award Outcomes and Progression, and Degrees Outcomes Statement 2021/22**

**For Endorsement**  
J Forrest/ J Guymer

The paper was presented to the committee, emphasising that the report had dual purpose: to provide an analysis of student progression and award outcomes in the context of condition B4 of the OfS regulatory framework; and to approve updates to the Degree Outcomes Statement. The decision required by ASEC was to endorse the updates to the 2021/22 Quality and Standards Report and Degree Outcomes Statement for onward consideration to Senate. Headlines from the report show that attainment (Good Honours) had returned to pre-pandemic levels. The gap for BAME attainment had widened, and whilst the proportion was small, it was still below the sector level. Level 4

continuation was a concern, and whilst there was an improvement in continuation for BAME students, it was still an area that required focus. Within PGT data, completion and attainment were on a downward trend.

The committee felt that BU needed to prioritise what areas to focus on, recognising that continuation was a big issue but that degree outcomes for underrepresented groups was also a concern, with a notable difference between genders.

It was observed that there was no OfS thresholds marked on the tables. The committee were advised that the OfS do not set thresholds for Good Honours. It was noted that benchmarks were looked at through Assessment Boards.

The committee discussed the data sets used and requested clarification on the commentary regarding BAME continuation being better. The committee were informed that the analysis of student progression and award outcomes was based on the Student Outcomes Data that was presented to ASEC on 25 January 2023. The secretary noted that Academic Quality (AQ) would review the data used.

**ACTION: The Secretary to review the data used for the Degree Outcomes Statement against other APP updates.**

There was further discussion over the need for one dataset, with the Head of FLIE reporting that consolidated data from Brightspace with protected characteristics was soon to be available. It was agreed that it was more helpful for PRIME if reporting was consolidated rather than having different data sets to work with. It was noted that this was highlighted in the report that in addition to Faculties reviewing the data through the 2023 Annual Monitoring and Enhancement Review Process, a recommendation was for Academic Quality to work with PRIME to develop a holistic approach to data reporting and monitoring.

**Decision: Endorsed for onward consideration to Senate**

#### **4.4 OfS Condition of Registration B2: Data to support Compliance**

**For Approval**  
J Forrest/ J Guymer

The paper was presented by the Academic Quality Policy and Project Manager. The paper responded to an action in last year's Quality and Standard Reports and set out proposed data sets to help BU further evidence its compliance with condition B2 of the OfS regulatory framework. The OfS consider the B conditions as baseline requirements for quality that all providers were expected to meet, with BU demonstrating through the Quality and Standards Report how it meets the requirements of the B conditions. Following the 2022 updates to the B conditions, B2 was broadened to include resources and student engagement. The precise wording of condition B2 required that providers ensure that "students receive appropriate resources and support, and for students to have effective engagement opportunities to ensure a high-quality academic experience, allowing them to succeed in Higher Education and beyond". Data in last year's report provides assurance around compliance with B2, action to consider what was in scope for this condition and what evidence could be used to make further judgements. Aligning with the outcomes focussed nature of the regulatory framework, data proposed to evidence compliance to demonstrate the effectiveness of BU processes, rather than processes themselves. Two different data sets were proposed, referred to as primary and secondary evidence. The primary evidence recommended by Academic Quality considered core in assessing compliance and was based on data the OfS will also use to monitor providers. Data used by the OfS

would not cover all B2 condition requirements, so the primary evidence also would include other internal data sets which were considered relevant in making judgements on compliance. The decision was for ASEC to consider and approve these data sets to be used in future reporting. The secondary evidence includes data used in the most recent TEF, the data is considered supplementary and therefore a decision was required from ASEC as to whether BU should also report on this data as part of its annual reporting against B2 conditions.

It was noted that whilst the TEF data would usually be collected, BU would not normally be reporting on them on an annual basis. Whilst BU captured a range of quality-related data, this has not been previously considered in the context of the B conditions, therefore it was commented that further work was needed to ensure BU reporting was more aligned to the B conditions requirements and to consider the value that BU measures added.

There was discussion over the B2 condition, and specifically how it required providers to have in place mechanisms for student engagement, including providing opportunities for students to provide survey responses. It was noted that currently BU was reviewing processes for student feedback through the strategic workstreams, to establish the main drive behind the questions that BU asks students and the effectiveness of the number of surveys used. It was agreed that the role of the Personal Tutor was key in providing academic support, and that further work needed to be done in using the note-taking system and Brightspace to collate data. It was felt that there needed to be coherency in how BU presented information to and asked for feedback from students. It was acknowledged that further work and action was needed to really embed student voice across the BU structures.

## **Decision: Approved**

### **4.5 OfS Condition of Registration B1 and B4: English Language Proficiency**

**For Approval**  
Dr G Roushan

The paper was presented, informing the committee that it had previously come to ASEC on 25 January 2023. Following this meeting on 25 January, ASEC requested that updates were made to the generic assessment criteria to include direct reference to English Language proficiency over the alternative approach to embed English language proficiency with a learning programme outcome. ASEC was asked to approve the amendments to *6C – Principle of Assessment Design: Policy* specifically the addition of the new clause 5.2, ASEC were also being asked to approve amendments to *BU's Generic Assessment Criteria* specifically updates to the transferable skills section, also approval to amendments to *6Q- Guidance on the Preparation of Assessment Briefs and Examination Papers, Submission and Receipting Coursework* specifically clause 2.7, the requirement of ALS student to include the term 'ALS Marking Guidelines' in the marking box when submitting on Brightspace and updates to the contact details for BUBS learning technologist. These were proposed to be effective from 2023/24. The committee were advised that the B4 condition expected a provider to be able to demonstrate that it had regulations in place for assessing English Language proficiency at a provider level and at a subject level. The Head of FLIE noted that the paper showed evidence that BU was making steps in this area. The committee's attention was drawn to the addition of point 5.2 in *6C Principles of Assessment Design: Policy*. The amendment was in line with the OfS requirements that the assessment of English Language should be embedded in all assessments. The committee were informed that FLIE would provide guidance and resources for this. The Head of FLIE reported that they were continuing to keep a close eye on how the sector responded to this new requirement.

It was noted that the English Language assessment criteria was only reflected in the transferable skills section of *BU's Generic Assessment*. As it was being embedded into assessment and assessment criteria, it was queried whether this should have been reflected across the whole grid. The committee were informed that discussions

were ongoing with DDEs but at present it could not be embedded into all Intended Learning Objectives (ILOs). There was further discussion over the amended wording to the transferable skills section, which made direct reference to English Language proficiency, with the BUBS DDE highlighting that whilst it was right to include it there, it did need to be embedded at a programme level and only fed through to unit level if appropriate. It was noted that this could cause potential challenges in terms of BU's own value sets, specifically in terms of inclusivity. There was concern regarding the transparency of marking criteria for students. Specifically, from the inclusion perspective, there needed to be clarity so that neurodiverse or overseas students were not being penalised.

There was discussion over whether BU was behind the sector in the support that was offered to students around English language provision. The Academic Registrar noted that a permanent role to support this provision had been reinstated.

The Secretary noted that this report had been presented to ASEC in January 2023, and there had been discussion at that meeting over whether this should be actioned via ILOs or via policy. The suggestion during that discussion had been to implement this via policy which has led to the creation of this paper and recommendations for updates to policy to aligned to the new OfS requirement, embedded in the B1 and B4, conditions of registration.

**Decision: Approved (with monitoring next year on implementation).**

#### **4.5 Annual Report: Equality, Diversity and Inclusion**

**For Discussion**  
Christa Lippold

The Head of Leadership and Talent Development presented the report to the committee. The report summarised and captured compliance with the Equality Act and key Equality Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) activities that have been undertaken in the past year. It was noted that there has not been an EDI manager in post for a year.

There has been an emphasis on training and development this year with all new staff to complete a mandatory e-learning resource to develop their understanding of equality, the development and training on EDI and the Equality Act is highlighted and incorporated into the range of development BU offers and a new Bias Awareness workshop has been developed and delivered. EDI supported the design and delivery of workshops in faculties with relation to disability and neurodiversity, understanding and challenging assumptions with a focus on accessibility and inclusivity. There had been an increase in students with neurodivergent needs, which was mirrored in an increase in staff with neurodivergent conditions. Guidance had been updated with development sessions planned for line managers to help support any colleagues that may need it. The committee were informed that there were 10 reported incidences in 2021/22 which happened both on and off campus. There were six academic appeals and five academic complaints that raised EDI elements at Central Stage Review, none of the complaints were upheld. There were no formal complaints from staff on equality grounds. BU currently was below the sector profile for BAME students and staff. There were a number of actions and initiatives to increase BAME staff representation across BU. The aim was to reduce the BAME student attainment gap, BU was below the sector position. There were actions around equal pay with BU undertaking a biannual pay review to ensure that staff were receiving equal pay for equal work. Analysis was ongoing to examine pay inequalities arising due to gender, race or ethnicity. BU was required to publish gender pay gap annually. BU's overall pay gap was higher than the sector medium. Overall, the action was to completely eradicate the BU gender pay gap by 2025. This was the aspiration and steps had already been taken during 2022 to achieve this, including in 2022 during the professional and support staff pay progression round, 61% of staff receiving the discretionary pay progression were female.

The Chair noted the breadth of the report and that some of the information in the report was replicated in other datasets and reports. It was noted that Table 5 in the report had a minor error, and the age category should read 31-50 under 2021/22. The FMC DDE highlighted that the data that was being reported was rich, but that with regards to the BAME attainment gap it was not clear that BU had a clear plan to help tackle this. The report mentioned that this would be picked up by Faculty annual monitoring, however it was felt that this should not be left to just programme level. The Academic Registrar noted that there was a limited view of BAME figures in the report as it did not reflect the departmental work within this area. There was discussion over whether the EDI report should come to ASEC and whether it came under the ASEC terms of reference. The Head of Leadership and Talent Development informed the committee that historically this report had come to ASEC after it had been presented to FRC. There was concern from some committee members that the report had already been presented to Board before ASEC considered it. The Chair noted that the annual reports received by the committee would be reviewed against the Terms of Reference to ensure reports and papers were aligned to relevant committee business.

**ACTION: Secretary to review the agenda planner against the ASEC Terms of Reference for the next academic year 2023/24.**

There was discussion over the ambitious target for the gender pay gap and it was noted that there was a 15% gender pay gap. It was noted that the lower grade levels contributed significantly to this.

## 5. FOR APPROVAL AND ENDORSEMENT

### 5.1 Faculty Annual Monitoring and Enhancement Review (AMER) Action Plans

For Approval

The Chair requested that DDE's present the Faculty AMER Action Plans, highlighting areas of change from earlier AMERS.

#### 5.1.1 Business School

For Approval  
Dr S Thompson

The BUBS DDE presented the BUBS Faculty AMER Action Plan, highlighting May updates, drawing attention to the red, amber and green actions throughout. Within Academic Support there had been discussions on clarity of roles and responsibilities for Programme Leaders, Level Co-ordinators and Personal Tutors to help support students better. Dissertation clinics had been progressed to help address previous challenges. Plans were finalised to run these clinics throughout July to align with PGT supervision for September 2022 starters. Regarding Inclusivity there was further follow-up with AdvanceHE regarding project plan, with a planned follow-up of the EDI commitments staff made earlier in the year. In Assessment and Feedback, there was additional work with a three-week assessment turnaround (3WAT), with the May update showing that the Sports and Event Management (SEM) Department had made the 85% minimum on 3WAT by early May.

There were no questions from the committee regarding the BUBS AMER Action Plan.

**Decision: Approved**

**5.1.2 Faculty of Health and Social Science****For Approval**  
Prof S White

The FHSS DDE presented the FHSS Faculty AMER Action Plan highlighting May updates. Within Assessment and Feedback it was noted that feedback via multiple surveys did not seem to be representative of student voice, therefore PLs were using student/ staff group to gain more meaningful feedback. It was highlighted that the number of appeals had increased since last academic year, but the majority had not been upheld. Work was ongoing in this area, with staff devolvement sessions planned for the summer with PLs to better equip them to have meaningful conversations with students regarding policy and procedure.

There were no questions from the committee regarding the FHSS AMER Action Plan.

**Decision: Approved**

**5.1.3 Faculty of Media and Communication****For Approval**  
Dr M Gray

The FMC DDE presented the Faculty AMER Action Plan, highlighting May updates. It was highlighted that currently there were six validations ongoing across FMC, with support from Academic Quality. Notable events in May included the Festival of Media Production and the Communication and Journalism Showcase. The committee were informed that UN Sustainability Goals were being embedded at each unit level. The DDE noted that with regards to three-week turnaround, the Faculty were not where they wanted to be, with the Faculty being marginally down from where they were at the same time last year. To make further improvements in this area the faculty would be implementing a new Assessment and Feedback working group next year. The 3WAT data would be reviewed in July to measure overall success this academic year and to review areas of concern. There was an Education Week scheduled for July to provide support to staff.

There were no questions from the committee regarding the FMC AMER Action Plan. The Deputy Chair referenced the recent BA Communication and Media PAR event and commended the way that the UN Sustainability Goals had been embedded into the programme.

**Decision: Approved**

**5.1.4 Faculty of Science and Technology****For Approval**  
Dr C Stewart

The FST DDE presented the Faculty AMER Action Plan highlighting the May updates. It was stated that there were continuing actions in key areas such as BAME Attainment and Overall Satisfaction. Within BAME Attainment actions remained in progress. As noted previously in ASEC there was variation across the six Departments, May updates highlighted that operationally the resources were focussed on the completion of the academic year but that a discussion on faculty resources will be had in the near future to look at how best this area can be supported. It was mentioned that with regards to 3WAT, there were still issues with PRIME reporting 4 week turnaround exams as effectively late on the dashboard. The Faculty would continue to liaise with PRIME regarding this. The Chair noted that this may have been resolved already. The BUBS DDE commented that there had been an additional column added that reflects the date that the feedback was due.

There were no questions from the committee regarding the FST Faculty AMER Action Plan.

**Decision: Approved****5.2 Continuation: Carrying Credit and In-Year Retrieval****For Approval**  
J Forrest

Academic Quality had undertaken a review of assessment board decisions and minutes, identifying the requirement to clarify aspects of the assessment regulations, particularly in relation to carrying credit, to ensure that assessment boards were clear when this could be offered to students. There were additional clarifications that had been added to *6A -Standard Assessment Regulations* that would enable more consistent progression decisions across faculties by reducing the potential areas for discretion. The paper also provided an update on the data findings following the first year of implementation of the In-year retrieval which was introduced in 2021/22 for Level 4 students. In-year retrieval was permanently established in *6A Standard Assessment Regulations* from 22/23 for both Level 0 and Level 4 students. To support this, the operating principles for in-year retrieval have now been added to *6L Assessment Board Decision Making Procedure* and were presented to ASEC for approval.

**Decision: Approved****5.3 Academic Regulations Policy and Procedure Updates:****For Approval****5.3.1 Apprenticeships: Amendments to Admissions Policies and Procedures****For Approval**  
J Freeman

Standard Admissions Regulations: Taught Programmes ARPP 3A  
 Admissions Policy Taught Programmes ARPP 3B  
 Admissions Appeals and Complaints Policy and Procedure ARPP 3C  
 Admissions Policy and Procedure for Applicants with a Disability,  
 Medical Condition or Other Support Needs ARPP 3D  
 Admissions Policy and Procedure for Applicants with a Criminal Record ARPP 3E  
 Admissions Guidelines ARPP 3V  
 Student Name: Policy and Procedure ARPP 3G

The Head of Student Administration presented the amendments highlighting the changes. Standard Admissions Regulations: Taught Programmes ARPP 3A had additional section outlining the standard entry requirements for apprenticeships. Reference has also been made to the new admissions policy being developed for apprenticeship provision. Admissions Policy Taught Programmes ARPP 3B had the addition of the words 'excluding apprenticeship' as the content does not reflect the policy and procedure for admission to apprenticeship programmes. The committee were informed that a separate admissions policy was being developed for apprenticeship provision. Summary of the amendments to Admissions Appeals and Complaints Policy and Procedure ARPP 3C included amendments to section 1 to note that for the purposes of this policy references to students includes apprentices, an alignment of the terminology with the academic appeals and complaints policies, an update to the wording in Section 6 to reflect changes to English Language requirements for applicants who require a visa and an amendment of the wording in section 20 regarding fraudulent applications to confirm that if an application was cancelled, another application would not be accepted by BU within the same admissions cycle. Admissions Policy and Procedure for Applicants with a Disability, Medical Condition, or Other Support Needs ARPP 3D has an updated regulated health professions course list within the appendix. It was noted that the content of this ARPP does not fully reflect the policy and procedure for apprenticeship programmes, and a separate admissions policy would be developed by the Apprenticeship Team. Summary of the amendments made to the Admissions Policy and Procedure for Applicants with a Criminal Record ARPP 3E included changes made to the key responsibilities section, reference to the DBS lead counter signatory has been removed as this is no longer an assigned role within the Admissions Team and updates to the guidance and forms with the appendices of 3E have been made following advice from Unlock. It was recognised that the content of this ARPP does not fully reflect the policy and procedure for apprenticeship programmes, and a separate

confirmed

admissions policy would be developed by the Apprenticeship Team for apprentices with a criminal record. Admissions Guidelines ARPP 3V has been updated to reflect online interview processes but was noted that it would be reviewed as to whether next year this will continue to be an ARPP. Student Name: Policy and Procedure ARPP 3G has been updated to reflect a change to the deadline to request a name change. All changes to ARPP 3G have been discussed and agreed upon with Legal.

The FHSS DDE questioned whether in ARPP 3B and 3D reference needed to be made regarding occupational health and applicants falsely disclosing that they have an OH injury. The committee discussed the wording of the policy and whether it should, be more specific and refer to any element of the application including any document provided in support of the application being fraudulent. The committee further discussed ARPP 3D and whether the reference to providing more accurate information should be expanded upon and linked to section 20 of ARPP 3B.

**ACTION: Head of Student Services to review the wording regarding fraudulent applications in ARPP 3B and ARPP 3D**

**Decision: Approved**

**5.3.2 Quality Management Records Retention: Policy and Procedure ARPP 10A**

**For Endorsement**  
J Freeman

The Quality Management Records Retention: Policy and Procedure has been reviewed and it was proposed that this be withdrawn as an ARPP. BU has a comprehensive Data Retention Policy for staff and BU Representatives on SharePoint and retaining this ARPP would duplicate information.

**Decision: Endorsed**

**5.4 Programme Development Proposals**

**For Approval**

**5.4.1 PDP: BEng/ Meng Mechatronics and Robotics with Foundation Year**

**For Approval**  
Dr Diogo Montalvao/  
Dr Roya Haratia

The committee were informed of a Chair's Action that had been approved regarding a change to the entry requirements in MSc Robotics. The programme had been approved in April to recruit for September 2023. There had been requests for information from potential applicants therefore it was urgent that the change was made, this had been approved as a Chair's Action prior to ASEC meeting. The change in entry requirements should be amended to read it is suitable for 'Engineering or Physics and related sciences' graduates.

The Acting Head of Department for Design and Engineering presented the proposed programme development for BEng/ Meng in Mechatronics and Robotics with a Foundation year. The committee were advised that this was part of a strategic development plan with the subjects overlapping with degrees that were already offered in the department. The committee were informed that there were staff within the department who specialise in mechatronics and robotics. The Department were keen to diversify the offer in Engineering to attract more students, get sustained competitive advantage and increase the department's reputation. The committee were advised that Bournemouth and Poole College were developing a course in this subject area which it was hoped would naturally feed into the proposed course at BU. The proposed course would utilise existing resources at BU including the Design and Engineering Innovation Centre, multidisciplinary units and staff from BU's Design and Engineering Department. The proposed course would have a common foundation year feeding into the first year which would take units from Design Engineering and Mechanical Engineering. There would also be

new units introduced. The committee were informed that market research suggested that the market for Robotics/ Mechatronics was growing, however there had been a recent plateau in numbers. Research suggested that programmes with Mechatronic and Robotics in the name recruited better, for example, with a 5-year average of 24 student at UWE. Loughborough and Plymouth show a year average of 35. Market research suggested that the average number of students where universities offered a similar course was 18.

A committee member noted that there were not many new units and whether realistically this was enough to offer a positive student experience. The DHoD for Design and Engineering felt that financially and from a student experience perspective this course was worthwhile as it was a low-risk programme. The BUBS DDE questioned whether it should be two separate degrees rather than an integrated master's degree, noting that within BU there had been issues with similarly structured integrated masters. It was questioned whether the integrated master's degree impacted the student experience. The BUBS DDE asked whether ASEC should approve more integrated master's degrees when more Faculties seem to be closing them. Strategically it was noted that if students withdrew at Level 6, it caused a massive withdrawal rate problem. The DHoD for Design and Engineering felt that this would not be an issue within this subject area. The Deputy Chair noted that within the engineering discipline, integrated master's degree were incredibly important for engineers professionally. There was discussion over the implications of having a compulsory placement. The member of the Professoriate asked whether BU was aligned with any industry in the area where placements could be linked up to. The Principal Academic in Electronic Science and Engineering reported positive feedback from companies who were interested in placing BU students, including Motion Control and Unix. The member of Professoriate asked whether the new unit Robotic Machine Vision would be shared with other programmes/ departments as if units were shared this would impact the cost. The Principal Academic in Electronic Science and Engineering informed the committee that this was to be introduced at Level 6 and be more specific to robotics. The committee was informed that it was hoped this could be running from September 2024. The Secretary noted September 2025 would be more likely as there was a UCAS timeline issue.

**Decision: Approved subject to further discussions with Academic Quality and M&C as to realistic timeframes**

## 5.5 CAS Exception Requests

For Approval

### 5.5.1 CAS Exception Request: BSc Operating Department Practice

For Approval  
Prof S White

The FHSS DDE presented the CAS Exception Request highlighting the Operating Department Practice has three areas of practice (anaesthesia, surgery and recovery) which were all fundamentally different with knowledge and skills that were closely related to each practice area. The committee were informed that some of the units in the programme mimic the areas of practice and need to run across different semesters to enable sufficient theoretical learning and placement time to achieve PSRB requirements for national standards of Proficiency for Operating Department Practitioners. The units all share the same ethical and professional frameworks, and principles of operating department practice. To ensure the links between the three areas are maintained throughout the year, certain units must span more than one semester. Additionally, some units must be delivered within the same theoretical blocks to avoid removing a student from placement, so these units must start at the end of one semester and continue within another.

**Decision: Approved**

## 5.6 Quality Assurance and Enhancement Group (QAEG) Nominations

**For Approval**  
J Forrest

The QAEG nominations were **approved** for the following:

Annie East

Sara Stride

## 5.7 External Examiner Appointment and Examination Teams for Research Degrees

**For Approval**  
J Forrest

The committee **approved** the External Examiner Nominations and Examination Teams for Research Degrees.

## 6. FOR NOTE

### 6.1 Annual Review of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

**For Note**

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

### 6.2 Update on Implementation of Scheduled Learning and Teaching

**For Note**  
J Guymer

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

### 6.3 Pending External Examiner Appointments

**For Note**  
J Forrest

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

### 6.4 Outcomes from Recent Evaluation Events And List of Completed Evaluation Events

**For Note**  
J Forrest

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

### 6.5 Minutes from other Committees

**For Note**

#### 6.5.1 BUBS FASEC Minutes: 15 March 2023

**For Note**  
Dr S Thompson

The minutes were **noted** by the committee.

#### 6.5.2 FHSS FASEC Minutes: 16 March 2023

**For Note**  
Prof S White

The minutes were **noted** by the committee.

#### 6.5.3 FMC FASEC Minutes: 15 March 2023

**For Note**  
Dr M Gray

The minutes were **noted** by the committee.

#### 6.5.4 FST FASEC Minutes: 15 March 2023

**For Note**  
Dr C Stewart

The minutes were **noted** by the committee.

#### 6.5.5 Apprenticeship Board Minutes

**For Note**  
Prof P Sewell

The minutes were **noted** by the committee.

---

**7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

The Head of FLIE updated the committee that work was ongoing with students and AMERs regarding the Assessment Review Update.

The Deputy Chair informed the committee regarding the ongoing work around apprenticeship compliance and the need to develop better feedback from apprentices. In the interim there was a need to collect survey data from apprentices. Due to some of the data being destination data the surveys could not be anonymous. ARPP 5B in future would cover situations like this, but in the meantime, it was requested that ASEC approve non-anonymous surveys for apprentices. The surveys must be undertaken as part of end point assessment in July so is unable to wait until the amendments to ARPP 5B are approved. The Deputy Chair highlighted that this would also need to be done for the Advanced Clinical Practitioner, so requested that ASEC confirm approval for this exception for the next few months. It was suggested that the situation was also flagged with the Data Protection Officer.

The SU VP Education raised the ongoing issue that some students had over the ending of the 2021/22 No Detriment policy. The SU VP Education highlighted that the concern was that when a policy change happens students felt that the rationale was not fully explained. The Secretary confirmed that communications could be developed to send to students where it was still relevant, explaining why the No Detriment policy was no longer being applied. The SU VP Education noted that communications were sent to students at enrolment regarding policy change but that it may be more helpful to have these sent at another time. The Secretary confirmed that this could be reviewed with SUBU's support to ensure communications regarding policy changes were more targeted and effective in future.

**ACTION: SU VP Education to liaise with Secretary regarding  
policy change communication to students**

---

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

Wednesday 18 October 2023 OVC Board Room