

E-Education Committee Summary: 17 – 24 April 2024

Summary of responses by the committee

Paper 1	Summary: CAS Exception Request: FST – Design and Engineering	Chair's View
For Approval		Approved
Comments		
Approved		Jacky Mack
Approved		Philip Sewell
Supported, approved		Philip Ryland
Approve		Sara White
Approved		Kerry-Ann Randle
Approved		Ann Luce
Approved		Gelareh Roushan
Approved		Fiona Knight
Approved		Katharine Cox
Approved, on the grounds of no impact on student voice/representation		Norah Deka
Approved		Sabeur Zoheir
Approved		Jules Forrest
Paper 2	Summary: Generative Artificial Intelligence – Academic Integrity Student Quiz	Chair's View
For Approval		Approved
Comments		
Approved		Philip Sewell
Ok, with the principle of a simple quiz, but this needs more discussion I feel. Ideally, it would be integrated with faculty / programme initiatives / support for LLS during extended induction as it will raise questions from students which will need addressing. Two key questions at this point: How would you ensure compliance? (that could be challenging in itself) and what happens to those who fail the test (in some cases repeatedly perhaps?). I think this needs more discussion.		Philip Ryland
Without seeing the training necessary to be able to identify if this quiz is manageable or not I cannot approve. Who is to do the training? Who is to manage students who do not do the quiz? where are the sanctions if they choose not to do it? etc etc. need to be agreed first. Discussion needed please		Sara White
It is unclear whether the aim of the quiz is to help the organisation understand what the knowledge and compliance of students is each year (alluded to in 2.2) or if this is a mandatory requirement? (alluded to in 2.1). What actions would be expected from the Education committee as a result of implementation? Would be helpful to have clarity before approving.		Kerry-Ann Randle
The concept is a good one. I support that. Detailed training material might not be ready yet, but I would like an overview of the framework or workflow it is part of, i.e. staff training and requirements running parallel to support this initiative. In principle, I think it's a great idea. It would certainly help us if linked with AOPs.		Carly Stewart
Agree in principle, but still some issues to iron out. Quite text based--also need to include video and audio, ie. Sora! Also last question when talking about things students should do--do we have a process for when a student reports unethical use? How is it proven and what consequences (if any) are there? Would also need to see the training of staff, programme support teams, as well as students. There's still a lot to unpack and discuss.		Ann Luce

Not sure the purpose of the quiz is clear. Is there training material? Who is being required to do the quiz? Is it mandatory? What will happen with the results? Further discussion needed.	Fiona Knight
Echo comments above in that the quiz idea is helpful, linked to training, future AOP. What happens if students do not complete the quiz?	Katharine Cox
I think i would like to have more of a discussion on this AI quiz before approving. I want more background on when this quiz would be given to students to complete, who would be making sure they did this, how many retries do they have if they fail. if this quiz was also more interactive it would be better as students will learn about the actual importance of AI/plagiarism etc rather than a quiz that can be done once and they potentially forget about.	Norah Deka
This is an activity that adds on the number of surveys/questionnaires and what have you on the student community. I would like to discuss more on this before approving too. My main concern is that the extraction of key information with good quality data (reflecting on the cohort volume and other of its representative parameters) may not be extracted well. I am more for an adaptive approach where information is dynamically gathered through time, so that a good picture of the situation concerning GenAI emerges as the true signature within the University.	Sabeur Zoheir
The idea seems a good one and in line with other sector approaches but we need more detail on how and when this will be implemented, what benefits and what are the risks? How will students access this - ie is it for all students or just level 0/4 inductions? What are we doing if a student does not complete it and what are we doing with the data? Suggests this comes back to a physical meeting for a full discussion.	Jules Forrest
Thanks for all the comments. In terms of training, the library already offers resources. We can however work together to help develop student literacy tools, something FLIE can help with further and potentially, in a similar way to our recently developed staff AI literacy tool that I introduced at the last Education Committee and I hope to update under AOB at today's meeting - subject to the programme review that I am chairing all day today finishes by then. Here is a link for the work-in-progress of the AI literacy tool for staff that incorporates feedback and comments from faculty representative as well as the BU AI Thinktank. https://brightspace.bournemouth.ac.uk/d2l/le/lessons/294724/units/2023506 In response to comments about the format of the quiz, if we take forward the proposed AI literacy tool (similar to the staff version) then the quiz may be take a similar form. However, the reinforcement comment I would suggest would require further consideration to determine direction.	Gelareh Roushan

Paper 3	Summary: QAEG Nominations for J Caudwell and S Hills	Chair's View
For Approval		Approved
Comments		
Approved		Jacky Mack
Approved		Philip Sewell
Supported		Philip Ryland
Approved for both staff members		Kerry-Ann Randle
Approved		Carly Stewart
Approved		Ann Luce
Approved		Gelareh Roushan
Approved		Fiona Knight
Approved		Katharine Cox
Approved, on the grounds of no impact on student voice/representation		Norah Deka

Approved		Sabeur Zoheir
Approved		Jules Forrest
Paper 4.1	Summary: Programme Development Proposal – FST MSc Mechanical Engineering Design	Chair's View
For Approval		Approved
Comments		
Think wrong year cited in first para. Otherwise approved		Jacky Mack
Approved		Philip Sewell
Approved		Philip Ryland
Approve		Sara White
Approved		Kerry-Ann Randle
Approved		Ann Luce
Approved		Gelareh Roushan
Approved		Fiona Knight
Approved		Katharine Cox
Approved		Norah Deka
Approved		Jules Forrest
Paper 4.2	Summary: Programme Development Proposal – FMC UG Marketing Communications programmes	Chair's View
For Approval		Approved
Comments		
Not clear if this was supported by Market research? Title feels more niche than current so wonder about impact on recruitment.		Jacky Mack
Market Research seems to be missing. Are these titles supported by the market research?		Philip Sewell
Be interested to see the market research paper which is referred to, but supported.		Philip Ryland
I agree with the above		Sara White
Support if aware of market research		Carly Stewart
Yes, two sets of market research completed. Not sure why they weren't included!		Ann Luce
Approved if changes reflect findings of market research		Fiona Knight
I am assuming confirmation of market research is required before approval?		Kerry-Ann Randle
Approved - market intelligence reviewed as part of FMC sign off		Katharine Cox
Approved, once above responses are reflected in paper		Norah Deka
Market research is no longer included in the Education Committee programme proposals as the committee Terms of Reference no longer have a remit for market performance or viability. However, there are queries raised here relating to the market research, so would suggest Faculty leads confirm separately to the Chair the nature of market research undertaken and approval by Faculty Exec.		Jules Forrest
Paper 5	Summary: External Examiner Appointments and Examination Teams for Research Degrees	Chair's View
For Approval		Approved
Comments		
Approved		Jacky Mack
Approved		Philip Sewell

Approved		Philip Ryland
Is it to approve or Ratify?		Sara White
Approved		Carly Stewart
Approved		Ann Luce
Approved		Gelareh Roushan
Approved		Fiona Knight
Approved		Kerry-Ann Randle
Noted		Katharine Cox
Approved, on the grounds of no impact on student voice/representation		Norah Dekar
Paper 6	Summary: Pending External Examiner Appointments	Chair's View
For Note		Noted
Comments		
Noted		Jacky Mack
Noted		Philip Sewell
Noted		Philip Ryland
Noted		Sara White
Noted		Carly Stewart
Noted		Ann Luce
Noted		Gelareh Roushan
Noted		Fiona Knight
Noted		Kerry-Ann Randle
Noted		Katharine Cox
Noted		Norah Dekar
Noted		Sabeur Zoheir