

Paper	Summary: Updates to ARPP 3K - Engagement & Attendance Policy and Procedure	Chair's View
For Approval		Approved
Comments		
The further changes are an improvement - approved		Philip Sewell
Happy to approve - Thank you for the clean copy too it was much easier to read as a whole		Sara White
Yes, supported. Helpful and clear to me. Approved		Philip Ryland
Approved. I have a question about 1.4; it didn't make complete sense to me: 'provides' (provides what?). Also, I had a thought about formative and summative assessment in this policy—the former may be captured by timetabled attendance but not in a 'take home' non-assessed assessment. The latter is covered in the assessment element of the policy. I don't want to overcomplicate things, but I wondered if it would be useful to distinguish and perhaps drive engagement with formative assessments.		Carly Stewart
In response to Carly's comment: Re: section 1.4, the sentence is "this policy and procedure provides for the University to withdraw a student" - i.e. sets out policy and procedure elements which enable/give the University power to withdraw a student. Would "enables" be clearer to you than "provides for"? As regards formative assessments, these have come up a lot in discussion with staff and there is potential to support the use of these to drive engagement by (a) ensuring staff understand the potential for use of formative assessment within the regs (appears not everyone shares the same understanding of the regs) and (b) doing some work on how formative assessment can best be used to encourage engagement. But this would be work around/to support the policy rather than part of the process of monitoring and following up on engagement. Is your thinking that not completing formative assessment could be used as another indicator of non-engagement/trigger for intervention, in the same way as low attendance or non-submission of summative assessment? Do you think it should be in the list in section 3.3.1? My concern is that at this point I'm not sure we do have the capability and capacity to log information about engagement with formative assessments and in any event this would add a layer of complexity onto the processes and data which I don't think staff can deal with. It could be something we log to come back to down the line when the core processes and concepts are embedded and we are looking at how to develop the process? Happy to discuss.		Rosalind Ashcroft
Approved. Thank you.		Gelareh Roushan
Much improved from previous version and therefore approved.		Fiona Knight
Approved!		Norah Dekar
Really helpful policy which will help us move forward on this area. However, if we are to achieve consistency in its application there are a few areas that require further clarification/actions. 1. We need to ensure other policies align to this new policy in respect of Support to Study, Fitness to practice and interruption. 2. Further consideration needs to be made related to what is regarded as 'appropriate attempts' in 1.4. I have emailed Ros separately on these points so on the basis that these will be considered and addressed, i am happy to approve.		Kerry-Ann Randle
In response to Kerry-Ann's comment: As Kerry has noted, we are having an on-going conversation about these points. We had always anticipated that as this policy and the operational processes developed, this would lead us to look at related policies and processes for supporting students. On "appropriate attempts", section 4.4 of 3K is meant to ensure that the Engagement Framework processes will be designed to ensure that these "appropriate attempts" will be made in every case. So, if staff follow the steps required under the Engagement Framework process and used the template comms provided, they will have made "appropriate attempts" and complied with section 1.4. We could amend the		Rosalind Ashcroft

last part section 1.4 to say "but only after appropriate attempts have been made to support the student to re-engage by applying the relevant engagement management process as provided for in sections 4.4 - 4.6".		
Much approved.		Sabeur Zoheir
Definitely improved over previous version. I still have some concerns about operationalisation of many of these areas, similar to what Kerry has raised, but can pick these up separately if needed. Approved.		Ann Luce
<i>In response to Ann's comment:</i> There is more information about the operationalisation to come, and this will show clearly what "appropriate attempts" to support the students looks like in practice, but happy to discuss any concerns at this point while we still have time to take them into account in the design of the initial operational processes. More generally, it will be an iterative process to develop the engagement processes themselves and then develop related processes so that they connect as effectively as possible. One of the outcomes from running this process will undoubtedly be that we identify further work that needs to be done. The aim for September is that we will at least be doing more than we currently do to identify and respond to students with low engagement, and that we will be continuing to develop the process. If we wait to implement the engagement processes until all the other onward processes are reviewed too then we will fall further behind where we need to be - and also it is by starting to identify and understand more about the low-engaging students through the Engagement Framework that we will develop a clearer understanding of what we need from these other processes like Support to Study.		Rosalind Ashcroft
Paper	Summary: Programme Development Proposal – FST Computing & Informatics programmes	Chair's View
For Approval		Approved
Comments		
I have a couple of queries: 1. It is unusual to see an integrated masters programme have 180 credits at level 7. They normally have 120 credits as an integrated masters has a total of 480 credits overall. Is the design correct? 2. Integrated masters in engineering are declining due to students not wanting to commit to more fees than they need to and that they can walk into a job upon graduation. Does the marketing support the development of an integrated masters?		Philip Sewell
<i>In response to Philip's comment:</i> The team queried this with the Head of Department for Computing and Informatics and it has been clarified that 180 credits at level 7 is an error. The plan is to have 120 credits at Level 7 in the new MSci programmes. The team plan to remove 2 x 20 credit units from the current curriculum for each programme and then introduce a 40 credit team project instead of the existing 60 credit Individual Masters Project. As this align to BU credit frameworks this can move forward to approval. It is no longer the remit of Education Committee to make decisions based on market research (see current Terms of Reference for this committee). Market research is considered by Faculty Executive and signed off prior to proposal coming to Education Committee.		Jules Forrest
Seems logical but I would like to see the market research to support.		Sara White
<i>In response to Sara's comment:</i> To note: It is no longer the remit of Education Committee to make decisions based on market research (see current Terms of Reference for this committee). Market research is considered by Faculty Executive and signed off prior to proposal coming to Education Committee.		Jules Forrest
Approved.		Ann Luce
Approved. I agree that reading some brief highlights from the market research undertaken would have been of interest.		Philip Ryland
<i>In response to Philip's comment:</i>		Jules Forrest

To note: It is no longer the remit of Education Committee to make decisions based on market research (see current Terms of Reference for this committee). Market research is considered by Faculty Executive and signed off prior to proposal coming to Education Committee.	
Approve. Very topical areas.	Gelareh Roushan
Approved.	Fiona Knight
Approved	Norah Deka
approved	Kerry-Ann Randle
All approved, with the exception of my concerns about whether we have set up new marketing strategies for recruitment on these new integrated master programmes. The value proposition on these should be strong enough so that we generate a large response from potential applicants. Or we opting for a progressive approach for these programmes to grow at L7? Discuss.	Sabeur Zoheir
Approved	Jules Forrest