

MINUTES OF A MEETING HELD ON 25TH MAY 2016

Present:

Prof Tim McIntyre-Bhatty (Chair)	Deputy Vice-Chancellor
Ms Mandi Barron	Senate Representative – Head of Student Services (SS)
Dr Barbara Dyer	Deputy Dean – Education & Professional Practice (FMC)
Ms Jacky Mack	Head of Academic Services (AS)
Dr Andrew Main	Deputy Dean – Education & Professional Practice (FM)
Ms Ellie Mayo-Ward	Vice President (Education) 2015/16, Students' Union (SUBU)
Dr John Oliver, Assoc Prof	Professoriate Representative (FMC)
Dr Corrina Lailla Osborne	Head of Academic Operations (OVC)
Prof Keith Phalp	Deputy Dean – Education & Professional Practice (FST)
Prof Elizabeth Rosser	Deputy Dean – Education & Professional Practice (FHSS)
Ms Catherine Symonds (Secretary)	Head of Quality & Academic Partnerships (AS)

In Attendance:

Dr Ian Donaldson [Agenda Item 4.1.5]	Principal Academic (FHSS)
Dr Lois Farquharson [Agenda Item 4.1.2]	Head of Leadership, Strategy & Organisations Department (FM)
Ms Nikki Finnes (Observer)	Quality and Enhancement Manager (AS)
Ms Maxine Frampton (Clerk)	Policy and Committees Officer (AS)
Ms Linda Ladle (Observer)	Careers and Employability Manager (SS)
Dr Darren Lilleker [Agenda Item 4.2.3]	Associate Professor (FMC)
Ms Nicola Murray-Fagan	Head of UK Student Recruitment and Outreach (M&C)
Dr Christopher Richardson [Agenda Item 4.1.3]	Senior Lecturer (FST)
Mr Simon Roberts [Agenda Item 4.1.1]	Senior Lecturer in HRM/Organisational Students (FM)
Mr Ricky Rogers [Agenda Item 2.2]	Quality and Enhancement Officer (AS)
Ms Netta Silvennoinen [Agenda Item 3.3]	Quality and Enhancement Manager (AS)
Prof Gail Thomas [Agenda Item 3.1]	Professor and Director of the Centre for Excellence in Learning
Mr Jeffrey Wale [Agenda Item 4.2.2]	Lecturer in Law (FMC)

1 APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from:

Dr Milena Bobeva	Senate Representative – Principal Academic (FM)
Mr David Foot	Market Research Manager (M&C)
Mr Alan James	General Manager of the Students' Union (SUBU)
Ms Chloe Schendel-Wilson	President 2015/16, Students' Union (SUBU)
Mr Arvid Thorkeldsen	Director of Undergraduate Programmes, Anglo European College of Chiropractic (AECC)
Prof Tiantian Zhang	Head of the Graduate School (GS)

2 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 11TH APRIL 2016

2.1 Accuracy

2.1.1 The minutes (ASC-1516-99) were approved as an accurate record.

2.2 Matters Arising (ASC-1516-100)

2.2.1 Minute 3.1.12 – EDQ Annual Report 2014/15

Mr Rogers was requested to provide more detailed information in the report moving forward which would provide the number of issues encountered by EDQ which related to issues such as the number of late modifications, retrospective modifications, typographical errors, etc, to help the Committee understand whether the new process was working well.

Action Completed: Mr Rogers confirmed he had added this suggestion to his internal process notes so the information could be included in the 2015/16 EDQ Annual Report.

2.2.2 Minute 3.1.17 – EDQ Annual Report 2014/15

Some External Examiners raised the same issues continuously despite receiving responses from Faculty staff explaining the reasons why their suggestion had not been implemented. For the 2015/16 EDQ Annual Report these issues would be looked at in detail and recorded in a table as it was important the information was not lost and an accurate picture could be presented and repeat issues could be identified.

Action Completed: Mr Rogers confirmed he had added this suggestion to his internal process notes so this information could be included in the 2015/16 EDQ Annual Report.

2.2.3 Minute 3.1.18 – EDQ Annual Report 2014/15

The Committee asked Mr Rogers to remove 'Unresolved Issues' from Table 4a moving forward and to provide 'Unresolved Issues' information in a new table containing more detailed 2013/14 and 2014/15 information. Mr Rogers agreed to provide an update at the next meeting.

Action Completed: Mr Rogers confirmed he had added the 'Unresolved Issues' information from Table 4a to his internal process notes so this information could be included in the 2015/16 EDQ Annual Report.

Mr Rogers provided a paper showing the 'Unresolved Issues' information for 2013/14 and 2014/15 as Appendix 1. The number of raised concerns in the final summary section now looked quite different and was shown in Table 1. The reason for such a change in the data was primarily due to a significant number of the External Examiners who raised concerns, only actually had concerns under unresolved issues, particularly during 2013/14. The analysis of the unresolved issues had not identified any specific areas of concern but clearly demonstrated consistency of the implementation of policy and procedures associated with assessment and feedback as an area that needed to be kept under review and action taken where appropriate.

2.2.4 Minute 3.1.21– EDQ Annual Report 2014/15

Mr Rogers agreed to provide more detailed information on the types of students committing academic offences and the level of study. This information would be included in all EDQ Annual Reports moving forward.

Action Completed: Mr Rogers confirmed the suggestion had been added to the internal process notes so this information could be included in all EDQ Annual Reports moving forward.

Mr Rogers provided the Academic Offences updated information as Appendix 2. The information previously provided had been further broken down by UK and overseas students. Table 1 of the paper demonstrated the information for the 2014/15 academic year. The number of students committing academic offences (UK versus overseas) were quite similar. Whilst the number of UK students enrolled at BU was significantly greater than the number of overseas students, UK students were likely to commit most offences at Level 6 whilst this was Level 7 for overseas students. UK students were likely to commit the least offences at Level 7 (the highest for overseas students) whilst this was Level 4 for overseas students. This information will continue to be closely monitored.

2.2.5 Minute 4.1.2 – Postgraduate Taught Cross-Faculty Operations Manual

The diagram in Section 10 did not clearly show the first point of contact for staff members as it indicated that staff could communicate with the Programme Leader or Fusion Link Tutor. Members agreed the first point of contact should be the Programme Leader, therefore Dr Osborne agreed to update the diagram accordingly.

Action Completed: The diagram was updated accordingly to reflect the suggestions made to the manual. The manual was now available on the ARPP webpage.

- 2.2.6 Minute 4.1.5 – Postgraduate Taught Cross-Faculty Operations Manual
ARPP 5C had recently changed its name to 5C – Continuous Monitoring of Taught Academic Provision: Policy and Procedure. Dr Osborne agreed to update the PGT Cross-Faculty Operations Manual in Section 3, 4.5 and 8.4.
Action Completed: The PGT Cross-Faculty Operations Manual had been updated accordingly.
- 2.2.7 Minute 4.2.1.4 – Faculty of Science & Technology: Programme Development Proposal – BA (Hons) Archaeology
The Committee gave approval of the proposed new programme for development, subject to Prof Phalp providing EDQ with confirmation that the FST Faculty Executive supported the new programme by adding the required detail and date of approval to the Faculty Executive Consideration and Actions Template. Prof Phalp would also confirm that market research had been carried out by the University’s Market Research Department and the outcomes of the market research.
Action Completed: The date of Executive approval had been confirmed and added to the Faculty Executive Consideration and Actions Template. The outcomes of the market research had also been sent to EDQ.
- 2.2.8 Minute 6.3.1 – Faculty Academic Standards Committee Minutes
Prof Rosser advised the Committee that the FHSS had made a lot of progress on addressing the 20% failure rates in units from the previous year. With discussions at the FHSS FASC meetings now taking place, this had encouraged staff to itemise all the hard work they had been putting into looking at the assessment approach and support given to students. Prof Rosser recommended other Faculties discuss 20% failure rates as it had been a huge benefit to the FHSS.
Action Completed: DDEPPs agreed that discussing 20% failure rates at FASC meetings had been a positive step forward and would help to identify any issues which ordinarily may not have been identified.
- 2.2.9 Minute 7.1 – Anglo-European College of Chiropractic (AECC) Academic Development & Quality Committee Minutes
KPIs had been developed for student engagement and would be monitored and reviewed annually. AECC students had been very keen to have the KPIs in place and it had been discussed at various AECC committees. Mr Thorkeldsen agreed to provide Prof McIntyre-Bhatty, Mr James and Ms Mayo-Ward with further information regarding the work being carried out in this area at AECC.
Action Completed: The ASC Clerk forwarded the student engagement KPI information on to Prof McIntyre-Bhatty, Mr James and Ms Mayo-Ward on 12 May 2016.

3 PART ONE: FOR DISCUSSION - INSTITUTIONAL MONITORING

- 3.1 **Update of ARPP 6F – Generic Assessment Criteria: Procedure (EDQ Document 6F – Assessment Policies and Procedures (ASC-1516-101)**
- 3.1.1 *ARPP 6F – Generic Assessment Criteria: Procedure* had been updated as the language used in the document was considered to be outdated and negative in tone and did not acknowledge students’ strengths or any areas for development. Some students had commented that the statements appeared to refer to the student rather than about the work submitted and this was not helpful.
- 3.1.2 A cross-faculty Working Group was set up to review and amend the criteria to ensure a student-centred perspective with a focus on assessment *for* learning as well as assessment *of* learning. The revisions made by the Working Group included:
- Landscape table format to enable easier comparison between mark bands;
 - Clearer language that referred to the work submitted and not the student;
 - A statement for feedback and *feedforward* for each mark band to provide more explicit feedback *for* learning;
 - A consistent description of each band of achievement at all levels (4-7) e.g. outstanding for high first, excellent for first, very good for upper second.
 - The preface to the criteria, which are intended to be used by staff, academics and external examiners, had also been updated to improve clarity.

It was anticipated the updated *ARPP 6F – Generic Assessment Criteria: Procedure* would be published by EDQ as soon as possible in order for the changes to be introduced for the 2016/17 academic year.

3.1.3 The Committee was requested to approve the incorporation of feedback and *feedforward* statements into Turnitin and Blackboard in order that a common language could be used across all programmes and disciplines. This would be in addition to detailed feedback on the particular assignment. The Committee was also requested to give its approval to the Working Group being able to review and make recommendations for revision of the related documents – *ARPP 6C – Assessment Design, Handling and Submission Policy* and *ARPP 6E – Assessment Feedback and Return of Work Policy and Procedure* to ensure consistency and clarity.

3.1.4 The Committee was supportive of the updated document, however it was noted that the document referred to both 'assignments' and 'coursework'. It was suggested that the document and templates be updated to ensure consistent use of terminology.

3.1.5 Dr Main had noted a number of amendments and agreed to send his comments/amendments to Ms Quinney for sharing with the Working Group.

Action: AM

3.1.6 The Committee suggested inclusion of an example of context specific information that would be meaningful to students; this would provide an example of how the generic information could be amalgamated with the marker's own comments. It may enable students to self-assess their assignment before they submit their work. Whilst there was some concern about making the criteria over complex it was suggested that a comment be added which would advise the student that the marker would like to have further dialogue with student. Overall the Committee was supportive of the addition of positive comments that would enhance the usefulness of feedback for students.

3.1.7 A discussion took place around how best to cascade the new document through the academic community in order to achieve engagement from all staff. Ms Mayo-Ward suggested that Academic Advisers could explain the language used for assessment and feedback to students and to also discuss any disparity. These discussions would also help to shape the role of the Academic Adviser. DDEPPs were requested to disseminate the information to Academic Advisers.

Action: DDEPPs/Academic Advisers

3.1.8 Prof Phalp advised that the existing Generic Assessment Criteria was included in the FST Student Handbook and the inclusion of this information had assisted with raising students' understanding of the marks awarded to their work. Prof Phalp would like the updated version of the Generic Assessment Criteria to be included in the new Student Handbook in order that students could access the information during their course of study in order to enhance future assignment submissions.

3.1.9 The Committee suggested that the document be reviewed annually in order that further improvements could be made and to ensure the document remains meaningful.

3.1.10 Prof Rosser asked that the document be disseminated to Faculties with immediate effect to ensure it is in place for the 2016/17 academic year as the Student Handbooks would be published shortly. Prof Thomas agreed that the updated document would be circulated to Faculties upon completion of Dr Main's suggested amendments.

Action: GT

3.1.11 **Approved:** The Committee approved the revised criteria, which would include the suggestions made by the Committee. The revised criteria would be introduced for the 2016/17 academic year and would be published by EDQ as soon as possible in order to include the revised criteria in Programme Handbooks.

3.1.12 **Approved:** The Committee approved the suggestion that the criteria be imported into Blackboard/Turnitin as generic marking rubrics to support the provision of additional detailed feedback to students.

3.1.13 **Approved:** The Committee approved the recommendation that the Centre for Excellence in Learning lead on revising associated documents – *ARPP 6C – Assessment Design, Handling and Submission: Policy and Procedure* **and** *ARPP 6E – Assessment Feedback and Return of Assessed Work: Policy and Procedure*.

3.2 **Trailing up to 20 Credits of Failure at Levels 4 and 5 (ASC-1516-102)**

3.2.1 Ms Symonds introduced the paper which included the key issues discussed at the February Academic Standards Committee meeting and the Senate debate in February on trailing failed units. The principle of trailing fails (up to 20 credits at Levels 4 and 5) was approved by Senate for implementation in 2017/18. The paper detailed the decisions and actions required to implement the principle of trailing fails through a number of proposed recommendations in order to guide the work to be undertaken during the next academic year.

3.2.2 Recommendation No.1 – The Assessment Board makes the decision to permit a trailed fail to the next Level, with or without attendance, unless PSRBs stipulate otherwise. The subject of fees for a trailed fail would also need to be considered within the University in relation to this.

Ms Symonds advised that any documentation needed to clearly state where the relevant decision making should take place. For trailing fails all decisions should be made and accurately minuted by the Assessment Board. When the regulations are revised they will need to incorporate the use of a mechanism to facilitate undertaking a failed unit alongside the next Level of study so that there is clarity for all stakeholders. Whilst the Committee agreed that attendance at classes for failed units would not be compulsory if the timetable allowed a student to attend lectures, then the student should make every effort to attend. It would not be possible for the University to change the timetable to accommodate those students who had failed a unit. It was agreed that all students would be given all options available, however the final decision would be that of the students themselves.

3.2.3 Recommendation No. 2 – Each formal element for the failed unit must contain a mark on the Board report for the unit to be eligible to be trailed. However, if any formal element component linked to the failed unit contains a 0% (zero) or a NS (non-submission) it will not normally be deemed eligible. (There may be exceptions if mitigating circumstances apply).

The Committee was concerned that this recommendation appeared to be too inflexible to manage the diversity of situations that may arise. Whether or not an assignment had been submitted did not necessarily give an indication of engagement with the unit overall hence Members agreed that this recommendation should not be taken forward.

3.2.4 Recommendation No. 3 – A trailed fail can apply to both core and option units unless the Board determines that the failed unit provides key underpinning learning and must be passed prior to commencing to the next Level. The Board will be aided by the list held locally by the Team to determine which units can or cannot be trailed.

There was discussion on whether Programme Specifications should be revisited to identify units that could not be trailed, however, Members felt that this should be determined by the programme team at Assessment Boards. Members agreed with the principle that units could be trailed providing the student had the underpinning knowledge. It was agreed that Assessment Boards would make the final decision. It was noted that Chairs of Assessment Boards would require training to facilitate consistent implementation of this recommendation.

3.2.5 Recommendation No. 4 – A student who is allowed to proceed to the next Level with a trailed fail must make good the deficiency by the end of that academic Level otherwise they cannot proceed any further.

The Committee agreed with this recommendation.

3.2.6 Recommendation No. 5 – Students are clearly advised of the consequences of subsequently failing the trailed unit (e.g. withdrawal, awarded credit only) and are provided with an opportunity to repeat the failed unit instead of trailing it (without having to appeal the Board decision).

The Committee agreed with this recommendation.

- 3.2.7 Recommendation No. 6 – Students are permitted one further opportunity to make good any failure on the trailed fail unit before being withdrawn from their programme. Clarification that any final reassessment taken on a trailing fail does not come from the current Level's reassessment allowance.

The Committee agreed with this recommendation. Dr Main suggested the last sentence should be reworded as "Clarification that any final reassessment on a trailing fail unit does not come from the current Level's reassessment allowance".

- 3.2.8 Recommendation No. 7 – Consideration of a fast-track approach is put on hold until the trailing fails process embeds itself at BU.

Detailed discussion had taken place at Quality Assurance Standing Group (QASG) meeting, Academic Standards Committee (ASC) meetings and Senate regarding a formalised 'Fast-track' approach and how to ensure that this type of approach would be equitable, consistent and flexible. It was noted that assessment submission dates would be agreed in discussion with students, and that this could facilitate shorter assessment timescales in practice, depending on individual student circumstances and programme requirements. Formalising a 'Fast track' route could be revisited as part of the initial review of the implementation of trailing fails.

- 3.2.9 Recommendation No. 8 – For students with mitigation, normally 20 credits should be carried over into the next Level, but exceptionally no more than 40 credits. These decisions should be clearly minuted by the Board.

The Committee agreed with this recommendation.

- 3.2.10 The Committee agreed that Section 3.8 - Compensation Regulations and Section 3.9 - Non Honours Degrees would be discussed at a future meeting of the Committee. Section 4.0 - Action Plan and Timescales was noted.

- 3.2.11 **Approved:** The Committee recommended approval to Senate of any policy-related recommendations agreed by the Committee.

- 3.2.12 **Approved:** The Committee gave in-principle approval for any related procedural changes within the *Academic Regulations, Policies and Procedures*.

3.3 **Review of 6M – Misconduct in Academic Research: Policy and Procedure (Proposed new title 6M – Research Misconduct: Policy and Procedure (ASC-1516-103)**

- 3.3.1 Ms Silvennoinen presented the paper following the review carried out by a cross-University Working Group in conjunction with UCU. The proposal was based on feedback from all stakeholders and the requirements for compliance with the sector framework that supports research integrity.

- 3.3.2 The paper summarised the outcome of a review of the principles and processes the University applies to investigations of staff and student research misconduct as outlined in the current *6M – Misconduct in Academic Research: Policy and Procedure*. Additionally, *6A – Standard Assessment Regulations* and *8B – Research Ethics Code of Practice* needed to be updated to align with the revised *ARPP 6M – Research Misconduct: Policy and Procedure*.

- 3.3.3 **Approved:** The Committee gave in-principle approval of the proposed procedural changes to *6M – Research Misconduct: Policy and Procedure*.

- 3.3.4 **Approved:** The Committee recommended to Senate its approval of the proposed policy changes to *6M – Misconduct in Academic Research: Policy and Procedure*.

- 3.3.5 **Approved:** The Committee recommended to Senate the minor changes to *6A – Standard Assessment Regulations (taught provision and research awards)*.

- 3.3.6 **Approved:** The Committee noted the changes to *8B – Research Ethics Code of Practice* (the Research and Knowledge Exchange Office (RKEO) to report to the University Research Ethics Committee (UREC)).

3.4 Faculty of Science and Technology – Faculty Quality Audit Report and Action Plan (ASC-1516-104)

- 3.4.1 The Faculty of Science and Technology Faculty Quality Audit took place in February 2016 and as a result of the outcomes an Action Plan was formulated. The Action Plan included with the report provided details of current actions and a further Action Plan would be listed on the February 2017 ASC agenda for the Committee to discuss progress of all the actions arising from the audit.
- 3.4.2 Prof Phalp advised that the Action Plan submitted alongside the Audit Report had been discussed at the Faculty Education & Student Experience Committee (FESEC) and the Faculty Academic Standards Committee (FASC) as a number of the actions listed on the Action Plan related to both committees. At the recent FASC meeting some minor updates were made to the Action Plan. Moving forward, the Action Plan would be monitored through FASC meetings and would be re-presented to ASC in February 2017.
- 3.4.3 Ms Symonds advised that the Faculty Quality Audit was a routine activity carried out on a quinquennial basis to establish whether the University could continue to place confidence in the Faculty's capacity to fulfil its responsibilities for the management of academic standards and the enhancement of the quality of the learning opportunities. There were also plans in progress that the University would like to learn more of before the start of the next academic year and these had been included in the Action Plan.
- 3.4.4 The Committee was pleased to note that the Faculty of Science and Technology Faculty Quality Audit had a successful outcome.
- 3.4.5 **Approved:** The Committee approved the Faculty of Science and Technology Faculty Quality Audit Action Plan.

3.5 Annual Review of Key Performance Indicators/Performance Indicators (KPI/PI) (ASC-1516-105)

- 3.5.1 The report was presented to the Committee to provide information regarding performance against the KPIs and PIs which are set out in BU2018.
- 3.5.2 In comparison to the report submitted to ASC in May 2015, a new column had been inserted into the table on Page 2 of the report, titled 'Sector Benchmarks'. This column had been inserted following discussion with the University Board to help Board Members better understand the wider context over time. It also gave the University an opportunity to consider the extent sector benchmarks had changed and hence to establish where the University currently stood. This was noted as having been a useful exercise.
- 3.5.3 KPI1 Academic Strength had continued to improve, and had increased by 1% to 71% overall in the latest KPI reporting period. This measure had improved for five consecutive periods, and had increased by 10% in the last 12 months. KPI1 was expected to have improved further when the July report is prepared for the University Board.
- 3.5.4 The increase in KPI1 was primarily as a result of progress in the following areas:
- The percentage of academic staff that held at least one recognised professional affiliation (PI14); this had increased from 34% to 40%.
 - PI15 – 'the percentage of academic staff who also work in industry' had increased by 2% to 28%.
 - The percentage of academic staff who hold a teaching qualification and/or who are HEA Fellows had improved from 59% to 61%, part of this increase was as a result of ongoing improvements in data quality.
- 3.5.5 Members agreed that overall the figures were very encouraging. It was noted that a very small number of KPIs were aspirational targets, but overall the majority of KPIs were achievable.

3.5.6 The Committee was advised of the recent publication of the Guardian League Table. Whilst the University had improved its ranking in the table, it had possibly been hampered by the NSS scores. It was noted the University has many Departments which perform well and above target. Unfortunately the lower performing Departments had hindered the overall ranking for the institution.

4.1 New Programme/Framework Developments Proposals

4.1.1 Faculty of Management: Programme Development Proposal – MA Human Resource Management (ASC-1516-106)

4.1.1 The Faculty of Management proposed to close the MSc Professional Development (HRM) and to introduce a new programme titled MA Human Resource Management. The current programme title was confusing to prospective students and did not clearly state that all the programme content was related to human resource management. The market for the programme was for HR practitioners who wished to obtain a Chartered Institute of Personnel & Development (CIPD) approved qualification at Level 7 in order to enhance their careers. The new programme title would be much clearer and more attractive to the market.

4.1.2 The old programme title would go through the formal procedure for closure. The new programme title would be marketed with a September 2017 start date.

4.1.3 **Approved:** The Committee approved the MA Human Resource Management programme for development.

4.1.2 Faculty of Management: Programme Development Proposal – BA (Hons) Global Business Management (ASC-1516-107)

4.1.2.1 The Faculty of Management proposed to close the current BA (Hons) International Business and Management programme and replace the programme with a new programme titled BA (Hons) Global Business Management.

4.1.2.2 The new online programme would focus on the contemporary global context and would allow a more interdependent, collaborative and interconnected approach across the programme. The proposed programme has been designed to cover a range of fundamental business functions and would include issues such as ethics, sustainability, entrepreneurship, innovation and digital marketing. The programme would reflect the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) learning objectives of global awareness, and the Faculty's commitment of developing effective communicators and graduates who would be able to operate in a global context.

4.1.2.3 Dr Farquharson confirmed that she was working with Dr Roushan on the Vision4Learning initiative in order to be able to utilise current resources to support the proposed programme as well as considering how internal resources could be used to further develop the programme content.

4.1.2.4 The revised programme would provide the University with an opportunity to partner with the Association of Business Executives (ABE) to create a 'top-up' route into the final year of the programme via an approved Recognition arrangement. This would help to create a more sustainable market for the programme.

4.1.2.5 Dr Farquharson agreed to work with the Marketing Department in order to market the programme as widely as possible.

4.1.2.6 **Approved:** The Committee approved the BA (Hons) Global Business Management programme for development.

4.1.3 Faculty of Science and Technology Proposal: Cyber Security Technology Professional Degree Apprenticeship (ASC-1516-108)

4.1.3.1 Dr Richardson advised the Committee that the Government had pledged to increase the quality and quantity of apprenticeships in England, and therefore had created a levy which would effectively result in employers paying for and choosing apprenticeship training. The apprenticeship levy would come into effect in April 2017 and would be set at 0.5% of an employer's wage bill. The levy would only be paid by employers with a payroll of over £3 million and employers would be able to utilise their levy contributions to fund external apprenticeship training on an approved standard. In addition, HEFCE has just launched the Degree Apprenticeship Development Fund (DADF) which would provide £8 million to support new degree apprenticeships. The deadline for proposals to be submitted is Monday 20 June 2016 in order to provide apprenticeships starting in September 2017.

4.1.3.2 The 'Cyber Security Technology Professional degree apprenticeship' was currently being developed under the Trailblazer initiative, and BIS were due to approve this development within the next six weeks. To ensure the University was ahead of competing universities, it was important to commence the development process for the proposed award imminently in order that the University can be one of the first universities to deliver the 'Cyber Security Technology Professional degree apprenticeship' from September 2017. The proposed programme would deliver Level 4 units over two years; Level 5 units over a further two years and Level 6 taught units over a fifteen week semester. The 60 credit Level 6 individual project would be industry based. The proposed programme would have an initial target of 40 students from the 2017/18 academic year intake and it was proposed that there would be a tuition fee of £6,000 per student for each academic year.

4.1.3.3 The University would need to consider on-site accommodation costs for students when the apprentice was working beyond daily travel, therefore Dr Richardson proposed two approaches to the delivery of the units:

- 3-5 day block delivery of a unit, followed by 8 weeks of online blended learning, or
- 2 x 8 week module delivery of 3 units

4.1.3.4 The proposed programme was the first presented for consideration by the University under the Government's new Degree Apprenticeship model. The Committee agreed that in order for the University to fully engage with the requirements of Degree Apprenticeships, a significant amount of groundwork was required, which would need to involve a wide group of staff from across Professional Services and Faculties. This would include a significant amount of work to set up a new regulatory framework for this type of award. In order to move forward, the University needed to be confident that the required strategic and operational models could be put into place to support the development and delivery of successful Degree Apprenticeships.

4.1.3.5 Following discussion with regards to resourcing the programme, it was noted that a Coordinator and a Programme Administrator would not be required for the proposed programme, however the Committee agreed that further dialogue would be required within the Faculty to look at the University structure and the support required. Dr Richardson confirmed the proposed programme would be a BSc (Hons) award.

4.1.3.6 **Approved:** The Committee gave approval in-principle to develop the proposed BSc (Hons) Cyber Security Technology Professional Degree Apprenticeship programme, with further work to be carried out first to consider areas such as finances, resources and a new regulatory framework.

4.1.4 Faculty of Health & Social Sciences: Programme Development Proposal – BSc (Hons) and Integrated Masters MSci Sports Therapy (ASC-1516-109)

4.1.4.1 A detailed competitor review had been conducted of areas which the University does not currently offer provision and this had identified Sports Therapy and Sports Rehabilitation as an appropriate programme area. The proposed Sports Therapy programme would strengthen the University's education, research and practice portfolio in the field of sport, in particular sports biomechanics, injury prevention and sports injury management.

- 4.1.4.2 Due to the significant overlap in possible course content between Sports Therapy/Sports Rehabilitation, the title of BSc (Hons) Sports Therapy was chosen. The title had also been selected as the Society of Sports Therapy would be the key accrediting body. Accreditation would be very important to those students studying the programme.
- 4.1.4.3 Market research had shown that the majority of sports therapy and sports rehabilitation courses recruited well and it was anticipated that the proposed programme would recruit high numbers.
- 4.1.4.4 Prof Rosser agreed that the Faculty would contact SportBU and other areas within the University with regards to options available to work together and better utilise physical resources.
- 4.1.4.5 **Approved:** The Committee approved the proposed BSc (Hons) and Integrated Masters MSci Sports Therapy programme for development, with further work to be carried out with regards to resources and the appropriate support from SportBU.
- 4.1.5 Faculty of Health & Social Sciences: Programme Development Proposal – MSc Advanced Clinical Practice (ASC-1516-110)**
- 4.1.5.1 The existing PG Dip Advanced Nurse Practitioner programme was a widely respected programme by students and employers alike, however due to changing titles and roles of key workers, the development of new programmes to align with Local (Wessex Health Education) and Department of Health Standards for Advanced Practice were now required.
- 4.1.5.2 It was proposed to develop a full Master's programme to address these new requirements for 'general' nurses, and as requested by Dorset Healthcare University NHS Trust, an advanced practice programme for Mental Health nurses would also be provided. Therefore a separate pathway title of MSc and PG Dip Advanced Clinical Practice (Advanced Mental Health Nurse Practitioner) was requested. It was anticipated that four of the units would be shared with the MSc and PG Dip Advanced Clinical Practice (Advanced Nurse Practitioner).
- 4.1.5.3 The decision to deliver the programme at both PG Diploma and full Masters level was due to the requirements of the market and employers for both awards. Not all students wish to progress to the full Masters, but do want the PG Dip award title for professional reasons. Marketing the programme at two levels would make it clear that prospective students could do this.
- 4.1.5.4 **Approved:** The Committee approved the following proposed programmes for development:
- MSc/PG Dip Advanced Clinical Practice;
 - MSc/PG Dip Advanced Clinical Practice (Advanced Nurse Practitioner);
 - MSc/PG Dip Advanced Clinical Practice (Advanced Mental Health Nurse Practitioner).

4.2 Programme/Framework Review Deferral Requests

4.2.1 Faculty of Health & Social Sciences Deferral: Learning and Assessing in Practice (ASC-1516-111)

- 4.2.1.1 The Learning and Assessing in Practice units were due for review by the University and the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) by August 2017. The NMC wrote to the University on 24 March 2016 to confirm the further extension to August 2018 as the NMC were reviewing their standards for education.
- 4.2.1.2 Dr Donaldson asked the Committee to extend the University review until the 2017/18 academic year so the University was in line with the NMC. This would allow future unit content to be considered following the publication of the new NMC pre-registration nursing and midwifery standards, which may impact on the Learning and Assessing in Practice units.

- 4.2.1.3 **Approved:** The Committee approved the deferral of the review of the following units to the 2017/18 academic year:
- Learning and Assessing in Practice (Mentorship) – 20 credits Level 7
 - Learning and Assessing in Practice (Mentorship) – 20 credits Level 6
 - Learning and Assessing in Practice (Mentorship) – 20 credits Level 5
 - Mentorship – Learning and Assessing Portfolio route (non-accredited programme) – Non-credit bearing
- 4.2.2 **Faculty of Media & Communications Deferral: Grad Dip/CPE Law/PG Dip Legal Practice (ASC-1516-112)**
- 4.2.2.1 The deferral requests were presented for further approval due to the Solicitor's Regulatory Authority (SRA) and Bar Standards Board (BSB) consulting on new Training Frameworks with an outcome expected in 2016. Both programmes are regulated by the SRA and BSB.
- 4.2.2.2 The deferral request for Grad Dip/CPE Law was the second request to defer the review of this programme. The first deferral was approved by the Committee in October 2015.
- 4.2.2.3 The deferral request for PG Dip Legal Practice was the third request to defer the review of this programme. The first deferral was approved by the Committee in October 2014 and the second deferral was approved by the Committee in October 2015.
- 4.2.2.4 **Approved:** The Committee approved the deferral of the review until the 2017/18 academic year.
- 4.2.3 **Faculty of Media & Communications Deferral: BA (Hons) Politics (ASC-1516-113)**
- 4.2.3.1 **Approved:** The Committee approved the deferral of the review until the 2016/17 academic year.
- 4.2.4 **Faculty of Health & Social Sciences Deferral: BSc (Hons)/PG Dip Adult Nursing, BSc (Hons)/PG Dip Mental Health Nursing and BSc (Hons)/PG Dip Children and Young People's Nursing (ASC-1516-114)**
- 4.2.4.1 **Approved:** The Committee approved the deferral of the review of the programmes listed below until 2018/19 academic year:
- BSc (Hons) / PG Dip Adult Nursing
 - BSc (Hons) / PG Dip Mental Health Nursing
 - BSc (Hons) / PG Dip Children and Young People's Nursing
- 5 PART THREE – FOR NOTE**
- 5.1 HE Sector Update (ASC-1516-115)**
- 5.1.1 **Noted:** The Committee noted the paper.
- 5.2 Partnership Agreements (ASC-1516-116)**
- 5.2.1 **Noted:** The Committee noted the paper.
- 5.3 Completed Framework/Programme Reviews, Validations and Reviews for Closure (ASC-1516-117)**
- 5.3.1 **Noted:** The Committee noted the paper.

5.4 Pending External Examiner Appointments (ASC-1516-118)

5.4.1 The External Examiner for the FdSc Communications Systems Engineering programme, the FdSc Communications Systems Management programme and the BSc (Hons) Management Information Systems programme would continue in his External Examiner's role until the event has taken place on 7 June 2016.

5.4.2 The External Examiner for the Bournemouth & Poole College (BPC) programmes would be extended and would cover the duties of an existing BPC External Examiner.

5.4.3 **Noted:** The Committee noted the paper.

5.5 External Examiner Nominations and Examination Teams for Research Degrees (ASC-1516-119)

5.5.1 **Noted:** The Committee noted the paper.

5.6 1C – Academic Regulations, Policies and Procedures (ARPP) Document Owners: Procedure (ASC-1516-120)

5.6.1 **Noted:** The Committee noted the paper.

6 REPORTING COMMITTEES

6.1 Quality Assurance Standing Group Minutes (ASC-1516-121)

6.1.1 **Noted:** The International and UK Partnerships Committee minutes of 22 March 2016 were noted.

6.2 Faculty Academic Standards Committee Minutes (ASC-1516-122)

6.2.1 **Noted:** The Faculty Academic Standards Committee minutes listed below were noted.

- Faculty of Health & Social Sciences minutes of 23 March 2016 (unconfirmed)
- Faculty of Media & Communication minutes of 27 April 2016 (unconfirmed)

6.2.2 Dr Dyer highlighted item 4.1 of the Faculty of Media & Communication FASC minutes which provided an update on the Validation/Review Schedule. FMC FASC members had raised a concern that January intakes created some difficulty for FMC's one year full-time conversion Master's programmes. On these programmes, units built on each other and therefore needed to be delivered in a certain sequence. As currently configured the units would have to be delivered again for any students commencing the programme in January. It was noted that the current Master's conversion courses were successful through their unique selling point which enabled students to start in September and complete the degree within a year and graduate in November.

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

7.1 There was no other business.

8. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Monday 3rd October 2016 – 1.00pm in the Board Room