BOURNEMOUTH UNIVERSITY   **Confirmed**
ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF A MEETING HELD ON 3RD OCTOBER 2016

Present:

Prof Tim McIntyre-Bhatty (Chair)	Deputy Vice-Chancellor
Prof Vanora Hundley	Deputy Chair
Daniel Asaya	President 2016/17, Students' Union (SUBU)
Mandi Barron	Senate Representative – Head of Student Services (SS)
Dr Milena Bobeva	Senate Representative – Principal Academic (FM)
Dr Barbara Dyer	Deputy Dean – Education & Professional Practice (FMC)
Alan James	General Manager of the Students' Union (SUBU)
Jacky Mack (Secretary)	Head of Academic Services (AS)
Dr Andrew Main	Deputy Dean – Education & Professional Practice (FM)
Prof Alison McConnell	Professoriate Representative (FHSS)
Assoc Prof Kevin McGhee	Professoriate Representative (FST)
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)
Jamie Swanson	SU VP (Education) 2016/17, Students' Union (SUBU)
Arvid Thorkeldsen	Director of Undergraduate Programmes, Anglo European College of Chiropractic (AECC)

In Attendance:

Dr Sue Eccles [Agenda Item 4.2.3]	Senior Principal Academic (FMC)
Ann Fernandez	Director of Marking & Communications (M&C)
Nikki Finnes	Quality and Enhancement Manager (AS)
Maxine Frampton (Clerk)	Academic Quality Officer (AS)
Prof Vasilis Katos [Agenda Item 4.2.1]	Head of Computing (FST)

1 APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from:

David Foot	Market Research Manager (M&C)
Prof Tiantian Zhang	Head of the Graduate School (GS)

2 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 25 MAY 2016

2.1 Accuracy

2.1.1   The minutes (ASC-1617-01) were approved as an accurate record.

2.2 Matters Arising (ASC-1617-02)

2.2.1   <u>Minute 3.1.5 – Update of ARPP 6F – Generic Assessment Criteria: Procedure (EDQ Document 6F – Assessment Policies and Procedures</u>
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 Completed: Dr Main sent his amendments to Ms Quinney on 25 May 2016 and the suggestions made were integrated into the document which has now been published. The Learning Technologists were continuing to develop an electronic rubric using the GAC that will be used in marking.

2.2.2 <u>Minute 3.1.7 - Update of ARPP 6F – Generic Assessment Criteria: Procedure (EDQ Document 6F – Assessment Policies and Procedures</u>
Ms Mayo-Ward suggested that Academic Advisers would be best placed to 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 Completed: DDEPPs confirmed the Generic Assessment Criteria had been circulated to Faculty academics and Academic Advisers.

2.2.3 <u>Minute 3.1.10 - Update of ARPP 6F – Generic Assessment Criteria: Procedure (EDQ Document 6F – Assessment Policies and Procedures</u>
Prof Thomas agreed to circulate the updated ARPP 6F – Generic Assessment Criteria: Procedure to Faculties so the information could be included in Student Handbooks for the 2016/17 academic year.
Action Completed: The revised criteria and the updated *ARPP 6F – Generic Assessment Criteria: Procedure* were circulated to Faculties through a range of contact lists including Deputy Deans (Education & Professional Practice) and Education Service Managers. The revised criteria and updated *ARPP 6F – Generic Assessment Criteria: Procedure* has been included in all Faculty Handbooks.

2.2.4 Ms Barron referred to Section 4.1.3 of the previous minutes regarding Degree Apprenticeships. Ms Mack advised that discussions had taken place with Bournemouth & Poole College however discussions were still in early stages with Faculties. A lot of infrastructure and underpinning work needed to be carried out and put into place for the Cyber Security Technology Professional Degree Apprenticeship for next year. Further discussions would take place at ULT/UET moving forward. Ms Mack agreed to send information to DDEPPs regarding information sessions and general awareness sessions which Bournemouth & Poole College were holding.

Action: JM

2.3 Academic Standards Committee Terms of Reference and Membership
(ASC-1617-03)

2.3.1 The Terms of Reference had one minor amendment which advised the Committee Clerk would now be a representative from the Academic Quality Team. The Membership List listed the new Committee members.

2.3.2 **Approved:** The Academic Standards Committee Terms of Reference and Membership List were approved.

2.4 Ratification of Chair's Action – New Award Title – MSci (Hons) (ASC-1617-04)

2.4.1 The Chair had been requested to approve the new award title of MSci (Hons) Sports Therapy programme and to also approve the MSci (Hons) award inclusion in *ARPP 2A – Awards of Bournemouth University: Policy.* The award was now consistent with all other awards within the University.

2.4.2 **Ratified:** The Committee ratified the new award title of MSci (Hons) Sport Therapy programme and also ratified the MSci (Hons) award inclusion in *ARPP 2A – Awards of Bournemouth University: Policy.*

3 PART ONE: FOR DISCUSSION - INSTITUTIONAL MONITORING

3.1 Marketing & Communications Annual Report (ASC-1617-05)

3.1.1 During 2015/16 there had been some significant changes and improvements in how the University published its public information. The information regarding the University's strategy, learning provision and services was required to be accurate, comprehensive and timely. With the introduction of new consumer legislation which refers to students as consumers, along

with the launch of the new website, improvements were made to the processes and procedures of how the University manages its external communications. The Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) had issued guidance for Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) which made recommendations for enhancing information provided to prospective students. Led by the Student Task & Finish Group, the University developed a Communications Policy which was approved by the University Leadership Team (ULT) in November 2015. The Communications Policy provides guidance and clarity over the management and control measures put in place to ensure the accuracy and quality of public information.

3.1.2   Marketing & Communications (M&C) has also worked with Academic Services and Faculty staff to add further detail to course information provided on the University's website for enquirers and prospective students e.g. typical contact hours for each course and the level of academic colleagues e.g. Professors or guest lecturers, as well as a breakdown of how courses are assessed. Another major change this year was sending information about significant changes made to a course to all prospective students who had expressed interest in or had applied to the University. All significant changes were now recorded in a log which was audited by M&C. An audit of the log took place in July and it was encouraging to see that Faculties had adhered to the requirements and were keeping logs of everything sent to prospective students.

3.1.3   Website content owners had been identified for each area of the BU website and each content owner was responsible for the accuracy of factual information on relevant areas. A review of the information on the website was undertaken on a continuous basis for the main areas such as course information, accommodation, fees and finance information, as well as all study information in line with recruitment cycles.

3.1.4   A Partner Institution Audit was undertaken in March 2016, which was a joint effort between M&C and Academic Services. 32 partner courses were audited for the accuracy of their entry requirements. The 32 courses were made up of different partnership models (17 Franchise partner courses, 2 off-campus delivery partner courses, 3 shared delivery/programme partner courses and 10 Validated partner courses). The 2016 entry requirements were all correct with the exception of Kingston Maurward College who had not displayed the IELTS requirements. The College was contacted as part of the audit process, but had still not made the changes at the time of the re-audit. The College has confirmed that the amendment would be made. Another audit would be carried out in due course and also logged on the Audit Log when completed. Ms Fernandez agreed to liaise with Ella Say with regards to this issue.

Action: AF

3.1.5   The University would continue to keep printed versions of various publications and prospectuses and would maintain a balance of printed and online information available to prospective and current students. Ms Fernandez confirmed that the University often received information from agencies which provided evidence that printed material was still important, although the level had reduced.

3.1.6   Members agreed that the publishing of lecturer data was complicated to provide to prospective students, although it was recognised that it was very important to publish this information and this was in line with CMA guidance. It was suggested that information relating to all guest lecturers and Professors should be included in course information as well as providing a link from course information to departmental staff including Professoriate members. Members also suggested that information regarding the previous year's teaching staff could be provided as well as providing webinars as a channel for reaching candidates.

3.1.7   Dr Bobeva suggested the inclusion of information which could be updated personally by academic staff with regards to current roles, job titles and the membership of societies as this would be useful for prospective students to see the calibre of staff members and their expertise which would hopefully encourage students to study at BU. Ms Fernandez agreed to look further at this suggestion and would provide an update at the next meeting in December.

Action: AF

3.1.8   Prof McIntyre-Bhatty drew attention to Section 3.24 of the report with regards to no longer holding contextual data around NSS data. Contextual data would now be weaved across course entry information as there was evidence the information was not being used and rather than losing the information, it would now be embedded elsewhere.

3.1.9   Prof McIntyre-Bhatty also highlighted Section 4.13 with regards to partner websites where 15 sites included incorrect information regarding accommodation details, mobility co-ordinator details and incorrect links. At the time of the re-audit, three of the sites had been corrected, which therefore meant that 12 websites had not been corrected. Ms Fernandez agreed to provide an update for the December meeting of the Committee which would include the most up to date and accurate information as possible, prior to the meeting taking place.

Action: AF

3.2   **Faculty Quality Audit Report and Action Plan – Faculty of Management** (ASC-1617-06)

3.2.1   Dr Main reported that the Faculty of Management had benefitted from the Faculty Quality Audit and the Faculty had received helpful recommendations. The first four recommendations were reinforcement of the policies being put into place to ensure staff were carrying out their roles as expected. Papers Boards were now taking place for all programmes and these would be audited in early November 2016. A positive outcome was expected due to the high level of improvement works carried out over the summer on ensuring briefs were clear and were understood by students.

3.2.2   With regards to the second recommendation regarding second marker engagement, reminders would be communicated throughout the Faculty to ensure early second marker engagement in the marking process. Reminders would also be included in team meetings.

3.2.3   The recommendation with regards to the Faculty applying a dual track approach to PREP for 2016/17 and for all academic staff to focus on the theme of provision of assessment feedback to students would be very useful to the Faculty and would strengthen the work carried out already. Regular meetings would be taking place with Heads of Education and Heads of Departments to ensure work continued appropriately.

3.2.4   The recommendation which would ensure the Faculty builds and embeds a research culture across the Faculty and then embeds that within curricula, was timely and would start to address the need for students to experience Fusion in their learning. Heads of Education would need to discuss this recommendation with education teams to achieve outcomes by 2018.

3.2.5   The Executive Dean for the Faculty of Management had recently attended the Faculty's one day conference and a lot of ideas were considered to include in the strategic agenda moving forward. The Faculty would ensure the shared strategic agenda for enhancement was fully monitored and evaluated within the academic governance structure, including Faculty Academic Boards (FAB) and Faculty Education & Student Experience Committees (FESEC).

3.2.6   The Faculty would ensure that programme teams analyse data sources (SimOn, MUSE and NSS) and respond accordingly. It was noted that SimOn seemed to be a particularly effective and useful source of information when used in addition to MUSE and NSS.

3.2.7   The Faculty was in the process of carrying out an audit of the employability of all graduates and was developing an Action Plan. Each department would be considering its placement and graduate development activities and synthesising enhancements accordingly. As a result of the audit, the Faculty would be much improved and the recommendations would support the development of the Faculty.

3.2.8   Mr Swanson fully endorsed the third recommendation with regards to assessment criteria. It was important for the Faculty to ensure that all expectations set by staff were made clear and were understood by students, as on occasion errors were noticed. A team had been put together to look at the parameters of assessment from a Level perspective and a Unit perspective, which was a positive move forward. Following discussion it was agreed that the recommendation would be amended to include 'more dialogue with the student body'.

3.2.9   Ms Mack asked for further detail in relation to a progress update which said that timetabling had improved on the previous year. Dr Main explained that last year a timetabling staff member left the University in August at the same time as the amalgamation of two Schools' timetables into one Faculty timetable. This year the Faculty was determined to improve on the previous year as the Faculty's Operations Manager had requested data much earlier from lecturers. This had led to the earlier release of the timetables which was hugely beneficial to students.

3.2.10   Prof Rosser commented on the recommendation which suggested the Faculty applied a dual track approach to PREP for 2016/17. Dr Main advised that the Faculty would focus on the theme of assessment and feedback with i:Innovate across the Faculty or per Department using the department Head of Education as a top down channel.

3.2.11   In response to the outcomes, the good work continued to progress and it had been useful to focus on the positive aspects of the audit. Dr Main agreed to amend the documentation as appropriate and would send to the ASC Clerk to circulate to members for information.

Action: AM

3.2.12   With the enhanced practice already implemented within the Faculty, it was hoped the additional work being carried out would lead to improved NSS scores.

3.3   **Annual Report on Programme Approval, Review and Closure** (ASC-1617-07)

3.3.1   In previous years, the Annual Report on programme approval, review, closure and modification was part of the EDQ annual report which went to the April meeting of ASC. It had been agreed that this year it would be submitted as a separate report in order that a timely discussion could take place on the year's activity.

3.3.2   There were currently 325 programmes across the University and its Partners, compared to 331 in 2014/15 and 375 in 2013/14. Currently, 19% of BU programmes were delivered at Partners, compared to 21.5% in 2014/15 and 23% in 2013/14. As predicted, the number of events held during 2015/16 was less than in previous years, possibly due to new CMA guidance resulting in a longer lead in time for reviews. There had also been an increase in the number of periodic review deferral requests. The majority of these were due to Faculties awaiting new Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) curriculum requirements to be published. Over the last five years a large number of approvals and reviews had taken place, resulting in Faculties consolidating what was currently offered before periodic reviews were next due, or before developing additional new programmes.

3.3.3   For all closing programmes which had been in approval for five years or less, the Academic Quality team would now complete a Programme Closure Evaluation Form to collect information with regards to the history of the programme and the reasons for closure. It was hoped that closer institutional and Faculty oversight of programmes closing before the first periodic review, particularly in cases where new programmes never recruited, would provide trends which could be reported to the Committee.

3.3.4   The number of modifications increased year on year and there has been a lot of discussion around modifications, particularly with the DDEPPs, to look at the reasons why there have been so many modifications. Following discussions it was agreed that Programme Modification Forms should only be submitted to Faculty Academic Standards Committees (FASC) for consideration and approval when absolutely necessary. The proposed modifications should be considered first by the Head of Department (HoD), Head of Education and Professional Practice (HoEPP) and the programme team, in liaison with the DDEPP were necessary. Moving forward, modifications should only be requested in exceptional circumstances and should be submitted to FASC by 30 November for student intakes commencing in the following September. This timescale was to facilitate other downstream systems such as assessment and timetabling. There was a process to manage modifications which had to be progressed outside of this timescale.

3.3.5   During 2015/16 there had been an increase in retrospective modifications. Moving forward, it was hoped that the number of modifications overall would reduce.

3.3.6　As of September 2016, the number of scheduled programme approvals and reviews stood at 24 programmes for 2017 entry, 44 programmes for 2018 entry and 93 programmes for 2019 entry. Moving forward, programme reviews will be grouped by calendar year rather than academic year, in order that the process linked with the CMA timelines.

3.3.7　Some programmes listed in Appendix 1 did not currently align with the Common Academic Structure (CAS) and following a recent review, some PG programmes did not offer a January intake. Discussions were currently ongoing with Faculties to address this.

3.3.8　The revised programme approval and review process was introduced in order to streamline the entire process and to reduce the ARPP documentation. A reviewed and refreshed *ARPP 4A – Programme Approval, Review and Closure: Policy and Procedure* had been written which provided a shorter and more concise document which amalgamated three separate ARPP documents into one 11 page document. A lot of feedback has been received with regards to the newly update ARPP and a number of amendments had been made to the process following the training sessions and since staff had started to use the new documents. A survey was sent to staff to request feedback on the new process. The response rate was very low, however, many staff had provided feedback during the year.

3.3.9　One of the key highlights of the revised process was that Faculty Executives were now responsible for the initial approval and support of new programme development and to ensure there was a link to Delivery Planning. Internal Faculty Consideration had replaced the Design Phase and should be a short focused meeting for new programme developments. For reviews, it could be part of a FASC meeting. Documentation had also been significantly streamlined with more use of templates rather than lengthy ARPPs. The feedback received with regards to document templates and guidance text had been positive which in turn had reduced the level of telephone calls being made to the Academic Quality Team.

3.3.10　Recently, it had become apparent that some QAEG members who take part in programme approvals and reviews have been dependent on the Quality and Enhancement Officer from EDQ to decide whether programmes, conditions and recommendations were suitable. The staff development workshops would be re-launched to recap on all processes and to remind QAEG members of their role.

3.3.11　Ms Finnes informed the Committee that a number of the actions listed in Appendix 4 – Programme Approval, Review, Closure and Modification Action Plan, would continue to be worked on throughout the year.

3.3.12　Dr Main advised that the Faculty of Management now ensured that all documents were fit for purpose before the Internal Faculty Consideration meeting and moving forward it was important that everyone understood that formal modifications were not always required.

3.3.13　Ms Finnes confirmed that staff development sessions would be available in due course for those staff members who prepare documentation for new programmes.

3.3.14　The number of retrospective modifications in Table 3 totalled 22. Ms Finnes agreed to send Prof McIntyre-Bhatty more detail regarding each retrospective modification and whether they had all been completely unforeseen.

Action: NF

3.3.15　Overall, the Committee was reassured that the new process had improved the timescale for programme approval, review or closure.   It was important the quality of the documentation for the process remained at a high standard so that students had high quality information they could make an informed choice with.

4.　**PART TWO – FOR APPROVAL AND ENDORSEMENT**

4.1　**Quality Assurance and Enhancement Group (QAEG) – New Nominations Received**
(ASC-1617-08)

4.1.1   The nominations listed below were **approved** for QAEG membership:

- Brenda Masters
- Dr Katherine Curtis
- Dr Sue Baron
- Dr Simon Dyall
- Dr Margarete Parrish
- Dr Desiree Tait
- Petra Brown
- Dr Jonny Branney
- Ashley Spriggs
- Dr Teresa Burdett
- Emil Sawadi
- Dr Lenia Marques

4.2   New Programme/Framework Developments Proposals

4.2.1   Faculty of Science & Technology: New Programme Proposal – MSc Internet of Things (ASC-1617-09)

4.2.1.1   The proposal was for a new suite of four programmes under the heading of MSc Internet of Things and was part of the Faculty's Delivery Plan. Prof Katos proposed to create a Masters Level programme in the field of Internet of Things, together with three specialisations in Data Analytics, Cyber Security and Mobile Computing. The Internet of Things would centre on a wide range of networked devices capable of sensing and transmitting data in order to create smart homes, smart industries and smart cities.

4.2.1.2   The market research carried out had indicated that there was currently an Internet of Things skills gap, and there were no PGT Internet of Things courses listed in HESA data for 2014/15 entry, which was the latest year that data was available. Reflecting on the growth of the Internet of Things, universities were seeking to capitalise on this, and there were now three full time courses currently recruiting in the UK.

4.2.1.3   The Faculty Academic Standards Committee (FASC) had discussed the titles and had agreed on titles which would not be a burden to the Faculty resources and which were compatible with the Faculty's programmes. The proposed programmes would use existing units, with only three new units being proposed. Prof Katos explained that there would be core units available and then depending on the options, each student could work towards their own specialisation. A discussion took place around the titles of the programmes and whether brackets should be included in the title rather than using 'and', or to replace 'and' with the word 'with'. Members also questioned whether there would be sufficient student numbers to be able to deliver all three programmes. Prof Katos advised that the Faculty had now recruited lecturers with an interest in this area and had also purchased some devices with the purpose of using them for the proposed programmes.

4.2.1.4   It was noted that the MSc Internet of Things had only been listed as one title within the Faculty's Delivery Plan, and the Delivery Plan had stated that recruitment data would be 10 students which was low as the Committee would not generally consider cohorts of less than 15 students.

4.2.1.5   Overall, the Committee was supportive in principle of the proposed programmes with the exception of the proposed MSc Internet of Things and Mobile Computing. The Committee suggested that further discussion needed to take place within the Faculty with regards to the three remaining programme titles and the anticipated cohort numbers. Following the further work suggested, the final decision of the proposed programmes would be taken by Chair's Action. Ms Fernandez agreed to help with any marketing requirements.

4.2.1.6   **Approved:** The Committee gave approval in-principle to develop the MSc Internet of Things, MSc Internet of Things and Data Analytics and MSc Internet of Things and Cyber Security with further work to be carried out on the programme titles and the expected cohort numbers.

4.2.2 **Faculty of Media & Communication: New Programme Proposal – BA Interactive Media Production** (ASC-1617-10)

4.2.2.1 The BA Digital Media Design programme had been closed due to poor NSS results. The closure of the programme had left a gap in the Faculty's curriculum which had led to the Faculty proposing to launch the new BA Interactive Media Production programme.

4.2.2.2 Dr Dyer advised that although the proposed programme had not been included in the Delivery Plan, it did have full support of the Faculty Executive and a gap in the market had been identified. The Faculty had also worked on addressing the issues identified through the NSS and the Faculty believed there was a lot of potential for the proposed programme.

4.2.2.3 Following a discussion, members believed that it would be difficult to support the proposal to develop a new programme immediately after closing the previous programme.

4.2.2.4 The Committee agreed that the proposal could not be carried forward as members believed they had not been in receipt of satisfactory evidence and could not be assured it could be delivered well, taking into consideration its predecessor. Members were also concerned with the proposal to include a compulsory placement. Moving forward, the Faculty would be required to include any proposed programme developments in their Delivery Plan, solve all of the problems encountered with the previous programme, and put in place a programme which would deliver a course worthy of achieving at least 85% satisfaction in the National Student Survey.

4.2.3 **Faculty of Media & Communication: New Programme Proposal – MA Education Practice** (ASC-1617-10a)

4.2.3.1 The University currently has a PG Cert Education Practice programme in place which is a compulsory programme for all new members of academic staff in order to gain expertise in the facilitation of learning. The proposed Masters programme would include areas of expertise such as technology enhanced learning, employability/work based learning and innovative assessment. These areas could be accessed as stand-alone short courses or as part of the planned new validated MA programme.

4.2.3.2 Recently, the Centre for Excellence in Learning (CEL) had also been approached by University colleagues such as those who support learning, demonstrators, librarians and learning technologists who had shown an interest in the programme. There would also be a market outside of the University from academic staff of other institutions. Those institutions who had shown an interest to date were the Arts University Bournemouth, Further Education Colleges and NHS partners.

4.2.3.3 The mode of delivery would be part time provision and primarily online, with either face to face and/or virtual supervision as appropriate. With the use of blended learning, this would make the programme flexible enough to fit around work and resources. It was expected that the income from external students would go to the Faculty of Media and Communication to pay towards the administrative costs of supporting the programme.

4.2.3.4 Members noted that those students who complete the PG Cert programme would gain Higher Education Academy (HEA) Fellowship and those students who go on to complete the Masters programme may be eligible to apply for Senior Fellowship of the HEA.

4.2.3.5 Dr Eccles advised that PG Cert student numbers were healthy and based on conversations with colleagues who had achieved the PG Cert in Education Practice there was a lot of interest to sustain numbers. It was believed that internal numbers would remain constant, however over time the numbers of external students would increase.

4.2.3.6 **Approved:** The Committee gave approval in-principle to develop the proposed MA Education Practice programme, with further consideration to be given to developing the programme to a wider audience.

5   **PART THREE – FOR NOTE**

5.1   **NSS Results (**ASC-1617-11)

5.1.1   **Noted:** The Committee noted the report.

5.2   **New Partnership Agreements** (ASC-1617-12)

5.2.1   **Noted:** The Committee noted the report.

5.3   **Completed Framework/Programme Reviews, Validations and Reviews for Closure** (ASC-1617-13)

5.3.1   **Noted:** The Committee noted the report.

5.4   **Pending External Examiner Appointments** (ASC-1617-14)

5.4.1   Faculties had been working on those external examiner appointments outstanding. Moving forward it was anticipated that the number of external examiners coming to the end of their tenure would reduce as they would be progressed earlier.

5.4.2   Prof McIntyre-Bhatty reminded members there were a lot of external examiners coming to the end of their tenure and it was hoped by the next meeting in December, all positions would be filled.

5.4.3   Prof Rosser advised that generally the Faculty of Health & Social Sciences had two external examiners for the Advanced Mental Health Practice programmes as the Faculty historically had more exam boards taking place throughout the year. Due to merging boards this year and the reduction in number of meetings, Peter Hall would not need to be replaced.

5.4.4   Dr Dyer confirmed that the majority of the Faculty of Media & Communication external examiner vacancies had now been filled and were now waiting on the receipt of passport photographs.

5.5   **External Examiner Nominations and Examination Teams for Research Degrees** (ASC-1617-15)

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

5.6   **Partner Review Action Plans Annual Submission** (ASC-1617-16)

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

5.7   **Wiltshire College QAA Higher Education Review** (ASC-1617-17)

5.7.1   Ms Mack highlighted one judgement listed in the report which required improvement – 'The quality of student learning opportunities **requires improvement to meet** UK expectations'. It was noted that this judgement did not specifically relate to BU provision.

5.8   **Weymouth College QAA Higher Education Review** (ASC-1617-18)

5.8.1   **Noted:** The Committee noted the report.

5.9   Yeovil College QAA Higher Education Review (ASC-1617-19)

5.9.1   **Noted:** The Committee noted the report.

6   REPORTING COMMITTEES

6.1   **International and UK Partnerships Committee Minutes** (ASC-1617-20)

6.1.1   **Noted:** The International and UK Partnerships Committee minutes listed below were noted.

- 9 May 2016 (confirmed)
- 20 July 2016 (unconfirmed)

6.2   Partnership Board Minutes (ASC-1617-21)

6.2.1   **Noted**: The Bournemouth & Poole College (unconfirmed) Partnership Board minutes of 12 August 2016 were noted.

6.3   Quality Assurance Standing Group Minutes (ASC-1617-22)

6.3.1   **Noted:** The Quality Assurance Standing Group (unconfirmed) minutes of 4 May 2016 were noted.

6.4   Faculty Academic Standards Committee Minutes (ASC-1617-23)

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

- Faculty of Health & Social Sciences minutes of 29 June 2016 (unconfirmed)
- Faculty of Management minutes of 11 May 2016 (confirmed) and 7 July 2016 (unconfirmed)
- Faculty of Media & Communication minutes of 22 June 2016 (unconfirmed)
- Faculty of Science & Technology minutes of 18 May 2016 (unconfirmed)

7.   Graduate School Academic Board Minutes (ASC-1617-24)

7.1   **Noted:** The minutes of 24 May 2016 (unconfirmed) were noted.

8.   Joint Academic Board Minutes (ASC-1617-25)

8.1   **Noted:** The minutes of 23 June 2016 (unconfirmed) were noted.

9.   AECC Academic Development & Quality Committee Minutes (ASC-1617-26)

9.1   **Noted:** The minutes of 18 May 2016 (unconfirmed) were noted.

10.   Any Other Business

10.1   Prof Rosser questioned whether the attendance of both Heads of Department and Heads of Education at FASC meetings was excessive. The Chair advised that as the Heads of Education become embedded in education practice, the University needed to ensure they were engaged and had time to develop themselves in their roles, therefore both the Heads of Department and Heads of Education should attend all FASC meetings.

10.2   It was agreed that Item 4 on the FASC Terms of Reference which referred to 'Faculty Heads of Department (or equivalent)' should be amended to read 'Faculty Heads of Department'.

10.3   The Chair wished to formally thank Dr John Oliver who attended his last Academic Standards Committee meeting in May 2016 for his diligent services and strong contribution to the Committee.

11.   Date and Time of Next Meeting
Wednesday 7th December 2016 – 1.00pm in the Board Room