BOURNEMOUTH UNIVERSITY                                    **Confirmed**
ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE

**MINUTES OF A MEETING HELD ON 2<sup>ND</sup> MAY 2013**

**Present:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Prof Tim McIntyre-Bhatty (TMB) (Chair) | Deputy Vice Chancellor |
| Prof Keith Phalp (KP) (Deputy Chair) | Associate Dean, HOAG (Software Systems & Psychology)(DEC) |
| Ms Louise Bryant (LB) | President 2012/13, Students' Union (SUBU) |
| Dr Sue Eccles (SE) | Head of Education, Media School (MS) |
| Mr David Foot (DF) | Market Research and Development Manager, Marketing and Communications (M&C) |
| Mr Alan James (AJ) | General Manager of the Students' Union (SUBU) |
| Ms Jacky Mack (JM) | Academic Partnerships Manager, Student & Academic Services (SAS) |
| Prof Elizabeth Rosser (ER) | Deputy Dean for Education (HSC) |
| Ms Pamela Rouse (PJR) (Secretary) | Educational Development and Quality Manager (EDQ), Student & Academic Services |
| Dr Philip Ryland (PR) | Deputy Dean (Education), School of Tourism (ST) |
| Mr Murray Simpson (MS) | Vice President (Education) 2012/13, Students' Union (SUBU) |
| Dr Rick Stafford (RS) | Associate Dean (Quality) (ApSci) |
| Ms Catherine Symonds (CS) | Institutional Facilitator, School of Tourism (ST) |
| Mr Arvid Thorkeldsen (AT) | Director of Undergraduate Programmes, Anglo European College of Chiropractic (AECC) |
| Dr Xavier Velay (XV) | Deputy Dean (Education), School of Design, Engineering and Computing (DEC) |
| Dr Geoff Willcocks (GW) | Director of Quality and Accreditations, Business School. |
| Prof Tiantian Zhang (TZ) | Head of the Graduate School, Research and Knowledge Exchange Office (RKEO) |

**In Attendance:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Ms Marianne Barnard (MB) | Partnerships Academic Administration Manager (SAS) [Agenda Items 4.2, 4.3, 4.4.5, 4.4.6, 5.2, 6.1 and 6.2] |
| Mr Bill Beetham (BB) | International Pathways – Academic Co-ordinator (M&C) [Agenda Item 4.1] |
| Mr Robin Chater (RC) | Quality & Enhancement Officer [Agenda Item 3.4] |
| Ms Maxine Frampton (MF) (Clerk) | Policy and Committees Officer (SAS) |
| Dr Janet Hanson (JH) | Education Enhancement Adviser (SAS) [Agenda Item 3.1] |
| Mr Geoff Rayment (GR) | Committee Clerk (SAS) |
| Dr Richard Shipway (RS) | Senior Lecturer in Sports Studies (ST) [Agenda Items 4.4.5 and 4.4.6] |

**1       APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from:

| | |
|---|---|
| Mr Ian Carter | Member of University Board, Observer |
| Mr James Holroyd | Student Journey Process Workstream Manager (Senate Representative). |
| Dr Sherry Jeary | Senior Lecturer, School of Design, Engineering and Computing (DEC) |
| Dr John Oliver | Deputy President EMMA, Programme Director (MS) |
| Prof David Osselton | Head of Forensic and Biological Sciences, School of Applied Sciences (ApSci) |

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 14 FEBRUARY 2013**

2.1.1 **Accuracy**

2.1.2 The minutes (ASC-1213-139) were approved as an accurate record with the exception of Section 4.3.1.1 which should read "Professional Doctorate (Research Practice)".

**2.2    Matters Arising** (ASC-1213-140)

2.2.1 Minute 2.3.1.2 - Updated Media School Report
*The action had been completed and was also listed on the agenda for ratification under agenda item 2.3.*

2.2.2 Minute 3.5.2 – BU Mapping to QAA Quality Code for HE: Chapter B5 – Student Engagement
*This subject had been discussed at the Student Voice Committee meeting on 24 April 2013.  When the minutes of the meeting were available and the mapping had been updated, the information would be circulated to all members.  It was also agreed this item would be referred to the next ESEC meeting on 29 May 2013.*

2.2.3 Minute 3.6.1 – BU Mapping to QAA Quality Code for HE: Chapter B11 – Research Degrees
*The action had been completed and the recommendations had been reviewed to ensure consistency and clarity in the text.*

2.2.4 Minute 3.11.1 – Student Population Statistics
*Members were reminded there may be differences in performance between ALN students and non-ALN students, and therefore a further statistical review of the data had been carried out by Dr Sheridan.*

*It was agreed that a longitudinal analysis should be made of the past two or three years information to see whether there was a pattern emerging and cross-refer the information to ESEC, Schools and student support services within SAS.*

**Action: LS**

*The ALS Team would also be asked for their views regarding how much support and advice was being provided to students.*

**Action: ALS**

**2.3    Updated Media School Report (ASC-1213-141)**

2.3.1 The Committee **ratified** the updated Media School Report.

**3       PART ONE:  FOR DISCUSSION**

**3.1    BU Mapping to QAA Quality Code for HE: Chapter B3 – Learning and Teaching** (ASC-1213-142)
*Received: Review of the QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education Chapter B3: Learning and Teaching*

3.1.1 Dr Hanson gave an overview of the review, which outlined the principles and arrangements that BU applies to the quality assurance and enhancement of learning and teaching opportunities in order to meet the requirements of the QAA Quality Code.  The paper had been discussed by Deputy Deans, Academic Partnerships, the Graduate School, SUBU and EDQ and the amended points were now formulated for the Committee to review.  The Quality Code incorporated three previous codes and covered students with a disability, distance learning and students at all levels on various programmes.

An update was provided on the two Indicators which required action.

3.1.2 <u>Indicator 2</u> – Dr Palfreman-Kay had been developing a number of Equality Impact Assessments and had prepared further guidelines for Framework Teams and Evaluation Panels, who would then be invited to consider how to accommodate disabled students and protected groups of students.

3.1.3 <u>Indicator 4</u> - BU had a KPI which gave a commitment to increase the proportion of academic staff who were Fellows of the HEA from 30% to 100% by 2018.  The Head of Education (MS) advised that Linda Byles, had been seeking accreditation from the HEA so that BU could award full fellowship status to its staff.  The Head of Education (MS) advised she would be meeting with DD(E)s on 15 May 2013 and would disseminate the information to Schools and to ESEC to review progress.  The proposed action point would be made more specific to reflect outcomes of that meeting.

Discussions regarding other 'Indicators' within the document took place:

3.1.4 <u>Indicator 7</u> - Indicator 7 provided a lot of information on undergraduate students, however it was felt that further research was required on postgraduate students' needs with regards to induction, e.g. additional induction handbooks or information.  The Academic Partnerships Manager and Dr Hanson would meet to add an additional 'proposed action' to the report to reflect this.  They would liaise with colleagues as necessary and identify who was best placed to review postgraduate pre-arrival and other information to establish whether current provision was adequate.

**Action:  JM/JH**

3.1.5 Indicator 8 - It was suggested that the phrase 'sign-up' be amended to 'engage with'.

3.1.6 <u>Indicator 9</u> - It was noted that a common template would be in use within each School from the start of the next academic year.  It was suggested an audit should be carried out at the end of the academic year to look at how the assessment sheets were being used.

3.1.7 Following discussion of various 'Indicators', Dr Hanson would make the amendments suggested by members and an updated document would be discussed at the next ESEC meeting on 29 May 2013.

**Action: JH**

**3.2** **Academic Offences Annual Report – Update on Actions** (ASC-1213-143)
*Received: Academic Offences Annual Report – Response from Six Schools: Update on Actions*

3.2.1 Following the December 2012 ASC meeting, the Deputy Dean of Education (HSC) had collated DD(E)s' comments regarding action to prevent plagiarism in order to provide an update on actions to the Committee.  There were many commonalities and existing good practice across Schools with a lot being done to help and prepare students.  A major issue was commissioned assignments and the sense that there was an increase in the use of commissioning agents.

3.2.2 The SUBU President commented that all Schools should include a plagiarism and self-plagiarism warning in their assignment briefs.

**Action:  DD(E)s**

3.2.3 Members agreed that commissioned assignments were extremely difficult to identify, and as a result of unitisation, students' work submitted for marking was not always marked by the same academic.

3.2.4 The Director of Quality and Accreditations (BS) commented that plagiarism had reduced with the introduction of Turnitin, which had in turn increased commissioning.  In order to reduce the commissioning of assignments, it was suggested that milestones could be built into dissertations to monitor data or research methods, for example.  Members agreed that increased guidance to students would be very beneficial, and the Deputy Dean of Education (ST) commented that tutors sometimes specified that a sample of the student's own data be presented with the assignment.

3.2.5    The Chair noted that the Director of Quality and Accreditations (BS) was establishing a working group to consider the issue of commissioning.  He asked that he take the lead on this on behalf of the Committee and conduct research of other higher education institutions' responses to the issue and advise the Committee of his findings for future discussion.

**Action:  GW**

3.2.6    SAS had been working on their Delivery Plan for international student support and it was agreed that additional support for international students regarding plagiarism and self-plagiarism should be included.  Some international students were at risk of unwittingly committing an offence due to cultural differences and varying attitudes to plagiarism.  It would therefore be worthwhile providing additional support and advice to international students.

**Action: JM**

3.2.7    The Committee **noted** the report.


3.3    **Standard Assessment Regulations: Recommendations for Change from Quality Assurance Standing Group (QASG)** (ASC-1213-144)
*Received: Standard Assessment Regulations: Recommendations for Change from Quality Assurance Standing Group (QASG)*

3.3.1    Ms Symonds reminded members of the proposals for change outlined in the agenda paper which were considered at the February 2013 ASC meeting [ASC-1213-118].  This had made a number of recommendations arising from the annual review of the University's standard assessment regulations for taught programmes carried out by the QASG.  Following the QASG meeting held on 22 April 2013, QASG members had agreed to recommend a number of further changes to ensure that students in all modes of study were being treated fairly.

3.3.2    Following discussion of the illustrative scenarios posed within the report, members agreed that Option 1 was the most equitable option, and had also been recommended by QASG following considerable dialogue. The accompanying recommendation to make the necessary changes to the Standard Assessment Regulations was also approved. Implementation would be continually monitored by QASG.  It was agreed that support should to be provided to students after each semester and guidance should be disseminated across all Schools.  It was confirmed a review would take place by QASG after the first academic year of the amended Regulations being in place.

3.3.3    *Recommendation 1 to ASC:* that Option 1 is adopted to support the implementation of the proposed new capping rule. *6L – Assessment Board Decision-Making*, including the *Implementation of Assessment Regulations: Procedure* to be amended accordingly to outline that all students would qualify for the same number of reassessment opportunities before entering repeat mode only if/when they exceed the reassessment threshold for the level.

3.3.4    The Committee **approved** Recommendation 1.

3.3.5    *Recommendation 2 to ASC*: to recommend to Senate that *Section 12 of 6A – Standard Assessment Regulations, 'Provision for Failed Candidates'*, be amended to specify that all students qualify for reassessment regardless of the total number of credits they had failed in a level.

3.3.6    The Committee **endorsed** Recommendation 2 for approval by Senate.

3.3.7    A further recommendation was made that the Exam Board should use its discretion to determine which units must be made good through reassessment and which must be repeated, and reach a decision based on academic judgement with rationale clearly recorded in the Board minutes.  Members expressed some concerns that this would provide scope for inconsistencies of approach and requested that further guidance be provided to Exam Boards.

3.3.8   *Recommendation 3 to ASC*: that where a Board determines both reassessment and repetition opportunities for a student, this should be based on Board discretion.

3.3.9   The Committee **endorsed** Recommendation 3 in principle with agreement that this would be referred back to QASG to provide guidance to Boards and Chairs before the start of the new academic year to ensure consistency.   This recommendation would be forwarded to Senate for approval, together with the resulting guidance, before the start of the new academic year so that it would be in effect in 2013/14.

**Action:  EDQ**

3.3.10  An overview was given of Recommendations 4 and 5 which included the definition of self-plagiarism and assessment requirements for repeat students, following requests from Schools to clarify guidance in these areas.  It was agreed that clearer guidance on plagiarism and self-plagiarism should be made available to students and both should be published within University documentation.  QASG had also discussed and agreed that in principle students could utilise previously submitted work if they had not received credit for it, for reassessment, without being in breach of self-plagiarism.

3.3.11  *Recommendation 4 to ASC*:  to recommend to Senate that *Section 12.7, 'Provision for Failed Candidates'*, of *6A – Standard Assessment Regulations (Postgraduate Taught Programmes)* be amended to allow an Assessment Board to determine whether a failed Dissertation or Final Project was retrievable for repetition purposes.

3.3.12  The Committee **endorsed** Recommendation 4 for approval by Senate.

3.3.13  *Recommendation 5 to ASC*: to approve changes to *6L – Assessment Board Decision-Making*, including the implementation of *Assessment Regulations: Procedure* to reflect the principle that students could be allowed to utilise work for which they have not received credit, for both reassessment and repeat purposes and the proposed change to the standard assessment regulations for postgraduate taught programmes.

3.3.14  The Committee **approved** Recommendation 5.


**3.4    Academic Offences: Policy and Procedure for Taught Awards: Recommendations for Change from Quality Assurance Standing Group (QASG)** (ASC-1213-145)
*Received: Review of 6H – Academic Offences Policy and Procedure for Taught Awards – Recommendations for Change from the Quality Assurance Standing Group (QASG)*

3.4.1   Mr Chater had conducted an annual review of the Academic Offences Policy and had gathered feedback and views from a number of stakeholders.  QASG had considered the issues which had arisen and a number of changes were proposed.

Recommendation 1

3.4.2   Following discussion it was agreed that Academic Offences Panels may request further evidence in exceptional circumstances when the Panel had heard both sides and had seen evidence, and then felt that further evidence was required which was likely to significantly affect the outcome.

3.4.3   The Committee **approved** QASG Recommendation 1.

Recommendation 2

3.4.4   Discussion took place regarding how an Academic Offences Panel may deal with additional evidence that was presented at the meeting, or provided to Panel members and/or the student less than five working days before the meeting, and whether this should be allowed.  Concerns were raised that the removal of a 'hard deadline' could prove problematic and make it difficult to keep to schedule.  It was agreed that all evidence should be with all parties at least five working days before a meeting takes place.

3.4.5 Following discussion of QASG Recommendation 2 -- that in exceptional circumstances additional evidence could be provided after the 5 working days deadline -- failed to receive strong support from the Committee and was **rejected**.

Recommendation 3

3.4.6 An overview was given of possible cases where a student might gain unfair advantage by making use of a translator to translate their work into English from their native language, thereby significantly changing the meaning or content. The Committee agreed that such use of a translator be added to the existing academic offence definition xiv.

3.4.7 The Committee **approved** QASG Recommendation 3.

Recommendation 4

3.4.8 An overview was given of the Tariff of Penalties: Penalties 1 and 2, and the problems identified with the implementation of Penalty 1 whilst retaining distinction from Penalty 2. Revised wording of Penalties 1 and 2 which aimed to resolve any discrepancies in interpretation were presented to the Committee for discussion and approval.

3.4.9 The Committee **approved** QASG Recommendation 4.

Recommendation 5

3.4.10 With regard to the retention of academic offences records in cases where the outcome was "no case to answer", it was confirmed that all records should be destroyed. However, in order to have an audit trail of all academic offences, it was suggested a central record should be maintained which did not identify the student, but would include key details of a case.

3.4.11 The Committee **approved** QASG Recommendation 5.

Recommendation 6

3.4.12 Following discussion, it was agreed that, if members of an academic offences panel should learn that a student was previously involved in a suspected case where the outcome was 'no case to answer', this must not be taken into account or allowed to prejudice the decision of the Panel for the current case.

3.4.13 The Committee **approved** QASG Recommendation 6.

Recommendation 7

3.4.14 An overview of QASG Recommendation 7 was given and members were advised how the University currently defines duplication or self-plagiarism. QASG had discussed this notion and had agreed that in principle students could utilise work for which they had not received credit for repeat or reassessment purposes.

3.4.15 The SUBU President advised that the explanation of self-plagiarism was often not clear to students and it was suggested the word "individual" be inserted to Recommendation 7 before the word "assessment".

3.4.16 The SUBU President also commented on the phrase "in order to make good failure", which was confusing for students. It was recommended the phrase be reworded to "in order to rectify failure".

3.4.17 The Deputy Dean of Education (ST) suggested the word "normally" be added before the word "submitted" in order to clarify whether there was any self-plagiarism.

3.4.18 The Committee **approved** QASG Recommendation 7 subject to the amendments suggested by members.

3.5 **3B Admissions (Research Degree Programmes): Policy and Procedure**
(ASC-1213-146)
*Received: 3B – Admissions (Research Degree Programmes): Policy and Procedures*

3.5.1 The Head of the Graduate School introduced the updated 3B Admissions (Research Degree Programmes): Policy and Procedure.

3.5.2 The Director of Quality and Accreditations (BS) suggested that Section 4.5 – Fair Access should be re-titled "Equal Opportunities". The Head of the Graduate School agreed with the comment made and would also check that the Head of Admissions had agreed the document.

**Action: TZ**

3.5.3 It was suggested the last sentence of Section 10.2.1 be re-phrased to make clear that online and telephone interviews were acceptable to the University.

3.5.4 Subject to the amendments suggested, 3B Admissions (Research Degree Programmes): Policy and Procedure was **endorsed** for approval by Senate.

3.6 **School of Applied Sciences School Quality Report & Action Plan and one year on Action Plan Update** (ASC-1213-147)
*Received: School of Applied Sciences – School Quality Audit Action Plan*

3.6.1 The Educational Development & Quality Manager introduced the School of Applied Sciences School Quality Audit Report from the Audit held on 7 March 2013, and Action Plans from this and also from the Audit held on 25 January 2012.

3.6.2 The outcome of the audit contained some commendations for the School and also made a number of recommendations that were contained within the Action Plan. It was confirmed the actions from 2012 were now all complete and the Committee was requested to approve the actions listed within the Action Plan for 2013.

3.6.3 The Panel were pleased that progress had been made and noted the very positive feedback from students regarding their experience within the School and of the University.

3.6.4 The Committee **noted and endorsed** the School of Applied Sciences School Quality Report and Action Plan.

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

4.1 **International Students Pathway Project, Kaplan International College (KIC) – Articulation Agreement Schedule A – Confidential Item** (ASC-1213-148)
*Received: International Students Pathway Project, Kaplan International College (KIC) – Articulation Agreement Schedule A*

*Secretary's Note: This item has been redacted due to inconsistency contained within the documentation provided to members. The updated documentation will be submitted for consideration at the ASC meeting scheduled for 29 July 2013.*

4.2 **Quality Assurance and Enhancement Group (QAEG) – New Nomination Received –**
(ASC-1213-149)
*Received: Quality Assurance and Enhancement Group (QAEG) Nomination – Jeffrey Chartrand, Bournemouth & Poole College*

4.2.1 Jeffrey Chartrand, Bournemouth & Poole College

The nomination of Jeffrey Chartrand for QAEG membership was **approved.**

**4.3    Partner Quality Report – Defence School of Communication & Information Systems (DSCIS)** (ASC-1213-150)
*Received: Partner Quality Report – Defence School of Communication & Information Systems (DSCIS)*

4.3.1    The Partnerships Academic Administration Manager presented the DSCIS Partner Quality Report.

4.3.2    The Committee **approved** the DSCIS Partner Quality Report.


**4.4    New Programme/Framework Developments Proposals**

4.4.1    <u>**DEC Proposal: Change of Title for Yeovil College Programme – FdSc Computing and Internet Technology to FdSc Computing**</u> (ASC-1213-151)
*Received: Programme Revalidation – FdSc Computing at University Centre, Yeovil (UCY)*

4.4.1.1    The Deputy Dean of Education (DEC) advised that University Centre, Yeovil sought to re-title the course from FdSC Computing and Internet Technology to FdSc Computing to improve recruitment in response to changing market conditions.

4.4.1.2    It was suggested that the IELTS entry qualification should be amended to 6.0 rather than 6.5.

4.4.1.3    The Committee **approved** the change of title of FdSc Computing and Internet Technology to FdSc Computing, subject to the amendment suggested.


4.4.2    <u>**DEC Proposal: New Programme – MSc Information Technology (Online)**</u> (ASC-1213-152)
*Received: Programme Development Proposal – MSc Information Technology (Online)*

4.4.2.1    The Deputy Dean of Education (DEC) gave an overview of the MSc Information Technology (Online) programme which would be delivered by the London School of Business and Finance (LSBF) through a distance learning platform.

4.4.2.2    LSBF had conducted a market analysis for the provision of online MSc Information Technology and it was estimated that the programme could recruit 8 students per month worldwide.

4.4.2.3    A typing error was noted in Section 4.1 of the report and it was confirmed that the date of the first intake would be January 2014 rather than January 2013.

4.4.2.4    The Committee **approved** the new programme – MSc Information Technology (Online).


4.4.3    <u>**AECC Proposal: New Programme – BSc (Hons) Human Sciences/MSc – Graduate Diploma Human Sciences**</u> (ASC-1213-153)
*Received: AECC Proposal: New Programme – BSc (Hons) Human Sciences/MSc – Graduate Diploma Human Sciences*

4.4.3.1    The Director of Undergraduate Programmes (AECC) introduced the proposed new programme which would provide an alternative pathway for entry into the chiropractic profession.  Students could enter the programme on a two year graduate diploma and then move on to a Masters degree.  This would enable them to gain a Masters degree in Chiropractic after four years rather than five.

4.4.3.2 Following discussion, members requested that the Director of Undergraduate Programmes provide further clarification on the award, the level and title, and re-present the proposal to the Committee at its next meeting on 29 July 2013.  It was also requested that a diagram of the programme structure be provided.

**Action:  AT**

4.4.4 **ST Proposal: FdA Business & Hospitality Management and BA (Hons) Business & Hospitality Management (Level H Entry)** (ASC-1213-154)
*Received: ASC Initial Approval Form – New Programme Proposals – FdA Business & Hospitality Management and BA (Hons) Business and Hospitality Management (Level H Entry)*

4.4.4.1 The Deputy Dean of Education (ST) outlined the proposal which was designed to provide current CertHE Business and Hospitality Management CPD students with a progression route to FdA and Honours level.

4.4.4.2 The Committee **approved** the two new programmes: FdA Business & Hospitality Management and BA (Hons) Business & Hospitality Management (Level H Entry).

4.4.5 **New Partner Proposal: Prince of Songkla University, Thailand – Student Exchange (Level 2)** (ASC-1213-155)

4.4.5.1 Partnership Development Proposal
*Received: Prince of Songkla University (PSU), Phuket, Thailand – Partnership Development Proposal for Student Exchange (Level 2)*

4.4.5.2 Dr Shipway introduced the partnership proposal with the Prince of Songkla University (PSU) in Thailand.  This partnership would primarily facilitate student and staff mobility and would develop international research links in tourism and hospitality.  PSU already have existing partnerships including with Hong Kong Polytechnic University and they appear to be considering a partnership with Surrey University.  It was noted that Dr Shipway would be visiting PSU in May 2013 to carry out a mapping process and to build on previous discussions.

4.4.5.3 Due Diligence Report
*Received: Prince of Songkla University (PSU) – Due Diligence Report*

4.4.5.4 The Partnerships Academic Administration Manager introduced the due diligence report and advised that the Prince of Songkla University (PSU) was a highly ranked University in Thailand and globally with partnership agreements with institutions around the world.

4.4.5.5 The Committee **approved** the partnership with Prince of Songkla University, Phuket, Thailand.

4.4.6 **New Partner Proposal:  Mercy College, USA – Student Exchange (Level 2)** (ASC-1213-156)

4.4.6.1 Partnership Development Proposal
*Received: Mercy College, USA – Partnership Development Proposal*

4.4.6.2 Dr Shipway introduced the partnership proposal with Mercy College, USA for an institutional partnership for Research/Staff Exchange (Level 1) and Student Exchange (Level 2).  The partnership would be primarily based around staff and student exchanges and aligned most closely with MS, DEC and the BS.  Mercy College currently had partnerships with Glamorgan University and the University of Roehampton and positive feedback had been received from both institutions.  Mercy College was based in the state of New York, which would be an attractive destination for BU students.

4.4.6.3 It was questioned which programmes and Schools would seek an exchange arrangement with this partner. It was agreed that Dr Shipway would work with Mr Ridolfo of the Business School to undertake a mapping exercise of the programmes involved.

**Action: RS**

4.4.6.4 <u>Due Diligence Report</u>
*Received: Mercy College, USA – Due Diligence Report*

4.4.6.5 The Partnerships Academic Administration Manager introduced the due diligence report and advised that Mercy College was a private, non-profit liberal arts college in New York ranked lower than BU worldwide.

4.4.6.6 The Committee **approved** the partnership with Mercy College, USA in principle subject to the action requested by the Committee.


## 5 PART THREE – FOR NOTE

### 5.1 Institutional Review and Sector Consultations Update (ASC-1213-157)
*Received: Institutional Review and Sector Consultations Update*

5.1.1 Members were advised the first QAA Institutional Review team visit to BU had taken place on 30 April 2013 and 1 May 2013. The second visit would take place during week commencing 10 June 2013.


### 5.2 Partnership Agreements (ASC-1213-158)
*Received: New Partnership Agreements (February 2013 to April 2013)I*

5.2.1 A paper which provided details of the partnership agreements that had been signed between February 2013 and April 2013 was **noted.**


### 5.3 Completed Framework/Programme Reviews, Validations and Reviews for Closure (ASC-1213-159)
*Received: Outcomes from Recent Evaluation Events and List of Completed Evaluation Events*

5.3.1 The outcomes from recent evaluation events were presented to the Committee. The Deputy Dean of Education (ST) drew attention to Section 1.8 on page 184 of the ST Undergraduate and Postgraduate Review, and confirmed that he had formally responded on the recommendation and a plan had been put into place.

5.3.2 The Committee **ratified** the approved Evaluation Events.


### 5.4 Pending External Examiner Appointments (ASC-1213-160)
*Received: Pending External Examiner Appointments*

5.4.1 The Committee **noted** the report.


### 5.5 External Examiner Nominations and Examination Teams for Research Degrees (ASC-1213-161)
*Received: External Examiner Nominations and Examination Teams for Research Degrees*

5.5.1 The Committee **ratified** the external examiner appointments.

## 6  REPORTING COMMITTEES

**6.1  International and UK Partnerships Committee Minutes** (ASC-1213-162)
*Received: International and UK Partnerships Committee Minutes of Meetings held on 6 February 2013 and 11 March 2013*

6.1.1  The minutes were **noted.**


**6.2  Partnership Board Minutes** (ASC-1213-163)

6.2.1  The following Partnership Board minutes were **noted**.

Wiltshire College minutes of 18 December 2012 (unconfirmed)
BBC minutes of meeting held on 15 January 2013 (unconfirmed)
AECC minutes of meeting held on 31 January 2013 (unconfirmed)
The Weald & Downland Museum minutes of meeting held on 28 February 2013 (unconfirmed)


**6.3  Quality Assurance Standing Group Minutes** (ASC-1213-164)
*Received:  QASG Minutes of 22 April 2013 (unconfirmed)*

6.3.1  The minutes were **noted.**


**6.4  School Academic Standards Committee (SASC) Minutes** (ASC-1213-165)

6.4.1  The following SASC minutes were **noted**.

MS Minutes of meeting held on 30 January 2013 (unconfirmed)
HSC Minutes of meeting held on 13 February 2013 (unconfirmed)
ApSci Minutes of meeting held on 30 January 2013 (unconfirmed)
DEC Minutes of meeting held on 6 February 2013 (unconfirmed)
BS Minutes of meeting held on 6 March 2013 (unconfirmed)
ST Minutes of meeting held on 6 February 2013 (unconfirmed)

6.4.2  The Deputy Dean of Education (DEC) was requested to advise the Chair when the issue relating to EdExcel had been resolved.

**Action: XV**

**6.5  Graduate School, School Academic Board Minutes** (ASC-1213-166)
*Received: Graduate School, School Academic Board Meeting Minutes of 26 February 2013 (unconfirmed)*

6.5.1  The minutes were **noted.**


## 7  ANY OTHER BUSINESS

7.1  The Chair advised members that this ASC meeting would be the last which the current SUBU President would attend.  The Chair gave thanks to the SUBU President for her hard work and significant contribution to the University.


## 8  DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING
Monday 29th July 2013 at 10.00am in the Board Room