

MINUTES OF A MEETING HELD ON 14TH SEPTEMBER 2012

Present:

Prof Tim McIntyre-Bhatty (TMB)(Chair)	Deputy Vice Chancellor (Student Experience, Education and Professional Practice)
Ms Louise Bryant (LB)	SU President 2012/13, Students' Union (SUBU)
Dr Sue Eccles (SE)	Head of Education, Media School (MS)
Mr Alan James (AJ)	General Manager of the Students' Union (SUBU)
Mr Clive Matthews (CM)	Deputy Dean (Education), School of Health & Social Care (HSC)
Prof Keith Phalp (KP) (Deputy Chair)	Associate Dean, HOAG (Software Systems & Psychology), School of Design, Engineering and Computing (DEC)
Ms Pamela Rouse (PR) (Secretary)	Educational Development and Quality (EDQ) Manager, Student & Academic Services (SAS)
Mr Murray Simpson	SU Vice President Education 2012/13, Students' Union (SUBU)
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 (BS)
Prof Tiantian Zhang (TZ)	Head of the Graduate School, Research and Knowledge Exchange Office (RKEO)

1 APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from:

Mr David Ball (DB)	Head of Academic Development Services, Student and Academic Services (SAS)
Mr Ian Carter (IC)	University Board Member
Mr David Foot (DF)	Market Research and Development Manager, Marketing and Communications (M&C)
Prof Alan Fyall (AF)	Deputy Dean (Research), School of Tourism (ST)
Ms Ana Gutierrez (AG)	Head of Student Administration, Student and Academic Services (SAS)
Dr Ross Hill (RH)	Associate Dean (Education), School of Applied Sciences (ApSci)
Mr James Holroyd (JH)	Student Journey Process Workstream Manager, Office of the Vice Chancellor (OVC)
Ms Sherry Jeary (SJ)	Senior Lecturer, School of Design, Engineering and Computing (DEC)
Ms Jacky Mack (JM)	Academic Partnerships Manager, Student & Academic Services (SAS)
Mr Philip Ryland (PR)	Deputy Dean (Education), School of Tourism (ST)
Prof David Osselton (DO)	Head of Forensic and Biological Sciences, School of Applied Sciences (ApSci)
Ms Catherine Symonds (CS)	Institutional Facilitator, School of Tourism (ST)

IN ATTENDANCE

Ms Marianne Barnard (MB)	Partnerships Academic Administration Manager, Student and Academic Services (SAS)
Mr Robin Chater (RC)	Quality and Enhancement Officer, Student and Academic Services (SAS)
Ms Maxine Frampton (MF) (Clerk)	Policy and Committee Officer, Student and Academic Services (SAS)
Mr Steve Gill (SG)	Financial Business Intelligence Analyst, Finance and Performance (F&P)
Ms Becky House (BH)	Senior Lecturer, School of Design, Engineering and Computing (DEC)
Dr Vicky Lewis (VL)	Director of Marketing and Communications, Marketing and Communications (M&C)
Dr Andrew Main (AM)	Associate Dean Student Experience, School of Design, Engineering and Computing (DEC), [for items 3.5 & 4.1]

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 28TH JUNE 2012

2.1 Accuracy

2.1.1 The minutes were approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

2.2 Matters Arising

2.2.1 Minute 2.2.1: The issue with regards to medical certificates being issued to students for minor ailments was ongoing, and a paper would be submitted to the Committee by the Head of Student Services at a future meeting. It was noted that the Medical Centre have agreed to continue to operate the same system for 2012/13 as they did last year, namely to issue proper certificates for shorter term illnesses, at a charge.

2.2.2 Minute 2.2.6: The desk based due diligence in respect of the Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM) was yet to be completed. It would be submitted to a future meeting of the Committee.

2.2.3 Minute 3.3: To be discussed under Agenda item 3.4.

2.2.4 Minute 3.3.2: It was queried whether the cross School event regarding the new international preparatory programmes proposal had taken place yet. It was confirmed that a meeting had been held. However, as some interested parties may not have had an opportunity to attend, the Chair would discuss with the project team whether to hold a further cross School meeting.

Action: TMB

The Director of M&C would also raise the matter at the International Pathways Steering Group meeting on 17 September 2012.

Action: VL

2.3 ASC Terms of Reference and Membership

Received: 2.3 ASC Terms of Reference and List of Members

2.3.1 The Committee were asked for comments regarding the ASC Terms of Reference and Membership. It was commented that the role of Students' Union Vice President Representation had changed to that of Students' Union Vice President Education.

2.3.2 **Resolved:** the membership section of the Terms of Reference would be updated to reflect this change.

3 PART ONE: FOR DISCUSSION

3.1 NSS Results

Received: National Student Survey Results

- 3.1.1 The survey results were introduced to the Committee. It was reported that further sector wide data was due to be received on 17 September 2012. Survey results data would be embargoed until 27 September 2012. It was noted that partner NSS results had not been included in the report and would be available at a future date.
- 3.1.2 The score for overall student satisfaction had risen from 70% in 2011 to 79% in 2012, with scores in other areas also showing improvement. This year a new category had been introduced to gauge student satisfaction with the Students' Union. With an overall score of 75%, BU had performed well in this compared to other institutions.
- 3.1.3 There had been an improvement in scores across all categories in comparison with the previous year. The Committee commended everyone involved on their contribution, although it was important to make further progress.
- 3.1.4 It was noted that all Schools would be responding to NSS results through their Education and Student Experience Plans (ESEPs).

3.2 Marketing and Communications Annual Report

Received: Marketing and Communications Annual Report

- 3.2.1 The Director of Marketing and Communications summarised the paper for the Committee. Reassurance was provided that processes were in place to ensure all marketing material was accurate and reliable.
- 3.2.2 It was vital to ensure that information being fed through to the course search tool on the BU website was accurate. The transition from a paper-based to an online version of the ASC initial approval form for new framework/programme proposals would enhance accuracy and help to avoid a delay in advertising courses. It was planned to implement a more sophisticated system for website content management that would eliminate any discrepancy between online and printed course marketing materials by deriving the printed versions directly from the online ones.
- 3.2.3 Key Information Sets (KIS) had been produced and, to help with the interpretation of the data, Schools had provided M&C with contextual data that would supplement course information on the website.
- 3.2.4 This year an online marketing partner guide had been introduced which would provide a 'one stop shop' for information for partners to use when promoting Bournemouth University courses. It was reported that completion of the annual review of UK partners was imminent and the audit of international partners would take place in October.
- 3.2.5 It was reported that Academic Partnerships had been working to enhance online marketing of partner provision and to make it clearer to prospective students that courses were based at the partner institution. Further work would be carried out with International and UK marketing staff to look at streamlining processes to avoid any risk of error.
- 3.2.6 The audit of online partner course information carried out in September was planned to be followed up with a final check in January 2013 to ensure that all amendments had been completed. It was confirmed that the majority of inconsistencies in previous cycles related to entry requirements, unit titles, start dates and fees not being listed. The Director of M&C would clarify the scale of the inconsistencies identified in the audit of partner programme online marketing information and the length of time taken to rectify any errors identified.

Action: VL

- 3.2.7 It was reported that an online version of the ASC initial approval form for new framework/programme proposals would be developed. It was recognised that this should satisfy Schools' needs as well as those of EDQ and M&C. The Director of M&C would relay this back to her department.

Action: VL

3.3 Framework Evaluation and Processes Annual Report

Received: Framework Evaluation and Processes Annual Report 2012

- 3.3.1 The EDQ Manager summarised the paper for the Committee, highlighting the process and the outcomes of evaluation activity undertaken on behalf of ASC and drawing attention to the Action Plan in Appendix 2. It was reported there had been fewer actions arising this year than in previous years, with the process now working well.
- 3.3.2 During 2011/12 a total of 41 evaluation events had been completed, which involved 88 award titles. Of the 41 events, 20 involved a meeting with the framework team, 12 were undertaken as a paper based exercise and 9 were undertaken by SASCs. In the forthcoming year 43 events were expected. It was reported that compared to last year, the number of framework reviews for 2012/13 was expected to double and the number of reviews for programme closure would reduce. The number of early reviews increased the overall volume of review events.
- 3.3.3 Areas of good practice were highlighted with the most commonly cited commendations based around established links with employers; enthusiasm from students; quality of resources/facilities offered to students; enthusiasm and commitment from the framework teams and the standard of documentation.
- 3.3.4 Revising unit descriptors had been the most commonly stipulated condition/recommendation arising from evaluation events and since this might be considered an expected part of evaluation outcomes, further clarification on the underlying issues was requested from the EDQ Manager.

Action: PR

- 3.3.5 The Committee reflected on the action plan and volume of activity. It was noted that given the current climate in the HE sector, there would likely be increased levels of innovation and creativity with regard to programme development to ensure that the University is competitive and appropriately responsive to market needs.

3.4 Business School – School Quality Audit Action Plan

Received: Business School – School Quality Audit Action Plan

- 3.4.1 The Action Plan was introduced. The Committee was informed that the School Education and Student Experience Plan (ESEP) would reflect the recommendations captured in the Action Plan, and would be used to monitor progress.
- 3.4.2 **Approved:** The Business School – School Quality Audit Action Plan was approved.

3.5 Quality Assurance Standing Group (QASG) Recommendations

Received: Quality Assurance Standing Group (QASG) Recommendations; Business School proposal for accelerated undergraduate degrees; Part-time programme credit structures

3.5.1 Business School proposal for accelerated undergraduate degrees

- 3.5.1.1 Members were advised that QASG had deliberated on this matter and on the advantages and challenges of delivering an accelerated degree programme. The Business School had explained the design of the programme in detail. On the proposed programme students would complete level C and half of level I within one academic year. There was insufficient break between level C ending and level I commencing for students to undertake reassessment. However, in order that students could know how well they had performed at level C before commencing level I units, an Assessment Board would be

held at the end of level C. In cases where a student had accumulated significant failure they would be given academic counselling as to whether to commence level I or wait 12 months in order to concentrate on making good their level C failure before commencing level I.

- 3.5.1.2 QASG recommended to ASC that it approve the piloting of this accelerated degree programme, as it was anticipated that the structure of the programme would enable those who aspired to achieve the qualification early to do so. It was noted that DEC welcomed the development of this programme as it envisaged that it might also wish to develop accelerated degrees in the future.
- 3.5.1.3 It was anticipated that the programme might particularly appeal to mature students. In view of the challenges of undertaking an accelerated programme, applicants would be interviewed in order to ensure that they had the necessary ability and commitment. It was highlighted that ideally applicants would have previous industry experience; however, a placement option would be offered on the programme.
- 3.5.1.4 It was advised that fees would be charged by level rather than the number of years of study.
- 3.5.1.5 **Approved:** The proposal for the assessment board and reassessment structure for the BA (Hons) Business Studies programme run at Guernsey Training Agency was approved.
- 3.5.1.6 **Resolved:** In relation to any future requests for exceptions to the assessment board and reassessment model, it was agreed that these should be referred to and considered by QASG on a case by case basis, with recommendations then being made to ASC for approval or otherwise.

3.5.2 Part-time programme credit structures

- 3.5.2.1 The Committee discussed QASG's recommendation that new/revised part time programmes should deliver up to a maximum of two thirds of the credits delivered on equivalent full-time programmes. There was broad approval from members for the recommendation to be agreed as the standard route. However, it was acknowledged that in future there might be instances where exceptions would be sought. It was noted that this could have implications for the Short Courses Framework in MS. This would be investigated.
- 3.5.2.2 **Resolved:** The recommendation was approved, with effect from academic year 2012-13. Any requests for exceptions would be referred on a case by case basis to QASG to consider and make recommendations to ASC for approval or otherwise.

4 PART TWO

4.1 Academic Offences: Policy and Procedure

Received: Academic Offences: Policy and Procedure

- 4.1.1 The EDQ Manager summarised the paper for the Committee. During 2012, EDQ updated this procedure in line with the new policy and procedure format. However, there had been some recent requests from Schools for several clarifications and changes to be considered for inclusion in the Policy and Procedure to be in force for the 2012-13 academic year. These had been considered by QASG and its recommendations had been brought to ASC for endorsement.
- 4.1.2 A summary of the proposed amendments was discussed and members welcomed them but sought clarification on a few areas.
- 4.1.3 The principle change proposed was to bring existing penalties 1 to 3, in the Tariff of Penalties, in line with the Assessment Regulations in order that the minimum penalties were at least as strict as the outcome for failure of a unit through poor performance or

through late submission of coursework. Members supported this change. However, the Students Union suggested that perhaps the Assessment Regulations were too strict in instances where a student had failed a single formal element; at reassessment the whole unit would be capped at the pass mark and students could not be rewarded for the other elements of that unit in which they might have performed well.

- 4.1.4 Another recommended change was to provide guidance relating to cases where students have mitigating circumstances that are relevant to an academic offence. It was clarified that if a student had not informed Bournemouth University of his/her circumstances at the appropriate time, those circumstances would not be considered unless the student provided evidence of valid reasons for not doing so previously.
- 4.1.5 It was requested that additional guidance and support be provided to students who had been found guilty of an academic offence in order to reinforce their understanding and help to ensure that they would not commit a further offence. Members agreed it would be helpful to publicise more widely information on the number of students being penalised for academic offences and the nature of those penalties, whilst maintaining student anonymity. Members agreed on the importance of students being aware of the full spectrum of academic offences not just plagiarism. It was noted that there were dangers inherent in providing a summary of academic offences in the student handbook as students may misinterpret or miss new or important information if they did not read the policy and procedure in full. It was suggested that a way be found to précis the information whilst directing students to the full, current version held centrally. The Students' Union would also be doing more in 2012/13 to signpost students towards relevant policies and procedures.
- 4.1.6 The EDQ Manager would schedule a review of Assessment Regulations for March 2013, in light of the above discussion. Further comments on the revised Academic Offences: Policy and Procedure, for consideration for 2013/14 implementation would also be reviewed at that time.

Action: PR

- 4.1.7 **Approved:** The revisions proposed in the paper were approved for implementation in the Academic Offences: Policy and Procedure for Taught Awards with effect from September 2012.

4.2 Quality Assurance and Enhancement Group (QAEG) – New Nominations Received
Received: Quality Assurance and Enhancement Group (QAEG) – New Nominations Received: two nominations from the Business School

- 4.2.1 **Approved:** The nominations included in the papers for Phyllis Alexander and Sally Weston were approved.

4.3 New Programme/Framework Development Proposals
Received: BA (Hons) Sociology and Anthropology

- 4.3.1 An overview was provided advising of the proposed new programme development from the School of Health and Social Care. The new programme would be located in the Social and Community Studies Framework and had been proposed in response to the School's strategic direction. It would foster increased cross-School collaboration between HSC and ApSci. Most of the units were already in existence and the programme would give wider choice to prospective students who wished to study social science.

- 4.3.2 In response to a query, the HSC DD(E) clarified that the proposed programme would have a placement and he would ensure it would appear in the documentation for the design phase.

Action: CM

- 4.3.3 **Approved:** The new programme proposal was approved for development.

4.4 Programme/Framework Review Deferral Requests *Received: Programme/Framework Review Deferral Requests*

4.4.1 Business School deferral request

4.4.1.1 BS requested that the interim review of the MSc Corporate Governance (BU and GTA) be deferred from 2012-13 to 2013-14. The request was submitted in order to bring this review in line with the rest of the BS Masters framework review. Written agreement had been received from the PSRB.

4.4.1.2 **Approved:** The Committee approved the deferral of the review.

4.4.2 School of Health and Social Care deferral request

4.4.2.1 HSC requested periodic review of the MA Advanced Mental Health Practice be deferred from 2012-13 to 2013-14. The request was submitted in order to tie in with the change of PRSB and also to allow a combined programme review and PSRB approval visit in early 2014.

4.4.2.2 **Approved:** The Committee approved the deferral of the review.

4.4.3 Media School deferral request

4.4.3.1 MS requested that periodic review of its postgraduate Short Courses Framework be deferred from 2012-13 to 2013-14. The request was submitted in order allow individual programmes and units to complete their first cycles and for the new Head of the Centre for Excellence in Media Practice to be involved in directing the revalidation.

4.4.3.2 **Approved:** The Committee approved the deferral of the review.

4.5 London School of Business and Finance, UK – Level 2 Off-Campus Delivery Proposal

Received: London School of Business and Finance (LSBF) Partnership Development Proposal – Off-campus Delivery (Level 2);

Received: London School of Business and Finance (LSBF) Due Diligence Report – Shared Delivery/Programme (Level 2)

4.5.1 The DEC DD(E) provided an overview to the Committee of the proposed development to partner with LSBF to deliver DEC's current MSc Information Technology to a worldwide audience as an online programme. It was clarified that BU would request full ownership of the IP, as it would be essential to retain this.

4.5.2 It was clarified that the LSBF IT infrastructure would be used to deliver the programme online. BU would be responsible for the content and quality of the programmes, with LSBF responsible for marketing and IT delivery and support. LSBF staff would not be involved in educational delivery.

4.5.3 BU would need to explore the LSBF marketing network and buying power and how these programmes would be positioned within the marketplace. It would be imperative to make it clear in the marketing that the programmes belonged to BU.

4.5.4 It was highlighted that students in BU partnerships could be represented by and offered some support from the Students' Union if they were experiencing a problem with a programme. It was agreed that this should be highlighted to students, perhaps in a marketing video.

4.5.5 The Committee supported launching the programme in this mode of delivery.

- 4.5.6 The Committee noted a QAA report about academic standards on LSBF in regard to its former relationship with another HE institution which highlighted a range of areas of concern, such as recruitment practices, volumes of complaints received, plus physical and human resources. It was noted that the report was published on 9 August 2012 and LSBF had six weeks to respond with an action plan.
- 4.5.7 Members wished to ensure that there was no risk to the University's reputation. It was noted that LSBF would shortly be subject to an Educational Oversight Review as an independent HE provider, and would also follow up on the items which had been flagged as a concern.
- 4.5.8 **Resolved:** The Committee agreed that BU would wait for the report of the Educational Oversight Review of LSBF and for references from other institutions in partnership with LSBF before a final decision was made.

4.6 Mahidol University International College (MUIC), Thailand – Level 2 Student Exchange Proposal

Received: Mahidol University International College (MUIC), Thailand – Student Exchange (Level 2); Mahidol University International College (MUIC), Thailand – Student Exchange (Level 2) – Due Diligence Report

- 4.6.1 It was reported that BU had been working with MUIC previously. However, the previous Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) had expired in 2007. The Business School now wished to re-establish the student exchange agreement. The Committee was asked to consider and give approval for the proposal to be developed and to determine whether or not a site visit would be required. It was established that whilst there had been recent visits to MUIC by BU staff, this had not included reviewing whether or not facilities were appropriate for BU students.
- 4.6.2 **Approved:** The proposal was approved for development and it was agreed that a visit was required in order to audit MUIC facilities.

4.7 Victoria University, Australia – Level 2 Student Exchange Approval

Received: Victoria University (VU), Australia – Renewal Form and Level 1 Due Diligence Report

- 4.7.1 The current Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with Victoria University had expired in August 2012. A Student Exchange agreement was signed in May 2011 and was due to expire in 2016. The School of Tourism wished to renew the MoU to progress the partnership. It had been noted at IUPC that the current exchange papers were signed before the new process for Level 2 approval began, therefore it was envisaged that Level 2 approval would be undertaken as part of the renewal process. ASC were asked to consider the proposal and how the review should be conducted.
- 4.7.2 It was agreed that the University should be doing all it could to encourage student exchanges, and members fully supported this initiative.
- 4.7.3 **Approved:** The Committee agreed that the Level 2 partnership approval should be undertaken as a desk based exercise.

5 PART THREE

5.1 Partnership Agreements

Received: New Partnership Agreements (June to August 2012)

- 5.1.1 **Noted:** A paper giving details of the partnership agreements that had been signed since June 2012 was noted.

- 5.2 Completed Framework/Programme Reviews, Validations and Reviews for Closure**
Received: Completed Framework/Programme Reviews, Validations and Reviews for Closure
- 5.2.1 **Noted:** The list of completed evaluations included in the paper was noted.
- 5.2.2 **Noted:** The outcomes of individual evaluation events were noted.
- 5.3 Pending External Examiner Appointments**
Received: Pending External Examiner Appointments
- 5.3.1 **Noted:** The pending External Examiner appointments detailed in the paper were noted.
- 5.4 External Examiner Nominations and Examination Teams for Research Degrees Approved by Chair's Action**
Received: External Examiner Nominations and Examination Teams for Research Degrees
- 5.4.1 **Resolved:** The External Examiner Nominations and Examination Teams for Research Degrees were ratified.
- 5.5 8A – Code of Practice for Research Degrees**
Received: Code of Practice for Research Degrees
- 5.5.1 **Noted:** The Code of Practice for Research Degrees was noted.
- 5.5.2 The Students' Union would liaise with the Head of Graduate School outwith of the meeting regarding some detail within the Code of Practice.
- 5.6 7A – Partnership Models and Definitions**
Received: Partnership Models and Definitions – Franchised and Validated Provision
- 5.6.1 **Approved:** The Partnership Models and Definitions – Franchised and Validated Provision were noted and approved. Members would pass on information to colleagues in their School/Professional Service as appropriate.
- 6 COMMITTEES**
- 6.1 International and UK Partnerships Committee Minutes**
Received: The minutes from the meetings dated 13 June 2012 and 11 July 2012
Received: The minutes of the Sub Group meeting dated 25 June 2012
- 6.1.1 **Noted:** The minutes were noted.
- 6.2 Partnership Board Minutes – Summer 2012**
Received: Partnership Board minutes for AECC, Bournemouth & Poole College and West London College
- 6.2.1 **Noted:** The minutes were noted.
- 6.3 Quality Assurance Standing Group Minutes**
Received: Quality Assurance Standing Group Minutes of 30 July 2012
- 6.3.1 **Noted:** The minutes were noted.
- 6.4 School Academic Standards Committee Minutes**
Received: SASC minutes for Ap Sci, BS, DEC and HSC
- 6.4.1 **Noted:** The minutes were noted.

6.4.2 The School of Applied Sciences SASC minutes were noted and it was reported that the CPD Policy and Procedure had been amended to clarify the required documentation to enable CPD delivery of a currently validated postgraduate unit.

6.5 Graduate School Academic Board Minutes

Received: Graduate School meeting minutes held on 30 May 2012

6.5.1 **Noted:** The minutes were noted.

7 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

7.1 No other business was raised.

8 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Thursday 11th October 2012 at 9.00am in the Boardroom