
Minutes of the meeting held on 12 May 2015 at 1.00pm in the Board Room

Present:

Prof T McIntyre-Bhatty (Chair)	Deputy Vice Chancellor
Ms D Sparrowhawk (Secretary)	Faculty Director of Operations (HSS)
Ms M Frampton (Clerk)	Policy and Committees Officer (AS)
Mr J Cooke	Head of Student Engagement (SUBU)
Dr F Cownie	School Student Experience Champion (FM&C)
Dr B Dyer	School Student Experience Champion (HSS) & Chair of the Student Voice Committee
Associate Prof G Esteban	Member of the Professoriate (SciTech)
Prof V Hundley	Member of the Professoriate (HSS)
Mr A James	General Manager of the Students' Union (SUBU)
Mr S Jones	Head of Facilities Management
Ms J Mack	Head of Academic Services (AS)
Dr A Main	School Student Experience Champion (SciTech)
Ms E Mayo-Ward	Vice President (Education) of the Students' Union (SUBU)
Canon Dr B Merrington	University Chaplain
Ms P Peckham	Faculty Academic Administration Manager (FM)
Prof K Phalp	Deputy Dean – Education & Professional Practice (SciTech)
Mr R Pope	Vice President (Welfare), Students' Union (SUBU)
Dr G Roushan	Associate Dean (Education) (FM) and Chair of the Technology Enhanced Learning Strategy Forum
Dr P Ryland	Deputy Dean (Education & Student Experience) (FM)
Ms C Schendel-Wilson	SU President 2014/15, Students' Union (SUBU)
Ms C Symonds	Head of Quality and Academic Partnerships (AS)
Prof T Zhang	Head of the Graduate School (GS)

Student Representatives:

Ms A Bruijnzeels	International Student
Mr R Garza	Postgraduate Taught Student

In attendance:

Dr N Hai	Quality & Enhancement Officer (Appeals & Complaints) (AS)
Mr J Nugent	Professional & Personal Development Officer (GS)
Mr R Walsh	Residential Services Operations Manager (SSS)

Apologies:

Apologies had been received from:

Ms M Barron	Head of Student Support Services (SSS)
Dr A Diaz	Student Engagement & Co-creation Theme Leader (CEL)
Ms A Lacey	Student Rep Champion (HSS)
Mr S Laird	Director of Estates
Dr S Minocha	Pro Vice-Chancellor (Global Engagement)
Prof J Parker	Member of the Professoriate (HSS)
Ms J Quest	Senate Representative
Prof E Rosser	Deputy Dean – Education & Professional Practice (HSS)
Associate Prof C Shiel	Associate Professor in Education (SciTech)
Mr J Ward	Director of IT Services

1. Welcome and Introductions

The Chair welcomed the group to the meeting and introductions were made. Apologies were noted as above.

2. Minutes of Previous Meeting held on 25 March 2015

2.1 Accuracy

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

2.2 Matters Arising

2.2.1 Minute 2.1 – Student Charters

A Charters Working Group met on 31 March 2015 comprising Faculty Champions, corporate services, student representatives and SUBU staff. Previous work was reflected on, including earlier Charters produced by individual Schools, feedback from Repfest and SUBU's own charter review. It was agreed that BU would benefit from an externally facing statement reflecting the institutional culture and setting out BU's commitment to its students. This 'Commitment' would then be developed by each Faculty individually, customising the principles as appropriate. The initial drafting work of the 'Commitment' was to be drawn up, circulated by SUBU in April 2015 with sign off from institutional partners as soon as practicable.

Action Ongoing: A further meeting was still to take place whereby the newly drafted paper could be discussed. Mr Cooke would circulate the paper to members to Faculties as it would be useful to have a BU over-arching commitment to students when they arrive at BU, and to also advise new students of the culture at BU and any mutual expectations to complement existing Faculty student charters. Members were concerned that this may not be available for the start of the new academic year in order to be included in Faculty handbooks. Ms Mack advised that a group had recently looked at compliance of the 'Commitment' against the new guidance issued to the HE sector and will need to be taken into consideration in future discussions. It was agreed that further work would be carried out over the next couple of months in order that the 'Commitment' is in place for 2016.

Action: JC

2.2.2 Minute 3.2.1 – Arrivals and Induction Annual Review

The Working Group had identified a proposed set of mandatory events to be held within Week 1 and has also identified the activities that should take place during the transition period (Weeks 2 to 12), which included appropriate contact at the key touch points during this period. The Working Group was now working on a plan/spreadsheet of the proposed activities in Week 1 for proposed sessions/activities to build consistency across BU. The Working Group had considered the Study Skills Workshops and it is proposed that this would be part of the library induction (by framework or programme) in Week 1 and again as part of a tutorial in Week 5 (w/c 19th October) 'refresher week and to start to think about assignments, use of the library and enhanced/review of study skills'. Gail Thomas had circulated the proposed format for the new student induction, with the reasoning behind the proposals to Faculty Deans, DDEPPs, ADSEs, DoPs and AAMs. Further negotiations would now take place to ensure that student experience was not compromised.

Action Ongoing: New induction proposals were now in place and a discussion had taken place within Faculties. The arrivals web pages for new students now included on one joint BU/SUBU 'landing' page, which would be much simpler for new students. These web pages would be monitored during September 2015 and an update would be provided to the Committee at the first meeting of the 2015/16 academic year. It was noted that it was important to progress the issue of single sign-on for students upon arrival to the University for September 2016 entrants.

Action: CS-W

2.2.3 Minute 3.1 – Debate Item: The approach we are taking to discuss student performance at the end of Semester 1 and what can be put in place to further encourage and support their learning

A clear set of expectations/guidelines/indicative content for the Academic Adviser sessions was to be agreed between the DDEPPs and ADSEs, and those guidelines would then be distributed to academic staff expeditiously. A meeting took place on 18th March 2015 to agree a way forward so that all Faculties work to the same standard. The next meeting would take place before the end of the 2014/15 academic cycle.

Action Ongoing: Dr Roushan provided an update to members advising that DDEPPs/ADSEs had agreed that it would be worthwhile to produce guidance principles for Academic Advisers at University level for all Faculties to discuss and develop further within each Faculty. Within the guidance there would be four key principles:

- Each student at BU will be allocated an Academic Adviser;
- Academic Advisers will provide advice and support in terms of student progress;
- Each student will meet their Academic Adviser at least three times per year, including a meeting at the end of Semester One to discuss individual progress and feedback;
- Faculties are responsible for monitoring and measuring the success of Academic Adviser arrangements and report through the ESEP.

It was agreed that the same Academic Adviser would be available to students throughout Levels C and I for continuity. Faculty Academic Boards would discuss the normal mode of operation for Academic Advisers. It was noted that the guidance would need to be in place before the start of the 2015/16 academic year.

It was agreed that Academic Adviser guidance would be circulated to members by 12 June 2015 for approval in order that it was in place before the start of the 2015/16 academic year.

Action: KP/GR/PR/FC

2.2.4 Minute 3.2 – International Mobility of Students Update

DDEPPs and ADSEs confirmed that low level mobility information was being captured within Faculties and would continue to be monitored. IUPC had recently discussed how to capture mobility information and a detailed plan to ensure comprehensive data capture would be developed. This was an area of work which was included in the Student Mobility Operational Plan (approved by IUPC) and the Academic Services Delivery Plan. The work would be taken forward as part of the implementation of the Global Engagement Plan.

Action Ongoing: Ms Symonds advised that IUPC needed to agree the information to be measured in order that a mechanism to collect the information could be put into place. Ms Symonds would provide an update to the Committee at the first ESEC meeting of the 2015/16 academic year. This action is linked to 2.2.5 below.

Action: CS

2.2.5 Minute 3.2 – International Mobility of Students Update

A revised Global Horizons Fund framework was being compiled for submission to IUPC to help address the timing of payments. The revised framework would be made available to ESEC once it had been considered by IUPC.

Action Ongoing: The Global Horizons Fund framework was not yet completed. Ms Symonds would circulate the information to members within the next few days.

Action: CS

2.2.6 Minute 2.1 – Accuracy of the previous minutes of 2 February 2015

Prof J Parker was listed as giving apologies for the meeting held on 2 February 2015, when in fact he was in attendance.

Action Completed: The minutes of 2 February 2015 were updated accordingly.

2.2.7 Widening Participation Annual Report

Prof Page suggested that the University should focus its outreach in inner city areas and conurbations. Ms Pichlmann agreed to look into this suggestion.

Action Completed: During the 2015/16 academic year, a series of engagements with schools and colleges in London and other cities will take place – specifically, BU representation at over 30 career and HE fairs providing advice and information about HE and BU; students experiencing the campus and specific subjects through 11 campus visits, presentations and workshops. We have worked with under-represented groups as part of this activity.

In the 2016/17 academic year, BU will specifically target schools and colleges outside of Bournemouth and Poole (in addition to the established outreach programme) that have a high number of students from LPN/BME backgrounds with outreach interventions. We also have applications from students from various city schools and colleges to attend our summer schools (breaks) in July 2015.

2.2.8 Agenda Item 3.5 – Introduction of Smoking Shelters

Students had recently advised they would like an increased number of smoking shelters around campus. SUBU were having ongoing discussions with the Estates Department. Manchester Metropolitan University had recently become a non-smoking campus and it was suggested this could be replicated by Talbot Campus. The results of research carried out by Manchester Metropolitan University would be examined to see how well the proposal had been received and implemented.

Action Completed: Members agreed that this issue should be transferred to the Health & Safety Committee for further discussion. Research was still being carried out into Manchester Metropolitan University's introduction of a non-smoking campus. The research outcomes would be passed on to the Health & Safety Committee in due course for consideration.

Action: CS-W

2.2.9 Fair Marking Update

Ms Mayo-Ward advised the Committee that she attended a meeting on 12 May 2015 with the Centre for Excellence in Learning (CEL) and SUBU, and some good discussion had taken place regarding Fair Marking. Ms Mayo-Ward would provide members with further information at the first meeting of the 2015/16 academic year.

Action: EM-W

3 PART 1: FOR DISCUSSION

3.1 Review of Education and Student Experience Plans (ESEPs) 2014/15

The Committee were advised that some of the School of Tourism (ST) actions would be taken forward to the Faculty of Management (FM) ESEP in due course, and that from 2015/16 the Faculty ESEP would have actions listed at department level due to the size of the Faculty.

Prof Zhang reminded members that although the ESEP had been introduced in response to historic BU NSS results it was important that all ESEPs considered students including PGT/PGR (Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey results).

With regards to areas of commonality, pedagogic development issues were highlighted by Dr Roushan. The Centre for Excellence in Learning (CEL) was looking to introduce a more consolidated view of staff development in this area and Faculties were requested to liaise with CEL regarding staff development centred around delivering assessment feedback. Further information would become available from CEL in due course.

The SciTech ESEP had been a reflective report. It was recognised that the Faculty of Science and Technology (SciTech) had attempted to provide greater prioritisation, reduce the number of themes and there had also been a number of improvements made within the Faculty. Members noted the numbers of students who did not take up the option of an attending an exam debrief, this was seen to be a missed opportunity for students.

A discussion took place regarding the introduction of Faculty ESEC meetings commencing in the new academic year, although it was noted that one such meeting already existed in the Faculty of Health and Social Sciences (HSS). These meetings would be separate to Faculty Academic Standards (FASC) meetings. Members agreed that Faculty ESEC meetings should have student representation. It was also agreed that generic Terms of Reference would be good practice and Ms Mack agreed to take this forward for approval in time for the start of the new academic year.

Action: JM

It was reported that the main focus of the HSS ESEP had been assessment and feedback. The Faculty had worked with students to clarify their expectations of assessment by embedding a strategy to improve links between Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs), assessment criteria and academic judgement, and work had started on embedding this into the rubrics of Turnitin. The pilot had been successful and valuable. In addition, the HSS system for 2014/15 onwards that had units with high fail rates ($\geq 20\%$) would be required to present a report to the Assessment Board was agreed as good practice that should be adopted by all Faculties for summer 2015 and beyond.

Action: DDEPPs

A discussion took place regarding co-creation of assignment briefs. It was a common theme across Faculties that often the wording used within assignment briefs was not always completely clear to students and they were sometimes unsure of what was required of them. As HSS had started this process with their students, members requested Prof Rosser share her knowledge in bullet point form via email. Dr Dyer and Ms Sparrowhawk agreed to work with Prof Rosser and circulate the information to DDEPPs.

Action: ER

The BS ESEP report advised that there was still a lot of work to be carried out with regards to clarifying exactly what feedback was and when feedback was being communicated. Dr Roushan would be looking at sustainability of the model used this year. Members agreed that the student experience budget had been very helpful this year as it had helped to invite students to less formal dialogue about their experiences in an informal atmosphere.

One of the key issues for the Faculty of Media and Communication (FMC) ESEP had been the transition of Law into the Faculty. The Faculty had been working with SUBU and had looked at a range of areas, including education, administration and student experience, to ensure the Faculty was working effectively. Mid Unit Student Evaluation (MUSE) had been implemented within FMC and a lot of time had been spent reviewing the outcomes of MUSE. It was noted there had been a slight decrease in student satisfaction from semester 2 compared to semester 1. A review of results had been considered at the FMC FASC meeting in April and the Faculty Executive meeting in May, with key themes now having been identified. A copy of the FMC's ESEP would be circulated with the minutes for information.

Action: ESEC Clerk

Referring to the BS ESEP, it was noted that there was a slight peak in the numbers of students committing plagiarism and a query was raised on whether that had been related to a particular cohort. It was advised that international students had historically committed the greater amount of plagiarism, where they did not really understand what plagiarism and particularly self-plagiarism meant. The Faculty are working with international students to advise of writing styles and referencing and noted that the implications of poor referencing/plagiarism are stated explicitly within Programme Handbooks. Information was also displayed on noticeboards around the Executive Business Centre (EBC) where most international students were taught, regarding the methods and outcomes of detected plagiarism. Members agreed on the importance of keeping all students fully aware of plagiarism as the level of work/administration for academics/administrators for each offence was considerable.

In order further to mitigate against occurrences of plagiarism, it was suggested that early guidance on each student's first two assessments would be beneficial to students. Students were currently guided to various web based exercises to provide a realistic expectation of what was and was not acceptable. It was also suggested that a summary be added to each Faculty Handbook to indicate the number of offences which had taken place over past academic years. Following discussion it was agreed that DDEPPs would take this suggestion forward.

Action: DDEPPs

It was suggested that a summary of the resources available could be provided to students. It was agreed that all the suggested improvements would be beneficial to students. Members were also reminded that that EDQ provide Academic Offences staff development workshops to staff members and highlighted the importance of all new academic staff members attending these workshops to ensure they feel confident with the procedures.

The Academic Services ESEP advised there had been a lot of activity with regards to increasing student mobility and raising awareness. The number of applications had increased from 33 to 95 for outgoing student study exchanges for 2015/16. A new orientation week had been delivered in January 2015 for incoming international exchange students. The myBU mobile app had also been implemented and further discussion would take place with CEL regarding further promotion of the app. A number of additional resources had been put into place within the library. These included an additional 16,000 e-books being made available during 2014/15, 42 extra study spaces and 17 extra PCs added to the first floor of the library.

It was advised that the Estates ESEP covered many areas within BU. Next year, the ESEP would focus on key items which link to the Estates Delivery Plan as that captured the most information. One key area that Estates would focus on was communication and the development of a back-up plan to manage expectation in the event of a delay in the completion of minor projects that affect 'business as usual', and to mitigate the risk to the student experience.

It was queried whether it would be possible for the Estates Department to look into the possibility of introducing the facility to reserve smaller rooms/staff offices through the timetabling system. This would then enable rooms to be booked for 1:1 meetings for Academic Advisers/Unit Tutors and students. Mr Jones agreed to discuss this issue further within the Estates Department.

Action: SJ

With regards to the 2015 Arrivals campaign, Ms Mack agreed to determine the timescales of enrolments, arrivals and library inductions and share the information with members.

Action: JM

It was reported that Student Emotional Wellbeing Service appeared to be working effectively as the Chaplaincy was not receiving such a high level of triage work as historically received. Other anecdotal feedback members had received from students had been very positive.

3.2 Annual Review: Postgraduate Taught (PGT) Framework Review

The Graduate School introduced the Postgraduate Professional and Personal Development (PPPD) Framework in September 2013. The Postgraduate Development Award (PGDA) was introduced as a means for postgraduate taught students to engage with the PPPD Framework and to enhance international mobility. The PGDA was now in its second year and student engagement had continued to grow along with enhancing the postgraduate taught student experience.

This academic year, the Graduate School had engaged with Faculties and part time, full time and distance learning PGT students. The current PGDA figures showed that the total number of registrations had doubled, and early monitoring of PGDA progression was promising. For the 2015/16 academic year, a target of 15% of the PGT population and a conversion rate of 40% was set as a gradual expansion plan for the PGDA programme.

Numerous events had been held to support PGDA activities and PGTs across Faculties. Over 250 students chose to enhance their academic skills, and feedback received had been very positive and helped PGTs at various stages of their programme. This year the PTES launched on 10 March 2015 and would close on 5 June 2015. The current response rate was 16%. The 2014 PTES response rate had been 23%, compared to the national average of 28.3%.

Members were impressed with the information contained within Table 3.2 and requested a breakdown by School/Faculty as it would be helpful for academic staff to encourage students to continue with their good work.

Action: JN

3.3 Annual Review: Key Performance Indicators/Performance Indicators (KPIs/Pis)

The report was presented to the Committee to provide information regarding performance against the KPIs and PIs which were set out in BU 2018.

One area which had been quite static was PI7 (UG students engaged in exchange and mobility in their programme) and the importance of Faculties effectively capturing this information was highlighted.

The target for PI15 (Academic staff on secondment into industry) was 10%, although in a number of areas within BU the figure was much lower at 5%. Members was surprised by the lower figure for PI15 as most academic staff use colleagues in industry on a regular basis through assignments and engagement with unit materials. There was a query on whether this information was being recorded correctly. Prof McIntyre-Bhatty agreed to look further into this issue.

Action: TMB

It was noted that the total for PI13 (Degrees eligible to be accredited by Professional Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs)) was surprisingly not at capacity/100%. BU has a high proportion of degrees which are PSRB eligible and it requires further investigation which programmes are eligible but are not progressing accreditation/recognition. PI14 (Proportion of academic staff who hold at least one recognised professional affiliation) was also lower than expected, especially given the generally high levels of programme accreditation. It was noted though that academic staff were not effectively keeping their profile in BRIAN (Bournemouth Research Information and Networking System) up to date and staff completing their profile was very important in order that the figure for PI14 improves.

Regarding PI6 (Academic staff with a teaching qualification and/or who are HEA Fellows), it was queried whether any further work was being carried out. The HEA UKPSF devolved framework of HEA fellowship recognition was still operational and gaining traction within BU. BU was currently showing a level of 54% of academic staff with a teaching qualification/HEA Fellows, against a target of 100%. The sector average was in the mid-twenties range.

3.4 SUBU President's Report

An overview of the current activities of the Students' Union was given.

- SUBU had moved into the new Student Centre which was proving to be an excellent study space and very busy.
- Ms Mayo-Ward and five Senior Rep Officers had recently presented the final session of the Service Excellence conference, with the main focus on the top six issues that students care about and BU would be looking to improve upon.
- The Communications Team were now planning for arrivals and working with Marcomms to ensure everything runs smoothly. A large number of arrivals events would be taking place in September.

The highlights of the results of the Times Higher Education Survey had included the following recommendations:

- Ensure that lecturers were always engaging and pass on their own experience to students;
- Continue the use of technology, such as videoing lectures;
- Encourage lecturers to have an 'open door policy';
- Continue the good work already carried out to improve non-academic aspects of student life:
 - by providing good extra-curricular activities/societies;
 - by creating a good community atmosphere;
 - by continuing the creation of a good social life.

It was noted that the results for BU sports facilities had decreased this year and dropped below the sector average. Mr Jones would share this information with the Estates Department and pursue with colleagues.

Action: SJ

The results for the library and the library opening hours had received good results and it was expected this score would improve should the library extend its opening hours during 2015/16 as proposed within the Academic Services Delivery Plan.

An overview was provided of the Student Opinion Survey (SOS) results. Throughout 2014/15, 20,445 comments had been provided by students on aspects of their BU experience. The top six items which 'mattered most' to students in 2013/14 were:

- Quality of feedback
- Contact and communication with lecturers
- Quality of lectures
- Timetabling
- Practical sessions/workshops and placements
- Assignment information and briefs

This year the SOS results had correlated with the NSS scores, with the exception of 'Impact on Personal Development'.

The Students' Union had made significant progress with the representation of PGRs this year. Ms Mayo-Ward had carried out a significant amount of work engaging with PGR students with SUBU, the Graduate School and Prof Fletcher in order to develop an action plan for addressing the issues raised in the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES). A list of the top issues raised by PGR students had been collated and is shown below. These issues are being reviewed by the Graduate School.

Action: TZ

- Lack of a stimulating research environment in Faculties – this was linked with a lack of opportunities to discuss research with other PGRs;
- Admin processes were not practical/helpful;
- PGRs perceive BU (and SUBU) to not value/respond to PGR feedback;
- Low level of BU support for PGR attendance of conferences/events, specifically funding;
- Central/Faculty induction is not effective;
- Lack of availability of a suitable work space/desk when needed;
- Lack of specialist resources or funding for PGRs – specifically issues with funding allocation/ budget being removed altogether, reduced or difficult to apply for;
- Less than 40% of all respondents have teaching/demonstrating roles, but of these, 68% of 'teachers' receive formal training and only 46% of 'demonstrators' receive formal training;
- Very few PGRs will actively promote PGR study at BU to others.

4. PART 2: FOR APPROVAL AND ENDORSEMENT

4.1 Third Party and Parental Involvement in Appeals and Complaints

The *11L - Third Party Involvement: Procedure* had been drafted to provide guidance for staff in dealing with third party representatives. The procedure would provide consistency with regards to appointing, engaging with and ending the involvement of a third party representative, and it also set out guidelines for the benefit of students, their representatives and staff who would deal with the relevant university processes.

The key points of the procedure advised of the process for the appointment for a third party representative to act on the student's behalf and also provided assistance with data protection, confidentiality and acceptable behaviour.

The Committee **approved** the *11L - Third Party Involvement: Procedure*.

4.2 BU Mapping against the new OIA Good Practice Framework

The University's Policies and Procedures for Academic Appeals and Complaints had been reviewed against the key principles of the OIA Good Practice Framework (GPF). The University already had a robust system in place, and the mapping against the OIA GPF had confirmed that BU was in a good position with their documentation.

The Committee was requested to consider the four recommendations and approve the document map in order to confirm that BU's Policies and Procedures complied with the OIA sector requirements. Following Committee approval, the relevant Academic Regulations, Policies and Procedures (ARPP), associated documentation and the ongoing action plan would be updated accordingly.

Recommendation 1

Recommendation to ESEC: For consistency with the OIA definition, it was recommended that BU adopted the definition of 'complaint' as per the OIA GPF, paragraph 14 as follows: 'an expression of dissatisfaction by one or more students about a University's action or lack of action, or about the standards of service by or on behalf of the University'.

The Committee **approved** Recommendation 1.

Recommendation 2

Recommendation to ESEC: That BU includes the following insertion into our definitions regarding the grounds for appeal. This will bring ARPP 11A in line with the OIA GPF (paragraph 18).

An academic appeal can only be considered on the grounds of one of the following:

- There has been a material irregularity or significant administrative error in the assessment process;
- The assessment was not conducted in accordance with the regulations for the programme;
- A student's performance in assessment has been affected by illness or other factors which, for valid reasons(s), s/he was unable to divulge before the meeting of the Assessment Board;
- Bias or perception of bias (*the new insertion*).

The Committee **approved** Recommendation 2.

Recommendation 3

Recommendation to ESEC: That BU considers formalising a mediation and conciliation procedure in line with the OIA GPF. If approved, an implementation plan would be written in 2015/16 which may include face-to-face conciliation.

The Committee **agreed** that the work to be progressed under Recommendation 3 be conducted and that the issue would return to the Committee for discussion in due course.

Recommendation 4

Recommendation to ESEC: That relevant staff development needs in Academic Services, Student Support Services and Faculties for mediation/conciliation are considered in line with Recommendation 3.

The Committee **approved** Recommendation 4.

5. PART 3: FOR NOTE

5.1 Centre for Excellence in Learning Update

The paper was noted.

6 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

6.1 There was no other business.

7. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Wednesday 23rd September 2015, 10.00am to 12.00pm in the Board Room