**Minutes of the meeting held on 5 April 2016 at 2.00pm in the Board Room**

Present:

Prof T McIntyre-Bhatty (Chair) Deputy Vice Chancellor

Ms P Peckham (Secretary) Faculty Academic Administration Manager (FST)

Ms M Frampton (Clerk) Policy & Committees Officer (AS)

Ms M Barron Head of Student Services (SS)

Dr B DyerDeputy Dean (Education & Professional Practice (FMC) and

 Chair of the Student Voice Committee

Dr R Gunstone Senate Representative (FST)

Dr D Holley Centre for Excellence in Learning Representative

Dr C Hunt Associate Dean (Student Experience) (FST)

Mr A James General Manager of the Students’ Union (SUBU)

Ms A Lacey Student Representative Champion (HSS)

Mr S Laird Director of Estates

Mr J Leung Vice President (Activities) of the Students’ Union (SUBU)

Dr A Main Deputy Dean (Education & Professional Practice) (FM)

Ms E Mayo-Ward Vice President (Education) of the Students’ Union (SUBU)

Dr C L Osborne Head of Academic Operations (OVC)

Prof K Phalp Deputy Dean (Education & Professional Practice) (FST)

Mr R Pope Vice President (Welfare), Students’ Union (SUBU)

Dr G Roushan Chair of the Technology Enhanced Learning Strategy Forum

Ms C Symonds Head of Quality and Academic Partnerships (AS)

Dr S White Senate Representative (HSS)

Student Representatives:

Ms K Moore Undergraduate Student

In attendance:

Dr N Hai Quality & Enhancement Officer (Appeals & Academic Complaints) (AS)

Apologies:

Apologies had been received from:

Mr J Cooke Head of Student Engagement (SUBU)

Assoc Prof Genoveva Esteban Member of the Professoriate (FST)

Mr S Jones Head of Facilities Management

Ms J Mack Head of Academic Services (AS)

Canon Dr B Merrington University Chaplain

Dr S Minocha Pro Vice-Chancellor (Global Engagement) (OVC)

Prof E Rosser Deputy Dean (Education & Professional Practice) (HSS)

Dr P Ryland Associate Dean (Student Experience) (FM)

Prof C Shiel Member of the Professoriate (FST)

Ms C Schendel-Wilson SU President 2014/15, Students’ Union (SUBU)

Ms D Sparrowhawk Faculty Director of Operations (HSS)

Mr J Ward Director of IT Services

Prof T Zhang Head of the Graduate School (GS)

1. **Welcome and Introductions**

The Chair welcomed the group to the meeting and apologies were noted.

**2. Minutes of Previous Meeting held on 11 February 2016**

2.1 Accuracy

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

2.2 Matters Arising

2.2.1 Minute 2.2.1.13 – Review of Education & Student Experience Plans (ESEPs) 2014/15

 *The current University timetabling system and processes had been reviewed with completion being most likely in the 2017/18 academic year. Due to IT resources being allocated to directly support the SITS Project and with the Unified Calendar activity being dependent on the SITS solution being implemented, the Unified Calendar recommendation was de-scoped from the SJP. It is now being assessed as a standalone project (under the co-ordination of OVC) involving IT, Estates and PRIME. It is likely that the primary focus of the reshaped project will be to provide management information with the secondary benefit to student experience. The timeline for the project is dependent on progress with SITS, so further enhancements to this aspect of the timetabling function will not be possible until 2017/18 AY at the earliest.*

**Action Ongoing:** No further information was available at present. OVC was leading on the co- ordination with stakeholders relating to action on a Unified Calendar and associated management information requirements. Mr Laird and Dr Osborne had recently met and confirmed the project was moving forward.

2.2.2 Minute 2.2.8 – NSS Results – Early Publication of Timetables

 *Meetings had taken place with Faculties and a paper summarising reflections on the timetabling process and possible improvements were included in a paper presented to ESEC in February. The task now was to continue to work across BU to implement the scheduling process and address any opportunities to improve both the quality and timing of the timetabling outputs. Further co-ordination meetings between Estates and Faculties took place in January 2016 and would now be an annual activity to build on the incremental improvements and to ensure joined-up activity.*

 **Action Ongoing:** A second round of co-ordination meetings with Faculty executives was underway with the intention to continuously improve the scheduling process. It was probable that timetable release dates would be similar to the 2015/16 dates, however opportunities identified to improve the quality of the first release would be taken. Mr Laird confirmed that the timetabling process had been discussed at ULT and a Working Group had been set up to move the project forward.

2.2.3 Minute 2.2.9 – Annual Review of PREP

 *Following discussion, it was agreed that Faculties and staff members responsible for leading Faculty level PREP activity would benefit from CEL assistance. The DDEPP for FM and HSS were requested to contact Dr Holley for support.*

 **Action Completed:** Prof Rosser confirmed she started working with Dr Holley in September 2015 and had continued to work Dr Holley to shape the faculty PREP activity and evaluation of the Academic Adviser role. Dr Main had also met with Dr Holley, and agreed a forward approach for the Faculty of Management (FM), especially with regards to semester 2. Heads of Education (HoEs) and Programme Leaders (PLs) were taking PREP forward within each Department, and would involve CEL appropriately.

2.2.4 Minute 3.1.12 – Debate Item – Sustainable Development – the responsibility of our colleagues in Estates, or an educative agenda?

 *DDEPPs were requested to encourage staff members to submit case studies to Prof Shiel which demonstrate good practice and excellence, and showed how sustainable development was being embedded into the curriculum and preparing learners to live and work sustainably. DDEPPs were requested to encourage discussion at FASC meetings around Sustainable Development.*

 **Action Ongoing:** DDEPPs confirmed that discussions within Faculties would take place at forthcoming FASC meetings. Dr White advised that FHSS had submitted one case study. DDEPPs would provide updates at the next ESEC meeting.

2.2.5 Minute 3.1.12 – Debate Item – Sustainable Development – the responsibility of our colleagues in Estates, or an educative agenda?

 *Prof Shiel agreed to circulate best practice to members.*

 **Action Ongoing:** An update to the action was not available and would be provided at the May ESEC meeting.

2.2.6 Minute 3.1.9 – Debate Item - Solving Problems with Placements

 *With regards to the first bullet point in Section 3.2 of the paper, Mr Jones advised that this area would be a practical point to be addressed before the proposal moved forward. Mr Jones advised Dr Osborne to liaise with Sarah Green to discuss the consequences of the bullet point listed within the paper as there could be negative consequences for the timetable, which ESEC has otherwise been determined to address.*

 **Action Ongoing:** Dr Osborne had met with Mr Jones and Ms Green and a Working Group had been set up to discuss implementation. An update would be available in two/three months.

2.2.7 Minute 3.1.12 – Debate Item - Solving Problems with Placements

 *Mr Pope advised that students do feel the University could provide more communication during their placement year. Dr Holley agreed to work with Faculties and assist with carrying out some pilot initiatives.*

 **Action Ongoing:** Dr Holley advised that she had been successful in adding Blackboard ‘ConnecTXT’ (a bespoke SMS system) to the myBU ‘package’. IT Services and Blackboard were now working with Dr Holley to get the system embedded and operationalised. As soon as testing was complete, CEL would invite Faculties to nominate pilot projects.

 Ms Barron advised that she had been working with M&C on a Placement students’ web page as well as a number of other initiatives regarding placement processes. Student Services are the service owner for cross-university placement processes, although Faculties provide the specific pre and on placement support. As there would be a large amount of review activity regarding employability in the next academic year (PVC Global is UET lead) it would be best to deal with any of these issues through that mechanism rather than CEL working in parallel. Ms Barron would provide an update at the May ESEC meeting.

2.2.8 Minute 3.2.1 – Updated ESEPs – IT Services ESEP

 *IT Services have been working with M&C to rollout the ‘single sign-on’ to multiple systems over a phased period. A completion date was not yet available and Ms Fernandez would contact Mr Ward for an update.*

 **Action Ongoing:** A Single Sign-On Feasibility paper was presented to the Digital Vision Steering Group in February 2016. Different technical solutions for the Identity Provider were currently being explored and ADFS (Option 3 in the paper) was now being considered. IT Services would provide an update on the preferred solution, a road map indicating which applications can be linked and project timescales at the next Digital Vision Project meeting at the end of April 2016.

2.2.9 Minute 3.2.9 – Updated ESEPs – Student Support ESEP

 *Ms Ladle advised that BU does not have the capacity currently to hold accommodation for incoming exchange students, as the number of incoming students had increased significantly. A number of people were currently working hard to resolve this issue. The Committee agreed that a decision would need to be made imminently as to whether BU could hold a small void, irrespective of the number of beds within BU. Ms Barron would provide an update to the Committee at the next meeting, following the update given to ULT.*

 **Action Ongoing:** Despite not having anything specifically allocated for exchange students, the University has housed 18 incoming exchange students in Semester 1 of 2015/16 and a further 25 in Semester 2. The biggest challenge was the overlap of incoming and outgoing students which means that the dates were not streamlined. It would be helpful if Faculties were able to address the overlap which would allow the University to be more strategic in what was allocated. By 2018 there would be more housing stock available which would allow more movement between semesters, for both incoming and outgoing students provided we can address the overlap issue. Ms Barron confirmed that she had discussed the issue with Faculties, unfortunately without resolution. Ms Barron would continue to work on this issue.

2.2.10 Minute 3.2.10 – Updated ESEPs – Student Support ESEP

 *Members agreed that the Student Wellbeing initiative had been an excellent initiative. Ms Ladle confirmed that the initiative had worked well and agreed to provide the Committee with a breakdown by Faculty at the end of the academic year.*

 **Action Ongoing:** This information would be provided at the end of the academic year as agreed.

2.2.11 Minute 3.4.4 – Teach@BU Update

 *Dr Holley suggested that Teach@BU and the HEA should be promoted to the Programme Leaders’ Support Network, therefore Dr Eccles would send information to Dr Holley.*

 **Action Completed:** Dr Eccles sent two documents to Dr Holley after the February ESEC meeting. Dr Eccles would also be speaking at several Faculty based events (FESECs and Framework meetings, etc) to further promote Teach@BU. The two documents sent to Dr Holley were emailed to members with the April ESEC meeting papers. Dr Eccles emailed DDEPPs on 12 February 2016, with both of the short papers, asking them to circulate to other Exec members and staff and also offering presentations around Teach@BU (particularly at Exec or FESEC meetings). In addition, a training event is due to take place on 28 April 2016 to prepare current Teach@BU/HEA Fellows to deliver workshops and introductory sessions within their own Faculties – the intention being that Teach@BU and the UKPSF can be further embedded at Faculty and Department level by staff within that Faculty and supported by the central Teach@BU team. All deadlines for applications were publicised regularly by Organisational Development.

2.2.12 Minute 3.6.7 – SUBU President’s Report

 *Mr Jones commented that discussions had been finalised with transport providers for the University and if further discussions were required they would need to take place imminently in order that further renegotiation could take place to accommodate Lansdowne based students. Mr Jones advised that he would need to know the scale of the issue and feed this back to the Panel. Ms Schendel-Wilson agreed to carry out further research and provide this information at the next meeting of ESEC.*

 **Action Ongoing:** Research was still ongoing and Ms Schendel-Wilson was continuing to gather evidence. Mr Laird confirmed that bus requirements were required to inform the Travel Plan, which would consider student needs over the next 3-4 years.

2.2.13 Minute 4.1.2 – Proposal for a Single Student Charter

 *Ms Peckham suggested that the Charter should list the same number of commitments for both students and staff. Dr Osborne agreed to look at amending the commitments as discussed.*

 **Action Completed:** The Single Student Charter now had an equal number of bullet points for BU’s expectations of students and students’ expectations of BU.

2.2.14 Minute 5.2.2 – Annual Report: Multi Faith Chaplaincy

 *The Committee agreed that the University did provide good services to students, although it was not clear whether the Employee Assistance Programme (EAP) was providing a suitable service for staff members. Ms Barron was requested to look into this issue further.*

 **Action Ongoing:** The EAP programme is owned by the Human Resources Department, along with the Equality & Diversity Advisors (Item 5.2.5 below). As these were both HR issues and did not fall under the remit of ESEC, Ms Barron had advised Karen Parker of the issues raised. Ms Barron would provide an update in due course.

2.2.15 Minute 5.2.5 – Annual Report: Multi Faith Chaplaincy

 *Dr White commented that staff members had been interviewed and appointed from various departments across the University and were due to receive Dignity and Wellbeing Advisor (DWBA) training in order to provide confidential DWBA support to students.*

 **Action Ongoing:** As the training of Equality & Diversity Advisors was arranged by Human Resources, Ms Barron had advised Karen Parker of the issue raised. Ms Barron would provide an update in due course.

**3 PART 1: FOR DISCUSSION**

3.1 Annual Report: Appeals and Complaints

3.1.1 The 2016 Appeals and Complaints Annual Report provided an overview and analysis of the University’s appeals and complaints activity between 1 January 2015 and 31 December 2015. The report included information with regards to both academic and non-academic appeals and complaints, and also included data relating to the number of appeals and complaints which had been submitted to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA). Dr Hai explained that the report also included enhancement work which had been carried out in 2015 and which would be used constructively for continuous learning. Details of the enhancements to University practice regarding appeals and complaints were included in the Action Plan for 2016.

3.1.2 The number of appeals submitted in 2015 had continued to decline with 175 academic appeals being lodged from a population of 18,338 students, which equated to less than 1% of students submitting an appeal. Of the 175 students who submitted an appeal, 89.1% were undergraduate students and 10.9% were postgraduate (taught and research) students. There was no obvious explanation why undergraduate students were more likely to submit an appeal than postgraduate students, although the proportion that was not resolved at local stage was far higher for postgraduate students (58% of appeals were resolved at Central Review Stage at the PG level, compared to only 24% at the UG level).

3.1.3 It was important to note that over the past twelve months Dr Hai had been working closely with SUBU, Student Services and Faculties, which had undoubtedly assisted with the decrease in the number of appeals being lodged. The major source of appeals was mitigating circumstances with 58.3% of appeals received being related to mitigating circumstances.

3.1.4 Dr White questioned how the Educational Development and Quality Department (EDQ) fed back information to those staff members who had been involved in appeals. Dr Hai confirmed that Academic Administration Managers (AAMs) were advised of all appeal outcomes and any comments received from the OIA. AAMs were responsible for dissemination of information to colleagues in order that any actions/ comments were acted upon.

3.1.5 Ms Symonds commented on the 12 postgraduate appeals received from the FM (8 of which had been resolved at the Local Stage) and information regarding the programme or unit titles which the students were studying. It was noted that the programme/unit titles had not been listed in UNIT-e, therefore it had been difficult to establish whether the 12 appeals were connected at the unit level (they were not connected at the programme level). Following discussion, Dr Hai agreed that he would investigate the FM appeals further to establish whether the appeals were connected in any way. Dr Main suggested that Dr Hai contact the FM AAM for assistance.

**Action: NH**

3.1.6 A discussion took place regarding the process that students must follow if they have mitigating circumstances. As the percentage of mitigating circumstance appeals submitted totalled 58.3% for BU Faculties (and 67% of appeals at AECC), Prof McIntyre-Bhatty requested Dr Hai to compare the University’s data with other Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

**Action: NH**

3.1.7 Moving forward, it was suggested that mitigating circumstances should be headlined and included in the Executive Summary of the Student Agreement/Programme Handbook. It was noted that many students do not read all information circulated, and members agreed that they were unsure whether any additional measures could be introduced to ensure that all students read mitigating circumstances information. Ms Peckham reminded members that the training of Student Reps historically included training around mitigating circumstances, however she was unsure whether this was still being carried out by SUBU. Ms Mayo-Ward was also unsure whether mitigating circumstances training was included in the Student Rep training, but would look into whether it would be viable to include mitigating circumstances training in Student Rep training.

**Action: EM-W**

3.1.8 Ms Moore advised the Committee that many students were unable to provide evidence of their mitigating circumstance, particularly if the reason was due to a family issue as family members often reluctant to provide evidence. It was suggested that students should be assisted by Faculties when they are struggling to provide evidence for difficult circumstances. Dr Hai reminded members that *ARPP 11A - Academic Appeals: Policy and Procedure for Taught Awards* and *ARRP 6A – Standard Assessment Regulations*, both state that evidence would be accepted from family members e.g. Death Certificates or medical correspondence. Dr Hai advised that in order to assist and sympathise with students, the University would be willing to accept retrospective evidence on the proviso that the evidence would be provided to the University in due course.

3.1.9 Ms Mayo-Ward reported that students do not remember all the information provided when they start university, and therefore do not always go to their GP for evidence of their illness, therefore the introduction of a step-by-step process would be very helpful to students. Dr Gunstone suggested that the University puts together a multimedia video or an interactive programme on iBU which would take students through the process. Dr Hai agreed to look into this suggestion.

**Action: NH**

3.1.10 Section 6.3 of the report stated that 15 non-academic appeals were rejected and 12 non-academic appeals were either upheld or partially upheld. Ms Barron advised that although the term appeal had been used, many issues were a consideration of parking circumstances (74%). However, the Committee requested more detail be included on those 12 that were upheld or partially upheld since those may have related to the 7 non-academic appeals relating to finance or immigration.

**Action: NH**

3.1.11 The non-academic complaints listed in Table 11 did not provide the Committee with sufficient detail and the Committee was unable to determine whether those that were still under investigation related to the ‘general’ category which was noted to frequently include issues relating to bullying or harassment – there were 7 non-academic complaints in this category. It was therefore not clear how seriously/timely the University was dealing with such complaints. Dr Hai agreed to provide more detailed information moving forward in order to provide comfort to members that non-academic complaints were being dealt with effectively.

**Action: NH**

3.1.12 Ms Peckham referred to Section 12 – Action Plan for 2016, and advised that she welcomed the majority of the items listed on the Action Plan, especially the formal mediation and conciliation process which would benefit some complex cases or for those cases which could become inflamed. The Faculty of Science & Technology (FST) was now in the process of implementing early resolution where possible.

3.1.13 Members agreed that SUBU staff should be involved in the staff development sessions as their Advice Workers speak regularly to students about appeals, complaints and mitigation circumstances.

3.1.14 Overall, the Committee had good assurance that the University was dealing with appeals and complaints in a timely and effective manner and was in line with OIA guidelines.

3.1.15 **Noted:** The Committee noted the Appeals and Complaints Annual Report.

3.2 Anonymous Marking Update

3.2.1 Ms Symonds provided the Committee with an update on the introduction of anonymous marking following on from the September meeting of ESEC when the Committee approved the principles of anonymous marking be adopted within the University wherever possible. A Working Group was set up to consider the practical aspects of implementation of anonymous marking on a pilot basis for this academic year. The Working Group included DDEPPs, AAMs, SUBU and academic staff from Faculties, and had met three times and had identified some challenges. The next meeting was due to take place in May 2016.

3.2.2 The pilot would involve semester 2 units as the online submission mechanisms had already been put in place for semester 1 and would have resulted in any student work already submitted being lost. It had been identified that large media files would be a potential difficulty, therefore other methods of assessment from other units of study would need to be identified for inclusion in the pilot.

3.2.3 Some technical difficulties with online submission had been identified, which were:

* All Faculties contact students who have not submitted their work on time - Faculties

contact students to advise them that their assignment has not been received and

their work would now be considered as a late submission if received within 72 hours.

Faculties consider this to be an important part of their responsibilities to students.

* The submission of assignments by Tier 4 students - Anonymous marking would not

work as it would not be possible to identify these students without removing anonymity

for an entire cohort. Not being able to use submission of assignments as a monitoring mechanism was a potentially serious issue.

3.2.4 Ms Symonds thanked David Fevyer and the Learning Technology Team who had looked into solving the problems encountered and had developed a complex ‘work around’. The Learning Technology Team have produced guidance and were working with Faculties to ensure all staff received training. Students have been advised that any work submitted late would not be marked anonymously.

3.2.5 Members were requested ask colleagues in Faculties to send Ms Symonds any feedback or comments to help inform processes moving forward.

**Action: All**

3.2.6 Dr Main advised that one restriction with anonymous marking was with regards to the lack of ability to upload feedback to students. The problem was magnified in the FM (Business School) for the Association to Advance Collegiate School of Business (AACSB) which had accreditation of prior learning. Faculty staff have to create a grid to show students their progress in their learning and this could not be facilitated by the current technology available in Turnitin that was facilitating anonymous marking. Some feedback given to students was very sophisticated and academic staff do currently encounter problems with the tool.

3.2.7 Ms Mayo-Ward suggested that anonymous marking would be a positive move with regards to the attainment gap. Ms Mayo-Ward had been reading positive statements from students and believed that anonymous marking would be beneficial to student experience. Ms Moore advised that she was due to submit an assignment shortly which would be anonymously marked and she was pleased to know there would be no bias and the process would be fair. Ms Moore also believed that anonymous marking would stop disputes amongst fellow students. Dr Gunstone advised there were very mixed views from students regarding anonymous marking in FST. Those FST students who were opposed to anonymous marking had suggested adding their personal details to their assignment. Overall, members agreed that there would always be some students who were in favour of anonymous marking and some against the process. Looking at the Appeals and Complaints information previously discussed, only one appeal had been received which was bias related.

 3.2.8 Dr Roushan reminded the Committee that with regards to the tools which had been spoken about e.g. Turnitin, possibly the University should look wider as there were many more tools available which the University was not capitalising on and would suit students whether marking was anonymous or not.

3.2.9 **Noted:** The Committee noted the Anonymous Marking Update.

3.3 Vision4Learning Update and Designing Learning Excellence

3.3.1 Dr Roushan and Dr Holley gave a brief presentation on ‘Achieving Learning Excellence through myBU’ and circulated a short paper. The paper had been written following conversations regarding Vision4Learning. The first phase of Vision4Learning had been the TEL Toolkit, the next phase would be the new Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) and further discussions would take place with the IT Development Team. Dr Roushan advised that the University would continue to use Blackboard for at least another twelve months and it was important the University capitalises working with them.

3.3.2 One key message which would continue to be worked upon was how the University prepares students for a digital world and developing students’ skills, confidence and expertise using tools externally. The EU has a policy framework which is designed to encourage and support digital competency and will set students on a life-long learning journey. Dr Holley advised that in the future, the UK workforce would need to have the ability to use digital technology purposefully and confidently to communicate, find information and purchase goods/services as a minimum. The University will aim to prepare students to be digital experts and have a high level of skills moving forward.

3.3.3 The University was well positioned to meet the needs of the UK Digital Economy. Opportunities would become available with the new Fusion 1 Building being available to students for learning and with the Bournemouth Gateway Building design process being underway at Lansdowne campus. Fusion completely matched the key reports which research was revealing. It was clear that the University benefits from pockets of excellent practice and has exceptional staff with happy students.

3.3.4 Looking at the recent Student Engagement Survey (SES), this saw the University remaining at joint 73rd and enhancing the student learning experience through engaging and interactive support through myBU, could be a factor in helping the University move forward. DDEPPs had agreed in principle to have University-wide i-Innovate PREP, where each staff member has been asked to make one small teaching innovation, ideally using myBU through the TEL Toolkit tool. Staff would then be requested to prepare one PowerPoint slide for the end of the academic year which would provide an analysis of how well the University was progressing.

3.3.5 Dr Roushan advised that academic staff were in the process of developing learning excellence around the feedback received from students over recent years and also using data from SimOn with regards to information received regarding assessment briefs and learning content, which the University was continually trying to provide to students. Recently it had been established that there was much more information at Faculty level which could be explored on myBU than the University was previously aware of. DDEPPs agreed to share the packaging learning content with Faculties.

3.3.6 IT had ensured that each tutor at the University had access to Lecture Capture and tutors were encouraged to use it, and it was highlighted that Lecture Capture was helpful for disabled students. Lecture Capture supported blended learning by encouraging academics to develop learning activities using technology, provided screen capture and allowed the digi-recording of lectures. Information was also available in advance of lectures through VLEs to those students who need to prepare prior to lessons which in turn was inclusive to all students regardless of learning style or need. Members were encouraged to speak to Learning Technologists as they have a wealth of practice which could be shared, and ultimately students being provided with any extra assistance as required.

3.3.7 A discussion took place around feedback and the Committee agreed that timely responses to feedback from students would be a ‘quick win’ for the University. Dr Holley and Dr Roushan would provide a ‘Suite of Innovation’ at the next meeting that members could share with colleagues in Faculties. Any feedback/ comments from SUBU would be welcomed.

**Action: AJ/E-MW/RP**

3.3.8 Prof McIntyre-Bhatty reminded the Committee that the University was at an important point in the Vision4Learning process and the University would need to spearhead innovation for students and staff by making technology easier for staff and stimulating for students over the next few years. Dr Holley agreed to circulate a link to information which would help members to understand EU good practice and could inform discussions taking place within Faculties about the best methods to move forward academically and pedagogically.

**Action: DH**

3.4 SUBU President’s Report

3.4.1 The Full Time Officer (FTO) elections had recently taken place with nearly 3,000 students voting in the election, which was an increase of nearly 500 votes on the previous year. This election also had the most diverse range of candidates. For 2016/17 there an additional FTO - Vice President Community had been introduced who would work closely with Ian Jones, Head of Regional Community Partnerships and work on transport issues. The new SUBU FTOs for 2016/17 were confirmed as:

 President Daniel Asaya

 Vice President Activities Brooke Elias

 Vice President Community Georgia Larkins

 Vice President Education Jamie Swanson

 Vice President Welfare Emma Baker

3.4.2 This year had been the first year of the new SIMple ONline (SimOn) feedback tool for Student Reps. In the first semester, SimOn collected nearly 12,000 comments which would allow Student Reps to engage further in discussion and ask questions, as well as being able to keep an accurate record of the information. SUBU now send SimOn reports to Faculties, although the core of the report was intended for Associate Deans Student Experience (ADSEs). The top themes of the reports were the quality of teaching, a lack of organisation with regard to timetables, unclear assignment briefs and assessment criteria, library resources, University buses and general campus facilities.

3.4.3 Ms Barron questioned whether any SimOn comments had been received with regards to Student Services as she had not received any comments to date. Ms Mayo-Ward was unsure whether the facility for Student Services had been put in place, but would check to see whether any comments relating to Student Services had been received as Estates, IT and the Library had been receiving comments.

**Action: EM-W**

3.4.4 The University of Kent had been impressed with SimOn and were looking to introduce SimOn to collect feedback and a number of other universities were also considering introducing SimOn. The National Union of Students (NUS) was examining the possibility of trying to support its development nationally which would provide informative and timely data available across the sector.

3.4.5 SUBU recently held its ‘Activities Awards’ evening which recognised the extra-curricular work achieved by BU students. Thirteen clubs achieved the status of ‘5 Star Club’ which was the highest number ever. In order to achieve this recognition, the clubs must engage a wide diversity of students in their club, should raise money for charity, work in the community and work with other societies/clubs.

3.4.6 With regards to the Personal Development SimOn topic, students have many opportunities for professional networking as the University regularly invites guest speakers to the University, however students often fail to attend. Ms Mayo-Ward and Ms Barron agreed to work together to provide information to students about guest speakers and those visiting the University as industry links, and to encourage attendance at these valuable events.

3.4.7 Prof McIntyre-Bhatty was pleased to hear that members liked the SimOn data provided, although some of the patterns were a surprise, for example in the Assessment and Feedback section, ‘Unclear assignment briefs and assessment criteria’ had received 229 comments under the ‘What doesn’t work well’ section and had received 51 comments in the ‘What works well’ section. This was an area the University had been working hard on for a few years now and it appeared that academic staff were still not dealing with this issue appropriately.

3.4.8 Another area which was disappointing to read was the Organisation and Management section. The ‘Good organisation of timetable’ section had received 102 comments in the ‘What works well’ section and 394 comments in the ‘What doesn’t work well’ section. The Committee had been aware of this issue and working hard to resolve issues for a long time and were surprised to see this data. Overall Student Experience received 230 comments in the ‘What works well’ section and 21 in the ‘What doesn’t work well’ section. *Poor* campus facilities in the Overall Student Experience section received 354 comments in the ‘What doesn’t work well’ section and *good* campus facilities only 68 comments in the ‘What works well’ section. *Poor* campus facilities and *improve* campus facilities were the highest proportion of comments in the ‘What doesn’t work well’ and ‘Ideas for improvements’ sections. Again this was not necessarily what the Committee would have expected to see given the investments being made including the Student Centre.

3.4.9 Ms Mayo-Ward believed that students’ impressions of the University would improve vastly upon the completion of the FB1 building as students’ satisfaction of University facilities would increase. It was also agreed that this was the first year of SimOn being used in the University, and it had been difficult to compare data with previous years. Upon receipt of next year’s responses SUBU would be able to provide more accurate comparable information. Ms Mayo-Ward confirmed that SimOn responses were sent to ADSEs in Faculties at present. If SimOn information should be forwarded on to other Faculty staff, members were requested to advise Ms Mayo-Ward.

**Action: All**

3.4.10 In order to understand the information provided, members thought it might be useful to compare the information with the feedback received from the Student Experience Forum which may include local issues. It was noted that Estates, IT, the Library and all Faculties were currently receiving SimOn information. It was agreed that any general issues which arise, should be forwarded to Ms Barron. Mr James advised that he would be looking further into the SimOn results for the Students’ Union.

3.4.11 Prof McIntyre-Bhatty asked each DDEPP to progress the essence of the discussion at each Faculty Education and Student Experience Committee (FESEC) meeting and any actions which arise should be acted upon by each department.

**Action: DDEPP**

**4. PART 2: FOR APPROVAL AND ENDORSEMENT**

4.1 There were no items for approval and endorsement.

**5. PART 3: FOR NOTE**

5.1 Centre for Excellence in Learning Update

5.1.1 DDEPPs were advised to contact Dr Holley if they would like her to attend a FESEC meeting to speak about Assessment and Feedback.

5.1.2 **Noted:** The paper was noted.

**6 REPORTING COMMITTEES**

6.1 Student Voice Committee Minutes of 2 March 2016

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

6.2 Technology Enhanced Learning Strategy Forum (TELSF) Minutes of 12 January 2016, 9 February 2016 and 8 March 2016

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

6.3 Faculty Education and Student Experience Committee (FESEC) Minutes

6.3.1 Prof McIntyre-Bhatty was pleased to see that Faculties were having detailed and important discussions at FESEC meetings and business was being moved forward effectively.

6.3.2 **Noted:** The Faculty of Health & Social Sciences FESEC minutes of 23 February 2016 were noted.

6.3.3 **Noted:** The Faculty of Management FESEC minutes of 13 January 2016 and 9 March 2016 were noted.

6.3.4 **Noted:** The Faculty of Media & Communication FESEC minutes of 17 February 2016 were noted.

6.3.5 **Noted:** The Faculty of Science & Technology FESEC minutes of 19 February 2016 were noted.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **7 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**7.1 Ms Barron and Dr Osborne have been working together to advise Academic Advisers of where to locate helpful information on the staff intranet and information relating to the Programme Leaders Support Network. |  |
| **8. DATE OF NEXT MEETING** Wednesday 18th May 2016, 10.00am in the Board Room |  |