



University of the
West of England

ACADEMIC BOARD

Minutes of the meeting held on 26 June 2013 at 2pm in The Dartington Suite,
Farmhouse, Frenchay Campus

Present: Dave Allen, Jenny Ames, Gaynor Attwood, Martin Boddy,
Emma Brown, John Clarke, Olena Doran, Rachel Cowie,
Manuel Frutos-Perez, Paul Gough (Acting Chair), Selena
Gray, Jane Harrington, Philip Jones, Helen Langton, James
Longhurst, Julie McLeod, Jo Midgley, Patrick Nolan, Paul
Olomolaiye, Matthew Partington, Peter Rawlings, Olly Reid,
Catherine Rex, Jackie Rogers, Charlie Roper, Fiona Tolmie,
Rosie Scott-Ward

In Attendance: Tracey Horton, Rebecca Smith (Officer),

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

AB13.06.01 Andrea Cheshire, Trevor Goodhew, Alex Gilkison, Glynn Lyons,
Kathryn Ross, John Rushforth, Bruce Senior, Steve West (Chair)

MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETINGS

AB13.06.02 Members confirmed the minutes of the last meeting were an
accurate record. Although the last meeting had not been quorate,
all items had now been signed off as Chair's Action after
correspondence with members.

MATTERS ARISING

AB13.06.03 **Report from the VC on items approved following Chair's
action from the meeting held on 1 May 2013** was noted.

AB13.06.04 **Report on the character capacity of MySite** - The site was
originally devised with a 4000 character limit (c.500 words). This
has now been expanded on a roll out basis with an additional 500
words. Potentially around 300 staff would be submitting and
approximately 1000 publications would be considered. Further
investigations were looking into expanding this for research and/or
actives fields.

AB13.06.05 **Report on progress from the Academic Calendar Group** – The
Academic Calendar group met recently to start discussions on a
January start calendar. The draft was currently with members for
initial comments, with wider consultation to follow. A three
teaching block calendar was proposed, and potential impacts on
both UG and PG provision and transitional arrangements were
also being considered. HR had confirmed this could have
significant implications for staff and a group would be put together
to identify how these would be addressed.

- AB13.06.06 **Report on the discussions with ITS around Shutdown weekends** – Continued consultation on appropriate dates was taking place. The committee calendar could include ITS shut down dates, and any changes would be publicised in advance.
- AB13.06.07 **Report on systems integration** – The DVC, Resources and Director of CAS were working on this, and an update would be brought to the next Academic Board meeting.
- Action: DVC Resources**
- AB13.06.08 **Report to Academic Board on a plan to implement creative learning and teaching and assessment approaches** – This theme had been discussed at the AQEC Enhancement meeting in April. A set of principles and actions had been written and were due to be circulated to ASQCs for comment. ASQC will also consider feedback from the practice led workshop that had taken place earlier in June.
- AB13.06.09 The **review of module types brought into the regulatory review** would be discussed later in the meeting as part of the changes to the regulatory framework paper.
- AB13.06.10 **Report on discussions around practice led curriculum** – The new 2020 Strategy had a clear ambition to be internationally recognised for practice oriented curriculum. A workshop had been held on 17th June which looked at 2 areas: how could 'practice oriented' be defined, and what enablers could help staff be professionally relevant and to ensure curriculum had employer input. A further report would be brought to Academic Board in 2013/14. Members confirmed this workshop had been well attended and was very useful, although the ramifications could have a huge impact on the curriculum. There were currently many different interpretations of 'practice oriented' which would need to be filtered and tested in each Faculty. The workshop also highlighted the work already going on within UWE, and this would be considered and shared.
- AB13.06.11 **AQEC report to Academic Board of any actions taken as a result of the discussion of the themes indicated by external examiners** – The actions were all in hand, with a majority of the themes discussed at the AQEC Enhancement meeting being taken forward as part of the set of principles agreed. The themes would be pulled together along with any actions out of the Academic Board and AQEC enhancement discussions to provide a clear action plan.
- AB13.06.12 **Delivery of programmes in languages other than English** – It had been agreed to pilot (subject to due diligence) a programme in Finnish with a partner organisation in Helsinki. Following completion of two cohorts, this would be reviewed and a paper brought to Academic Board on future proposals. It was noted that there were a number of risks involved in managing this type of collaboration. The Special Curriculum Approval Panel was

undertaken in English which evidenced how conversant colleagues in Helsinki were in English, and this pilot would be useful to test how this type of delivery would work in practice.

STUDENT UNION REPORT

- AB13.06.13 The Students' Union Representatives thanked the Committee and members for welcoming them to Academic Board. There was real value in contributing to discussion at this level. The new SU president was welcomed, and the Student/Governors Forum was also deemed as extremely useful. The Chair confirmed a large number of SU reps had been present and contributed to the last meeting of AQEC, showing evidence of commitment during non teaching times.

CHANGES TO FACULTY STRUCTURES

- AB13.06.14 **HLS** – A proposal to change the name of the current Department of Applied Sciences to the Department of Biological, Biomedical and Analytical Sciences, to merge the Department of Psychology and Department of Health and Social Sciences to become the new Department of Health and Social Sciences, and to rename the Faculty to the Faculty of Health and Applied Sciences was received. All staff in the Faculty had been consulted, with a survey monkey system used to find the most popular choices for the new department names. This was seen as an exemplary method of checking whether titles were appropriate. The cost of changing titles was high, although it was recognised that signage was still not up to date across the University, and therefore the impact was minimal. The proposals were approved.
- AB13.06.15 **FET** – The proposal to expand the Construction and Property Department was received. During the portfolio review within the Faculty, the decision to close the Department of Planning and Architecture was made, moving the provision into the Departments of Construction and Property (C&P) and Geography and Environmental Management (GEM). Consultations had begun on the expanded department name, but the final outcome would not be known until the following Friday. The proposal set out three areas to move: architecture cluster programmes to move to C&P with the name of the department changing, the planning programmes would move to GEM (the department name to remain the same), and the Centre for Transport and Society was also proposed to be located in GEM. The Faculty wanted to bring the request to AB prior to final analysis of department title outcome to allow further time and subsequently Chair's Action to be taken. The Directorate of FET would meet, vote and make a decision. Members were happy to recommend approval of the Faculty changes, subject to approval by the Chair of Academic Board, following the outcome of the Faculty vote. (*Post meeting note: the Vice Chancellor has approved the title of Department of Architecture and the Built Environment*).

ACADEMIC BOARD STRUCTURE

- AB13.06.16 Members received a proposal to change the UWE Academic Board Governance structure and recommend approval to the Board of Governors. Changes would be reflected in the membership of AB, and to reflect a senate type committee, encouraging more deliberation and debate. Faculty Boards would also be introduced, but would not sit within the existing Quality Management and Enhancement (QME) Framework to allow a forum for discussion and debate amongst academic staff. Terms of reference had not yet been defined, but would include items for debate, advising Executive Deans and the Senate on academic strategy, relevant academic topics, promoting good practice and sharing learning within each Faculty. Voting for non executive membership would take place in September ready for the first meeting of Academic Board, and a draft committee calendar for 2013/14 had been circulated (Research Committee dates were still to be confirmed). Programme Management Committees would also be re-introduced to encourage programme teams to work more closely together, and would allow space to meet with members of SRSFs and external stakeholders/bodies once a year. With regard to the existing governance structure, there would be some minor tweaks in terms of membership but this would remain the same as in 2012/13. To enable the re-naming of AB to a 'senate' would require investigation into the University Articles; at present this would not be allowed. The election and decision making powers of executive and non executive members would also be dictated by the articles. The term senate was generally used in pre 92 Universities, which may therefore have merits but could also bring risks.
- AB13.06.17 Members welcomed the change to reflect more engagement with academic staff, and to change the balance of discussion. At present areas such as the NSS results were taken to the Vice Chancellors' Executive; this would be brought back to AB as the driver of the student experience. At present, AB was dominated by teaching and learning business, and it was hoped that the shift in membership would increase discussion around research but would also create a dynamic which would challenge and deliberate discussion. To encourage this, on top of having an approval remit, agendas would be opened up for topics to debate on, making meetings more interactive. Discursive agenda items could be suggested, or fed up from Faculty Boards.
- AB13.06.18 Any action coming to AB from the NSS and SES would be at a University wide level; results and action plans from student surveys would be reflected in programme level monitoring. As the proposal suggested that Associate Deans L&T would not be members of the new senate, it was noted that they would have oversight of student surveys through the annual monitoring cycle and action plans. The reintroduction of Programme Management Committees was also welcomed; some could be brought together in programme clusters as long as all key staff involved in the delivery of the programmes could attend.
- AB13.06.19 It was noted that learning and teaching fellows may be non academic staff from all over the University – the proposal would be

changed in light of this. The membership covering the area of research was questioned, however it was felt that the proposed balance between research and teaching members was appropriate as some of the elected members from the Faculty could be research active. There was also only 1 administrative representative, however voted in members could represent all areas across the University. Sending alternatives would also be reconsidered. It was noted that the workshop/discussion group method used for the April AQEC Enhancement meeting had worked well, facilitating more creative thinking. In addition, receiving presentations around key topics would be welcomed.

- AB13.06.20 When new or changes to policy were brought to the senate, it may be useful to provide the underlying principles initially prior to development work taking place. This would help identify early problems or involvement from key colleagues/centres, and would ensure the members were aware and understood these earlier. It was hoped the senate would be a policy setting chamber, rather than policy receiving although it would still keep a role in approving policy developments and regulations. The structure and changes to the agenda would also be key to ensuring the discursive senate hoped for in the paper; if the membership was changed but the same agenda used it was likely nothing would change. There would still be some reporting and approval business for the senate, but half of the agenda could be allocated to debate or the 'pitching' of proposals/papers. The VC wanted the senate to reflect the cultural shift within the HE sector, and members embracing this would ensure its success. There would be an annual event where the senate, VCE and Board of Governors met to share topics/business. The forum for this was still to be decided, but it would sit outside the formal governance structure. Induction for staff would also be considered to frame what would be expected from members.
- AB13.06.21 It was agreed that further investigation would take place regarding any necessary changes to the Articles; however AB **recommended** the changes to the Board of Governors.

THEMES FROM STUDENT FEEDBACK

- AB13.06.22 The tabled paper provided the Board with initial themes from the Student Experience Survey (SES) at an Institutional level. Business Intelligence had added a key related to the importance of each question. Faculty level results would be available within the next week. In the future, annual monitoring would be changed to pull SES, NSS and SRSF feedback together at programme level. The student partnership officer within CAS was currently undertaking a triangulation exercise between the three forms of feedback to identify themes, issues and good practice. A quick turnaround of this was key to ensuring earlier communication to students, subsequently increasing student engagement with surveys and feedback. Further work was also underway to consider how this could be effectively fed back to students i.e. a continuous 'Your Voice, Our Improvement' campaign. For example, the re-registration email to students highlighted some

examples where action had been taken in response to student feedback.

AB13.06.23 All of the work around student feedback was welcome, especially the early focus on the SES. This provided a snapshot of what level 1, 2 and PGT students were saying about the University, although it was important to consider alongside the NSS and SRSF feedback. The colour indicator showed some 'reds' which were issues for the University, and some 'greens' indicating areas which worked well although further work would be needed to decide how to use the data and choose priority areas for target. Online marking had been identified as a challenge for staff although the SES results showed an increase in satisfaction from students in receiving prompt feedback. It has become evident through NSS scoring that other comparable HEIs had made a step change upwards, where as UWE had remained level. This had brought UWE down in the rankings, and therefore the next NSS results would be important to see whether UWE had made enough change to increase this. However, it was noted that the tight timescales involved in last year's survey and action planning had not given much time for actions to be embedded. There was a cluster of issues around teaching, showing the need for support to deliver teaching more interactively and be more interesting and motivating. Communicating this to the Governors and managing their expectations would also be key. However, the results did show where work has been taking place. The outcomes of The Times Good University Guide were going to be delayed until September whilst a merger with The Sunday Times league tables was taking place; this was the general KPI the University had worked to in the past. Interim results from the DHLE on statistics of graduate employment were also encouraging.

AB13.06.24 With regard to module evaluations, having a more effective module evaluation process would be able to identify problems earlier and help with a higher marginal return, indicating more resource was needed to implement the online module evaluation form. Naming and shaming in some previous faculties had increased module deployment and identified where additional resource was needed. A strategy for implementation was being developed, including increasing engagement to 100% (only 47% modules deployed in May 2013 round). The response rates from students also show a drop in engagement; speed and following issues through would help increase this. Student feedback should also be considered as part of the field board, feeding into the quality discussions that were now taking place.

NEW POLICIES OR MAJOR AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING POLICIES

AB13.06.25 **Attendance and Engagement Policy** – The development of the new policy met new legislative requirements and had been developed as a result of student feedback. AQEC had endorsed the policy and ASQCs had been consulted; Academic Board was asked to grant approval. Key principles of the policy were the expectation of all students to attend and engage, with monitoring

in place to gauge this. Risk factors were in place to identify level of disengagement, with different processes for different levels of risk. Warnings would also be provided through blackboard. Levels of retention were increasing, and the implementation of the policy should have a further positive impact. The monitoring of the data would be vital, and further work was taking place over the summer around how student contact would be organised. It was felt that in some instances student advisors would be the most appropriate form of contact, in others it could be the programme manager. Bringing this together in a central process would ensure students were not contacted by multiple people. This would also ensure high risk students were contacted appropriately. It was suggested that UWE email addresses were consistently used, as some receive communication through personal emails which can be confusing; one email address would ensure all students knew where key communications would be sent, reducing privacy issues. This was one of the recommendations coming from the Student Communications Working Group. FET ASQC had highlighted concerns around the policy, and once the minutes were available a response to these would be welcome. The policy and implementation would be reviewed after 1 year. AB agreed to approve the policy.

Action: Chair to respond to FET ASQC concerns

AB13.06.26

Religious Observance Policy – Academic Board had previously asked the Director of CAS to develop a religious observance policy; SSD had also been tasked with this as part of the Single Equality Scheme. The paper brought to AB was a part of the policy which focused on assessment, to which a huge amount of work had taken place holding consultations with staff and students. The wider policy would cover areas such as food, dress and facilities. The Trade Unions had expressed concerns that the policy only covered students so further consultation was taking place. Concerns were raised over the evidence required. The Chaplaincy had been consulted, and investigations into other HEI religious policies had been done although no legal feedback had been sought. The Board felt overwhelmingly that UWE should not have a religious observance policy as presented. This could have implications for what has been agreed in the Single Equality Scheme. The Deputy Academic Registrar agreed to discuss this further with the PVC involved.

Action: DAR

AB13.06.27

Student Conduct Policy –The major changes to the student conduct policy were endorsed by AQEC. The changes meant the policy would be more accessible to students and had stripped out some of the detail for administrative processes, allowing for earlier resolution where possible. AB approved the changes.

AB13.06.28

Student Pregnancy, Maternity and Partner Leave Policy – The single equality scheme had requested the development of the new policy, which had been endorsed by AQEC. This included leave for adoption, although it was not reflected in the title. Work

regarding facilities for pregnant or nursing students was still ongoing, especially at Glenside and Bower Ashton campuses where only limited facilities were currently available. There were queries regarding guidance for students who decide to terminate their pregnancy (page 53) and the Board felt this should be reviewed. AQEC had also raised concerns about the policy being located in the disability service – the Director of Student and Partnership Services advised that this was being reviewed. AB approved the new policy subject to the above queries.

Action SSD

AB13.06.29

Disclosure and Barring Service Policy – The Disclosure and Barring Service was the new name of the Criminal Records Bureau. The existing policy only covered admissions; therefore a new policy had been developed to include other work happening across the University, making sure this was aligned. This had been endorsed by AQEC. All activity regarding specific programmes which have to be DBS checked were included, although casual staff were not (they would be part of the staff DBS check). Annual declarations were included, and communications to staff and students would be sent to confirm all of these new and changes to policy had been approved. AB approved the new policy.

UPDATE TO ACADEMIC REGULATIONS

AB13.06.30

Updates to the Regulations for the academic year 2013-14 – The first section of the report highlighted key changes to the regulations flagged for AB; the second section was a starred item detailing the list of changes made to the regulations over the academic year. The main changes reflected updates to Extenuating Circumstances (ECs) and PGR regulations. A Lean review considering ECs had looked at ways of streamlining and improving the service provided in terms of a quicker decision rather than a long wait leading up to the EC Panel. Item 1 provided clarity of acceptable evidence for an EC, and confirmed that earlier submission and better quality of evidence would reflect in a quicker decision. Item 3 reflected ECs for module gatherers and CPD students; they had previously not been permitted to use ECs in the past and it was proposed to allow this if needed. Item 4 described the 3 stage EC process: immediate response with decision, further evidence or discussion requiring input from a Panel chair which could be convened via telephone conference or via correspondence, or a Panel meeting being convened for more difficult decisions. Item 5 reflected the updates to the assessment offences policy (which had been approved by AQEC) and now included other offences such as self plagiarism. Item 6 updated the regulations for PGR students; they do not normally complete components of assessment. Again a table had been created to reflect the different types of assessment offences and penalties. Another change reflected minimum and maximum periods of registration for PhD students, aligning to the sector. Tidying up of the regulations had also been completed, aligning some procedures back to regulations where appropriate. Additional

regulations had also been added in some areas to provide further information/clarity where procedures had been removed during the separation of procedures and regulations into two separate documents.

AB13.06.31 Members agreed the work completed to update the regulations was excellent. One day illnesses such as food poisoning had not been included in discussions or changes for ECs and it may not always be possible to get medical evidence for these. In these instances, the expectation of students managing their time leading up to assessment was fine for coursework but not for examinations. A communication strategy was being put in place to advise students and staff of the regulatory and policy changes, especially regarding self plagiarism. Methods to detect this would be essential to ensuring regulations were met. The clearer guidance and expectations would help both students and staff to understand and engage with this. Cheating on exams would also be investigated further with CETTS. AB approved the changes.

AB13.06.32 **Variant regulations for UWEBIC** – The variant regulations were received, and emphasis was mainly around assessment regulations in terms of how they would run examination boards and the responsibilities of chief and field external examiners. AB approved the variant regulations.

AB13.06.33 **Minor updates to variant regulations for ProfGCE and PGCE programmes** – The variant regulations had been updated to reflect changes in terminology and out of date references. Where possible they had also been aligned to the main regulations. The changes were approved by AB.

BACHELOR OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION WITH HONOURS

AB13.06.34 The proposal to include an award of BBA in the regulations to meet the international market was received and approved.

ACADEMIC SKILLS SUPPORT PAPER

AB13.06.35 The paper proposed a hub and spoke approach to support students in their studies, and pulled together activity already available across the University. A workshop investigating academic literacy support in March raised issues which were brought in with feedback from other areas across the University. The workshop also highlighted that there was a lot of good practice, although this was not consistent or signposted well enough to students. One section of the paper provided information around work being undertaken by the Library, and recommendations centred around leadership, governance and a physical 'hub' which would offer generic activity/support spreading across the sites. Further development of the MySkills site would also be included, with positive feedback received regarding the changes already made to the front page. The challenging timeline around implementing the 'hub' at Frenchay Campus ready for December 2013 would be reviewed; along with the timelines to

provide a 'hub' at other campuses, but members welcomed the development. The SU welcomed all recommendations, and a leaflet would be produced to help signpost students to the right place.

WESTON COLLEGE – FDSC HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE PRACTICE

AB13.06.36 Retrospective approval was sought to allow 5 students recruited by Weston College to be admitted to the above programme without the requisite English and Maths. Additional support would be provided by the college to support the students, who would need to pass these pre-requisites to enable them to pass the degree. Changes had also been made to the delivery method for level 1 student's without formal approval, and it had since been reiterated to Weston College that University approval had to be sought through the appropriate channels prior to future changes being implemented. A review of UWE Federation Colleges was underway, with each completing due diligence through the Academic Partnership Team. The results of this were expected in June, and would facilitate decisions around allowing colleges to run validation only models instead of franchise. AB agreed to approve this request retrospectively but felt that University regulations and procedures must be reiterated to the College as activity such as this could not be tolerated in future.

DEPOSIT OF E-THESIS TO THE RESEARCH REPOSITORY

AB13.06.37 The request to allow completed PhD and Prof Doc e-theses to be automatically added to the repository was received. At present, theses were already deposited with the library and made available externally through the British library. A pilot had been run to provide a deposited format accessible through the repository which could be easily accessible, and approval was sought to implement this across the University. The Graduate School and Research and Knowledge Exchange Committees had discussed and agreed this, which would bring UWE in line with other HEI's. A process to identify whether there may be data within a thesis which would be protected by the confidentiality agreement would need to be put in place, which had already been taken into account for the print system. Workshops would be delivered to explain the principles i.e. benefits or losses to uploading the thesis. Separate processes regarding printed and online versions could be confusing, although at present it was a regulation to provide a printed copy. AB agreed to approve the proposal.

OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR ETHICS REVIEW OF STUDENT RESEARCH PROJECTS

AB13.06.38 Julie Kent attended the Board to present the proposal. The proposal had been considered previously at the Research Committee, and the paper set out the operating procedures and expectations for student research projects which involve human participation and therefore have an ethical aspect. HLS had already been piloting the procedures, and full implementation

would ensure a consistent approach across the University. Consultation had taken place with other faculties, and was deemed appropriate for all research students. Outcomes would be judged as either having competence, or would be considered further at the Ethics Committee. FAQs had been included in appendix 3, and would be available on the RBI site in time for September.

- AB13.06.39 Administrative support for students completing research projects was discussed. Support was provided where students have to apply to the Ethics Committee, with additional contacts available in some external organisations. However, in terms of support at module level, this is outside of the remit of the University Research Ethics Committee. Throughout the pilot issues had been identified regarding lack of admin support, with the existing policy implicating that the department should have something in place. Since the administrative restructure, the only support came from the Graduate School and RBI and further investigation would take place in the 2013/14 academic year to identify systems in place and admin overheads of supporting this system. FET had run a similar scheme which was risk based with module leaders/supervisors providing judgements, feeding into the Ethics Committee. Members were supportive of the approach for students; a standard approach was already set out for staff in the Ethics procedure. Discussions had also taken place with IT services to develop an online application process, supporting the system further. AB endorsed the proposals for implementation in August 2013.

Action: Research Ethics Committee to consider levels of support required

SELECTION OF STAFF FOR RESEARCH EXCELLENCE FRAMEWORK 2014

- AB13.06.40 Richard Bond attended the Board to present the paper. The report primarily set out the processes within the University for selecting staff to be included in the 2014 Research Excellence Framework (REF). These processes were governed by a code of practice which had been signed off by the Funding Council. The selection of staff was based around the quality of research, and was undertaken at Faculty level by Associate Deans (Research) and overseen by the REF strategy group. Internal and external peer review had been included; with the code of practice ensuring processes were completed fairly and transparently. Previous cycles of activity throughout the years had led to a refined submission process, and had identified who was likely to submit. The final stages were underway, and the report provided an overview of the size and shape of the University submission. Potentially around 300 staff would be submitting and approximately 100 publications would be considered. These numbers were slightly smaller than the University submission in 2008, but this was reflected in the higher submission requirements and the change to the way funding was received for the process. However, the number of completions per person was double that

of 2008; indicative of the higher level of quality. The University submission was due in November 2013, and would include the impact, marketing and publicity of UWE's research i.e. new stories. The outcomes would not be known until later in 2014.

AB13.06.41 It was noted that the interpretation of early career researchers was different to that in other institutions. Definitions were clearly set out by HEFCE i.e. started research career after August 2009, independent researchers, etc. Research Fellows and Senior Research Fellows were also independent of this. Other Universities have a different view of whether someone is classed as independent, although early career researchers were usually part of a team. There were also differences across subject areas.

AB13.06.42 All submissions were being considered and looked at, with some requiring tweaking or responses to areas of concern. The statistics were extremely impressive, with 50 million pounds of research income being included. Investigations would take place in the autumn term to gauge the impact of research, what we can do next and to consider sharing this with the wider University.

Action: UWE REF Manager

ANNUAL REPORTS

AB13.06.43 **Academic Quality and Enhancement Committee** – The summary of business undertaken by AQEC was received, and provided confirmation that the committee had discharged the responsibilities set out in the terms of reference.

AB13.06.44 **Collaborative Provision Committee** – The summary of business undertaken by CPC was received, and provided confirmation that the committee had discharged the responsibilities set out in the terms of reference.

AB13.06.45 **Graduate School** – The report highlighted outstanding results in terms of the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES). Other work within the Graduate School had been successful, i.e. the restructure from 4 areas to 1. A reconsideration of the name could reflect how successful this has been.

It was noted that the annual report from the Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee would be presented to the first academic board of the new year.

PROFESSOR EMERITA

AB13.06.46 The proposal to appoint Dr Lesley Moore as a Professor Emerita was approved by the Board.

AB13.06.47 An emeritus status for senior lecturers was suggested. The University had a separate list of titles which could be used, although this could be considered further to include this request.

Action: DAR

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

AB13.06.48 The Chair thanked the members and student representatives for their hard work throughout the year. Nominations for membership in the next academic year would be sent out shortly.

AQEC Minutes: R Smith
Unconfirmed: 01 July 2013
Chairs minutes: 12 July 2013
Confirmed:

ACADEMIC QUALITY AND ENHANCEMENT GROUP – ACTION SHEET FROM THE MEETING HELD ON 05 June 2013

Minute	Substance	Actioning Officer	Reporting/other deadline
AB13.06.07	Report on systems integration – The DVC, Resources and Director of CAS were working on this, and an update would be brought to the next Academic Board meeting.	DVC Resources	
AB13.06.25	Student Attendance and Engagement Policy - FET ASQC had highlighted concerns around the policy, and a response to these would be welcome.	Chair of AB	
AB13.06.26	The Board felt overwhelmingly that UWE should not have a religious observance policy. This could have implications for what has been agreed in the Single Equality Scheme. The Deputy Academic Registrar agreed to discuss this further with the PVC involved.	DAR	
AB13.06.28	Student Pregnancy, Maternity and Parent Leave Policy - AQEC had also raised concerns about the policy being located in the disability service – the Director of Student and Partnership Services advised that this was being reviewed. AB approved the new policy subject to the above queries.	SSD	
AB13.06.39	Operating Procedures for Ethics Review of Student Research Projects -Throughout the pilot issues had been identified regarding lack of admin support. Since the administrative restructure, the only support came from the Graduate School and RBI and further investigation would take place in the 2013/14 academic year to identify systems in place and admin overheads of supporting this system.	Research Ethics Committee	
AB13.06.42	Selection of Staff for Research Excellence Framework 2014 - Investigations would take place in the autumn term to gauge the impact of research, what we can do next and to consider sharing this with the wider University.	UWE REF Manager	
AB13.06.47	An emeritus status for senior lecturers was suggested. The University had a separate	DAR	

	list of titles which could be used, although this could be considered further to include this request.		
--	--	--	--