University of the West of England
BRISTOL

ACADEMIC BOARD

Academic Quality and Enhancement Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 28 November 2012 at 2pm in The Dartington Suite, Farmhouse, Frenchay Campus

Present:	Jackie Chelin, John Clarke, Rachel Cowie, Fay Croft, Liz Falconer, Nadine Fry, Lisa Harrison, James Longhurst, Katie McFadden, Julie McLeod (Chair), Margaret Needles, Billie Oliver, Neeaj Ramyead, Oliver Reid, Kathryn Ross, Sam Thomson, Fiona Tolmie, Stephen Waite, Karen West, Neil Willey, Teresa Wood
In Attendance:	Rebecca Smith (Officer), Martin Underwood (for item 4.3)

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

AQEC12.11.01   Sophie Evans, Paul Gough, Emmanuel Okon, Jonathan Simmons

MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETINGS

AQEC12.11.02   The Committee agreed that the minutes reflected an accurate account of the discussions which took place at the meeting on 03rd October 2012.

AQEC12.11.03   The actions from the last meeting were discussed further. The list of current University Committees and student representatives had been circulated. Timetables had been agreed between students and staff so that Student Rep Staff Forums (SRSFs) should now be taking place. It was recognised that it was late in the academic year to begin the SRSF schedule; however problems had been encountered with aligning SRSF meetings to student timetables, and receiving confirmation of student representatives, which needed to be sought before the meeting dates could be confirmed. A few field and programme leaders had organised their own meetings. This process would be revised for the next academic year. The SRSF dates also do not align to the schedule of Departmental Committees. Further discussions with the Deputy Academic Registrar would take place to ensure these problems were resolved and not repeated for the 2013-14 academic year. The CETTS Team had worked hard to find appropriate slots for meetings, and discussions with student reps had taken place to allocate them to the right SRSF, however it was not always possible to accommodate everyone. There also needed to be further communication to students when meetings were changed. The Governance Team had circulated a final set of dates and times for meetings, which would now be worked to.

AQEC12.11.04   There were also concerns over the lack of consultation with

students about the NSS results. Further problems in the allocation of student representatives to Committees, which had meant in some instances there were different students on SRSFs to that on Departmental Forums. A further review of governance arrangements and the inclusion of students in quality assurance processes and governance structures was needed. The Chair had previously visited Exeter University and had taken away some ideas and suggested models for further improvement to the UWE system. It was suggested that a fixed governance structure and timetable would ensure earlier engagement.

Action: Deputy Academic Registrar

AQEC12.11.05   At the last meeting, AQEC received an update on the progress of the Online Module Evaluation project. The suggestions from AQEC had been fed back to the project group, and a pilot had taken place which had worked well. An email to staff had detailed the communications due to be sent shortly to staff and students, and the frequently asked questions devised to help use the tool. The project would be implemented to allow students who are finishing a module in December to complete a module survey online; this will allow for further developments if needed before students complete their studies for the academic year in May. The issue of disengagement with an online method of module evaluation was discussed; many other institutions had tried and failed. One main reason for this may have been the perceived link to online submission and assessment; however this would be a separate tool within blackboard. The aim of the project would be to maintain response rates, increase the level of evaluation to all modules, and to utilise the feedback to enhance UWE curriculum; students being able to see the improvements being made from their feedback would increase engagement. A progress report would be submitted to AQEC at the end of the academic year to gauge whether response rates had increased, and the quality of the responses received.

Action: Online Module Evaluation Project Lead

AQEC12.11.06   The project had considered making the feedback tool compulsory, which students would need to complete before receiving assessment feedback. At present, the University hoped that the ease of the tool within blackboard would increase response rates, so this had not been incorporated. Once these initial investigations had taken place, further consideration would be given to linking the survey to a compulsory method. The student representatives did not see a problem with this, as long as the survey was not too time consuming they recommended considering making it compulsory. Further promotional suggestions of using pop ups within the library database may also draw students attention. Along with Module Leaders, it would also be essential for student representatives and the Students' Union to champion the survey. The timing of the survey was also discussed, which at present was at the end of the module in most cases. Further investigation would take place into whether this could be earlier within the module to allow current students to benefit from improvements. At

present this would be easier for long thin modules, but not short and fat. This would also increase the opportunity to discuss feedback within lectures, and unpick what can sometimes be generic feedback. It was important to note, however, that feedback would be anonymous. All of the suggestions made would be fed back to the project group.

Action: Online Module Evaluation Project Lead

AQEC12.11.07   The suggestions made by AQEC on the Technology Enhanced Learning Strategy were incorporated into the paper which was considered and approved by Academic Board. The discussions around technology and normalising TEL at Academic Board had not resulted in actions or changes, but would help develop the strategy in the future. The final TEL Strategy would be sent to AQEC members for information.

Action: Head of EIC

MATTERS ARISING

AQEC12.11.08   The matters arising from the last meeting were noted.

ANNUAL BUSINESS FOR AQEC

AQEC12.11.09   The annual business agenda for AQEC was received, which aimed to ensure the Committee had an opportunity to identify and discuss enhancement opportunities, along with receiving reports from working groups and Committees. The April 2013 meeting would focus on specific enhancement theme(s). Student feedback should be added to the standing items of the Committee, and a verbal report would be provided by the student representatives at each meeting. There were also other suggestions made at the October AQEC meeting which could be considered for inclusion or as an enhancement theme, and the Graduate Destinations Report would be brought to the February 2013 meeting. Assessment and feedback had been highlighted as a major issue for UWE, and a conference on this topic had been scheduled in January 2013. The Chair encouraged colleagues to participate and engage with this.

Action: Committee Officer

REVIEW OF PERIODIC CURRICULUM REVIEW IN 2011-12

AQEC12.11.10   The revised report brought together the good practice, themes and recommendations for the University. It was useful to bring these outcomes together, and possible themes within the commendations should be highlighted and communicated. One area which may have been missed within the outcome reports was confirmation of whether the curriculum was still current, met QAA benchmarks and was comparable to similar provision in other HEIs. This outcome is usually taken as a given unless particular issues have been identified, however it may be useful to ensure this is included within the QMEF guidelines as it was an important

outcome to note. The alignment to Faculty, University and external strategies, for example TEL and the Sustainability Plan, would also be included. Recommendations from some of the reviews suggested expanding external links, which although extremely important is sometimes hard to do under time restrictions. Could this be encouraged further by the University, and specific time allocated to allow this to take place? The recommendations to faculties would be taken forward by Heads of Department within Departmental M+E, but further consideration was needed regarding where University actions should be considered. The Head of the Quality Process Team in CAS, liaising with the Governance Team, would confirm the most appropriate forum for discussion of University actions.

Action: Head of Quality Process Team

AQEC12.11.11 There was a further discussion around the use of blackboard and ISIS for short courses and CPD. Blackboard did not accommodate short course programmes, and true CPD within ISIS was managed through virtual awards which were incoherent. There had also been recent issues with regard to access to blackboard. The TEL Management Group would take this forward, although it was recognised that the CPD system needed to be considered prior to changes being made to the policy. Links to RBI would also now encourage the support and management of CPD students.

Action: TEL Management Group

AQEC12.11.12 The Chair specifically highlighted commendations identified within the report, for example the use of students within the feedback process at Hartpury College. Overall, the Committee agreed that the revised report with the executive summary confirmed that appropriate curriculum review had taken place. The progress of recommendations being taken forward and fed back to AQEC would be clarified.

Action: Head of Quality Process Team

SUMMARY OF EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORTS IN 2011-12

AQEC12.11.13 The Committee received the summary report, and noted that specific themes and actions had been identified for consideration by the University. The Chair welcomed the report, stating that the more coherent and themed outcomes ensured it was easier to decipher these University actions. The paper also included data sets extracted from the tick boxes within external examiner reports, although it was confirmed that the colour coding was not as useful. Further dissemination was planned for Faculty ASQCs and SRSFs. The report had been sent to the SU for feedback, although time restrictions meant this had not been considered prior to AQEC. It would also be useful for Faculty ASQCs to consider the report prior to submission to AQEC, and this was planned for future years. This would also ensure the outcomes were fed into Annual Monitoring. Time restrictions and the re-arranging/cancellation of some ASQCs in October had meant this

had not been possible this year.

AQEC12.11.14   The area of moderation, first and second marking and changes to marks had been identified within the report, and it was identified that this was an area of the regulations which would usefully be discussed at the EE Induction Day. The regulations are clear and practices are in place to ensure there is a fair and consistent approach to challenging marks within moderation, so it was unclear why this had been identified as an area for concern by external examiners. This was a theme extracted from a number of external examiner reports, and academic staff queried whether it would be useful in these instances to highlight the number of programmes associated with these comments, the number of examiners which made this comment and whether they are new or existing examiners to help gage the level of dissatisfaction. Plagiarism was also identified as an area for concern, which had been highlighted within the 2010-11 feedback from external examiners. Within the 2011-12 academic year the University had developed and implemented an assessment offences policy and therefore it would be useful to note this progress within the report. It may also be beneficial to split feedback between academic and professional external examiners, as professional examiners may have less understanding of quality assurance processes within HE. However, induction processes and mentor allocation should ensure this is not the case. Again, it would be useful to check whether externals within a field team had identified similar issues, or whether some comments were isolated. Small field teams may also mean that one negative report could have a bigger impact on overall satisfaction over bigger field teams, thus emphasising the need to balance the analysis of this feedback.

AQEC12.11.15   The Chair raised concern regarding the inconsistent process of sending draft scripts to external examiners; this is an important aspect of the role. The use of blogging as an assessment tool had been identified as an area of good practice, although tutor access to blackboard may restrict this practice. This would be considered further within the online assessment project. This project would allow external examiners to access learning and teaching material through blackboard, but also would link to the systems and processes underpinning this, therefore involving colleagues from the Programme Administration and Assessment Team (PAAT) and Quality Team within CAS. Prior to the roll out of the online access portal, interim access would be available for external examiners. Both PAAT and module leaders had been involved in this, which ensures all systems (ISIS and the Curriculum Approval and Review SharePoint website) were integrated and maintained in one place to avoid duplication and error. This project would also link into the new TEL Strategy.

Action: The Project Liaison Officer from IT Services

AQEC12.11.16   The area of concern regarding support for weaker students could be an enhancement theme discussed at the April AQEC meeting. It would also be necessary for faculties to take this forward for further consideration. These concerns had also been highlighted

through other feedback routes, and therefore the University should take this forward. The Faculty of Business and Law had been commended on this area of practice, and these processes could be disseminated and shared across the University. It was agreed that this, along with the area of moderation, would be enhancement themes for discussion at the April AQEC meeting and would be added to the annual business agenda. The report also identified variations across the faculties in ownership and practice of provision delivered by partner institutions, which would also be added to the discussion items.

Action: Committee Officer

AQEC12.11.17   The quote regarding the overall agreement from external examiners that UWE provision is comparable to other similar Universities, and in some instances Russell Group Universities, was discussed. This quote would be removed from the report as this was not necessary. The comment regarding seeking input from external examiners for new or changes to curriculum would be rolled out further within the new QMEF processes for curriculum design and approval from January 2013, although it was noted that this practice was already in place in HLS and had been commended. Again within HLS the Chair noted issues which had arisen through other feedback routes regarding discrepancies with marking and suitability to practice within the Psychology Department, these had not been highlighted within the report. These would need to be taken forward by the Associate Dean LTSE in HLS and the Head of Department.

Action: Associate Dean LTSE HLS

AQEC12.11.18   The quantitative data sets within the report were discussed. The comparison to the last two years' data and as stated above, the colour presentation along with the uses of + and – signs, was confusing. These colours (i.e. the use of red as a decrease in confidence) may not always be appropriate as it may not have decreased by a significant amount. The balance overall also needed to be clearer, i.e. the committee would not need to know if 100% confidence had been received, rather the balance between limited and broad confidence, and whether overall this had increased rather than looking at a particular question. The Quality Team in CAS planned to undertake a review of the external examining process within 2012-13, and the questions/structure of the report and this thematic summary would be taken forward for consideration.

Action: Quality Team

AQEC12.11.19   Colleagues within PAAT should be the main liaison with external examiners with regard to sending relevant documentation. Some of the data also suggested that Boards were not conducted appropriately. Other issues regarding arrangements for visiting the University were highlighted. These ownership issues identified by examiners and highlighted in Appendix 3 had been fed back to the Deputy Academic Registrar, who would take this forward via

consultation with PAAT and the Chair.

Action: DAR

AQEC12.11.20   The report highlighted broad themes for improvement of practices across the University. It was recognised that these themes may not be common across the whole University, but should feed into pockets where improvement was needed. It was also recognised that not all areas of good practice identified would be appropriate in other areas of the University, therefore further engagement from Programme Managers would help identify where areas of improvement were needed, and whether good practice identified within other programme clusters would be appropriate. Since the centralisation of University administration, increased University ownership was evident for external examiners, for example the Induction event which was being organised by the Quality Team. Further engagement with external examiners throughout the year may also lead to increased understanding and confidence within annual reports. Although there were issues identified by AQEC members regarding this analysis and summary report (the correlation between the actions identified (qualitative) and the datasets (quantitative) – which at present do not seem to link together), and the level of University oversight required, the Chair confirmed that some clear actions had been identified for further action, and that the report had opened up a useful discussion around the process of external examining; something which had not taken place before. The Quality Team would consider this feedback to improve the reporting process within 2012-13, and the way in which the University analyses and reports on this feedback. Potential software had been identified to help this analysis in the future. The consideration of the postgraduate research external examining system (how this is currently undertaken and how they could be linked up) would also be included, along with academic colleagues to ensure the feedback is useful for them. It would also be useful to have clearer definitions regarding the different types of confidence examiners have (i.e. broad/limited etc), and to ensure they are able to clearly indentify why they may only have limited confidence.

Action: Quality Team

AQEC LEARNING FROM REPORT (LEARNING FROM PROGRAMME REPORTS PRODUCED IN 2012-13)

AQEC12.11.21   The Deputy Academic Registrar spoke to a review and lessons learned paper reporting on the process of completing programme reports within 2011-12 A sample of programmes had been reviewed, and an example of a good and bad report had been attached. It was recognised that there were timing problems within the Annual Monitoring process, and how this fits within the Committee Structure. The template also is not clear enough on completing wider analysis of other forms of feedback, such as the SES. There has been a particular emphasis this year on the NSS, but this had led to these other forms of feedback being overlooked. Discussions have started to ensure the Annual

Monitoring timings and process are improved for next year, and at present two Departments had volunteered to run workshops to consider this further. It would be useful for further workshops across the University to take place, as it may not be the case the one size fits all. This is especially evident where modules and programmes sit across departments and faculties.

AQEC12.11.22   Programme leaders had reported that they are asked to complete programme reports at a very busy time, and when complete data is not available from Business Intelligence. The full data is not published until re-sit data has been collated, however it may be more useful to publish the initial data from the July Boards to allow earlier engagement with the reports, and then update the data once the re-sit information is available. It would also be useful to have module reports available at the Field Boards to facilitate discussion with external examiners. Although the process of Annual Monitoring is a QAA requirement, it should also be seen as an opportunity to review and enhance provision, with an emphasis on outcomes. This may encourage programme managers to understand this as a useful enhancement process rather than something which has to be followed. There were still some programme reports missing, and the aim would be to receive 100% reports across the University. It was suggested that the data per programme be embedded into the report template, although this was available through links within the report. The aim was not to regenerate the data, but rather to access this and analysis it. It was recognised that extracting this data can take time, so easier means of accessing this and aligning it would be beneficial. The practice in HLS of completing programme reports earlier to allow for a more detailed analysis was agreed as good practice, and the guidance for this would be circulated to members for wider dissemination.

Action: Associate Head of Department of Health and Applied Social Sciences

AQEC12.11.23   NSS action plans were usually incorporated into annual monitoring reports, and the focus of individual action plans may have taken away the University oversight. Although there may be some duplication within 2012-13 because these different processes (SRSFs, module and programme reports and NSS) may ask the same questions, it was important to keep a coherent overall picture and a comprehensive action plan for the programme. It was agreed that a more streamlined approach would be considered for the following year. The qualitative information would be extracted, which would highlight areas that are not directly related to teaching and learning, which would be presented to VCE in the new year. This would then be fed into faculties/services to feed into their actions plans. University oversight of these actions was still key to ensuring there was an understanding of what was happening across the University. The Deputy Academic Registrar would work further with Associate Deans to ensure the process was more streamlined for 2013-14.

Action: DAR

QAA INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW 2014-15

AQEC12.11.24   The paper outlined the proposal to put together a small planning group, to consider and prepare for the QAA Institutional Review. This group would initially consider where we are and any gaps, and create plan for the next 3 years. The University has an advantage in that the Chair, the VP Education and the Student Representative Co-ordinator are trained QAA Reviewers/involved in the review process, their knowledge of the process can therefore be pulled upon.

NSS ACTION PLAN UPDATE FOR PRIORITY AREAS

AQEC12.11.25   The report provided an update on the progress to date from the identified NSS priority areas. The initial analysis had considered how satisfied students were compared to other discipline areas, and had pulled their findings together under 4 categories; target group 1 being the highest priority. This target group was considered separately, whereas groups 2,3 and 4 were pulled together. One of the key recommendations was to enhance student input and engagement in SRSFs. All of the actions and recommendations will be reviewed again in January 2013 to identify whether there has been an increase in this level of engagement. The hope was that this would show students the University was taking action – it was agreed that action plans should be regularly discussed at SRSF and other student forums.

AQEC12.11.26   The postgraduate research (PGR) survey would take place through the HEA-led PRES, and would be signed off shortly. In the future this would mean the University was able to consider feedback for both UG and PG provision at the same time. Postgraduate taught programmes had also been brought into the SES. Clear communication would be key to ensuring engagement with this. The PGR survey would take place every 2 years, and will be implemented in April 2013.

REPORTS FROM AQEC SUB GROUPS

AQEC12.11.27   The Committee noted that the first meeting of the Learning For All Hub Group would be arranged shortly. The first meeting would pull together cross university champions to discuss what the hub would look like.

Widening Participation and (School & Colleges) Partnership Group

AQEC12.11.28   The Group would meet 3 times a year. An operational group would also be put together to consider the access agreement, future plans and other strategies, with a substantive item for discussion taking place at each meeting. There will also be some analysis of WP data to understand further our enrolment within the widening participation category, and to indicate what is happening with our WP students. A dashboard would also be created to allow faculty colleagues to interrogate this data. A new access agreement will

be written for 13-14, along with a WP Statement Plan. This will be a central plan bringing together all aspects of WP across the University, i.e. UWE Federation and schools and college partnerships. This will identify achievable targets to increase WP. These other WP relationships already existed, although they may be focusing on other areas so it would be essential to capture the value of these relationships within WP, and to ensure they are consistently managed. It was also envisaged that relationships with existing UWE Federation College could be developed to support more than just the delivery of Foundation Degrees.

ACTIONS FROM THE FBL ASQC IDENTIFIED FOR AQEC CONSIDERATION

AQEC12.11.29   The issues with regard to 1) access to services for programmes starting at non-standard times, and 2) making Blackboard available for a longer period before automatic processes cut off, were considered by AQEC. Some students had not been able to access materials within Blackboad within their first few weeks of teaching. This issue is mainly linked to problems this year with registration, and a Registration Project Board has been set up to manage the start of year activities for next year. Non standard start times also cause problems with regard to access to Blackboard, the library and other facilities such as picking up ID cards. The student demographic was changing, and the idea of ensuring access to facilities at different times is essential to accommodate this. The Chair would take these issues forward with Facilities for further consideration.

Action: Chair

AQEC12.11.30   Issues had also been identified with guest access to Blackboard. It had been assumed that guest access was a default setting; however staff did have to request this. The Project Liaison Officer from IT Services would take this issue forward.

Action: Project Liaison Officer from IT Services

Post meeting note:

AQEC12.11.30
Guest access to Blackboard
In response to queries about the availability of a course for guest access and the action required from the tutor.

All Blackboard courses have been made available for guest access and in practice this means access to course materials in Blackboard.

No action is required from the tutor to make course materials available for guest access unless the course materials contain e-reserves, in which case they are not available. Availability of Blackboard e-reserves is constrained by the conditions of our agreement with the CLA (Copyright Licensing Agency).

Action is required if other course content areas are to be made available for guest access; Blackboard support guidance is available to instruct how to do this at this address http://info.uwe.ac.uk/online/blackboard/staff/guides/guest-access.asp

If colleagues believe that this guidance does not provide sufficient instruction, the Blackboard Support Team would be happy to work with them to make the guidance more intuitive and instructive.

The content of the current guidance is reproduced here:

Managing Guest Access in Blackboard Courses
Background

It has always been possible to make Blackboard courses available on a read-only basis to all UWE students and staff, in particular for showing course content to students who are making module selections. This is achieved by enabling "guest access" on a course and content basis. To support wider access, IT Services have been asked to enable this feature on all Blackboard courses from 2012/13.

All courses will by default allow guest access, however if an instructor has a particular need to restrict access to content, they can decide which individual content areas are available to guests by following the Quick Steps below. Newly created content areas by default are unavailable to guests. Please note guest access does not extend to discussion boards, assessments or other interactive tools. Special arrangements will be made for licensed content managed through Blackboard e-Reserves.

In this context guests are people who have already have access to Blackboard: they will generally be staff or students, and guest access does not equate to public access. This means:

- *UWE students and staff can search for courses using the search function on the Courses Tab in Blackboard and access content even though they are not enrolled on the course*
- *Instructors retain control over which content areas are accessible to guests*
- *Guests can only access available courses that have passed their start date and have not yet reached their Field Board date.*
- *Guests cannot access Feedback courses (i.e. those which have passed their Field Board date) through the Course Search function.*
- *Discussion boards, assessments or other interactive tools are never visible to guests*

Guest access is of particular value for showing course content to students who are making module selections, or students who completed earlier runs of a module but still want access.

AQEC12.11.31   Part time students also face particular issues to access; they are almost invisible within the general management of the University. NSS results from part time students have been analysed, with feedback suggesting that they feel like second class citizens. Identifying a community for these students as soon as possible was essential as students will be partaking in the NSS again within a few months. The DAR confirmed work was underway to consider how to move forward for these staff and students.

Action: DAR

AQEC Minutes: R Smith
Unconfirmed: 29 November 2012
Chairs minutes:
Confirmed:

ACADEMIC QUALITY AND ENHANCEMENT GROUP – ACTION SHEET FROM THE MEETING HELD ON 28 November 2012

Minute	Substance	Actioning Officer	Reporting\other deadline
AQEC12.11.04	To consider the models taken from Exeter University, and a fixed timetable for the governance structure.	**DAR**	**Before the next academic year**
AQEC12.11.05	A progress report to be submitted to AQEC to gage whether the response rates for the online module evaluation had increased, and the quality of feedback being received.	**Online Module Evaluation Project Lead**	**June 2013 AQEC meeting**
AQEC12.11.06	To send the approved TEL strategy to AQEC members for information.	**Head of EIC**	**By the next meeting of AQEC**
AQEC12.11.09	To add student feedback as a standing item on the AQEC agenda, for verbal feedback from the students union at each meeting.	**AQEC officer**	**By the next meeting of AQEC**
AQEC12.11.10 & 12	To consider where University actions and recommendations arising from the summary report of periodic curriculum reviews in 2011/12 should be sent for action, and how they would be fed back to AQEC.	**Head of the Quality Process Team**	**By the next meeting of AQEC**
AQEC12.11.11	To re-consider the management of CPD at UWE.	**TEL Management Group**	
AQEC12.11.15	To include the consideration of allowing external examiners access to online blogs to encourage further use as an assessment tool within the EE portal project.	**Project Liaison Officer for IT Services**	
AQEC12.11.16	To add the following enhancement themes to the agenda for AQEC in April: • Support for weaker students; • Moderation and the moving of marks within a cohort; • Variations across the faculties of ownership and practice of provision delivered by partner institutions	**Committee Officer**	**By the next meeting of AQEC**
AQEC12.11.17	To consider the feedback regarding discrepancies in marking within HLS.	**Associate Dean LTSE HLS**	
AQEC12.11.18 & 20	To consider the feedback from AQEC members within the review of the external examining process.	**Quality Team**	

AQEC12.11.19	To take forward the issues identified within appendix 3 of the report with the Programme Administration and Assessment Team.	**DAR**	
AQEC12.11.22	The guidance within the Department of Health and Applied Social Sciences regarding the completion of programme reports at an earlier stage would be circulated to members for wider dissemination.	**AHod HASS**	**By the next meeting**
AQEC12.11.23	To work with Associate Deans LTSE to ensure the process of feedback (annual module and programme reports, SRSFs and NSS action plans) was more streamlined within 2013-14.	**DAR**	
AQEC12.11.29	To take forward the issues identified regarding students starting at non standard times with Facilities.	**Committee Chair**	
AQEC12.11.30	To take forward the issue with regard to guest access on Blackbloard.	**Project Liaison Office from IT Services**	
AQEC12.11.31	To consider ways to move forward with regard to the management of part time students.	**DAR**	