



## ACADEMIC BOARD

Minutes of a meeting of Academic Board held on Wednesday 13 March 2013.

**Present:** Dave Allen, Jenny Ames, Gaynor Attwood, Andrea Cheshire, Olena Doran, Manuel Frutos-Perez, Alex Gilkison, Trevor Goodhew, Paul Gough, Jane Harrington, Philip Jones, James Longhurst, Julie Mcleod, Jo Midgley, Patrick Nolan, Emmanuel Okon, Paul Olomolaiye, Peter Rawlings, Olly Reid, Catherine Rex, Jackie Rogers, Kathryn Ross, John Rushforth, Bruce Senior, Fiona Tolmie, Steven West (Chair)

**Apologies:** Jadeon Basecombe, Martin Boddy, John Clarke, Alison Fletcher, Selena Gray, Helen Langton, Glenn Lyons, Matthew Partington, Pippa Regan, Tom Renhard, Stephen Waite

**In Attendance:** Rachel Cowie (Secretary); Beryl Furey-King (Clerk); Lysandra Marshall (UCU)

### AB13.03.1 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

*Paper AB130301 and AB130302 were received*

Academic Board approved the minutes of the meetings of 19 December 2013 and 14 February 2013.

### AB13.03.2 MATTERS ARISING

**AB13.03.2.1** Attendance and Engagement Policy  
*Minute AB12.12.2.5 refers*

**AB13.03.2.1.1** The Pro-Vice Chancellor (Learning and Student Experience) reported on the progress of the draft paper presented to the previous meeting. The paper had been revised following discussions and a further meeting of the group would take place on the following Monday in order to firm up the suggested activities, understand the frequency required for any intervention and get a view of what a model of student success would look like in order to identify students at risk. This would lead to a paper which would be brought to the next meeting of Academic Board. In addition, a meeting had taken place to look at how the University could best monitor and contact students and it was hoped that this would lead to a technological solution in the long run.

**AB13.03.2.1.2** The Chair noted that other institutions were at various stages of developing attendance and engagement policies so there was an opportunity to look at lessons that could be learnt. The UKBA requirements had triggered many institutions to look at an attendance policy but that the policy under development would consider the correlation between attendance, engagement and outcomes. In addition, PSRB requirements across the sector needed to be taken into account especially in areas such as Health and Education. Students had engaged with the discussions and it was anticipated that this would lead to development of an understanding between staff and students where the right environment to help students progress would be established. It was noted that as a result of PSRB requirements HLS was already putting mechanisms in place for September using the ARC system and they were concerned that any technical solution being put in place by the University would be compatible. The PVC (LTSE) advised that the University policy would align the expectations for September, although implementation would not be through ARC. HLS representatives were part of the attendance & engagement group.

**AB13.03.2.1.3** The Students' Union suggested that there was a difference between an attendance policy and monitoring attendance. They were keen that the policy would be more about monitoring attendance rather than requiring attendance. The VP Education would be invited to the meeting on 18<sup>th</sup> March. The Chair reminded the students that there was a requirement for some students to attend due to the requirements of their supporters such as Allied Health and Nursing and Midwifery, although it was hoped that the policy would lead to a partnership in attendance and engagement with the students.

**AB13.03.2.1.4** It was agreed that the draft policy would be brought to the next meeting, once it had been discussed at AQEC.

**Action: The Pro-Vice Chancellor (LTSE) to report to the next meeting of Academic Board.**

**AB13.03.2.2** Faculty ASQC responses to Student Representative Forum  
*Minute AB12.12.5 and paper AB130303 refers*

**AB13.03.2.2.1** The meeting was reminded that a paper from the Student Representatives' Forum had been taken to the December meeting of Academic Board and a decision had been made to forward this to Faculty Academic Standards and Quality Committees (ASQCs) for comment. The paper presented was a summary of responses from ASQCs including a chart on page 26 which gave an illustration of one of the issues raised with the bunching of assessment deadlines.

**AB13.03.2.2.2** The Associate Dean LTSE (FET) commented that the response from that Faculty had followed the January ASQC but that a fuller discussion and response had followed the March ASQC. This had been shared with the Students' Union and so a further updated paper was available from FET.

**AB13.03.2.2.3** The AD LTSE (FBL) also commented that there had been a full discussion at the FBL ASQC and that students had fed into it via SRSFs.

**AB13.03.2.2.4** The meeting discussed the report at length during which it was suggested that many institutions were moving away from mandatory exams and were using

other forms of assessment such as portfolios. Other solutions put forward included extending the academic year to avoid bunching or using the estate in a different way. It was noted that changes in types of assessment could be challenging, especially for programmes with PSRB involvement. It was suggested that the University might wish to consider synoptic assessment with learning outcomes assessed across a programme rather than on a module by module basis, in particular at level 1.

**AB13.03.2.2.5** The PVC (LTSE) advised that the Academic Quality and Enhancement Committee (AQEC) intended to engage in an enhancement activity at its April meeting which would look at assessment and moderation.

**AB13.03.2.2.6** Various alternative assessment practices were suggested including a purely formative year 1 progressing to more summative assessment through the different levels. However it was noted that students often do not like formative assessment as they prefer to have a mark attached to the work that they do. It was noted that earlier assessment was often linked to better student engagement. It was also noted that the different definitions of module types hindered innovation and it was requested that this is looked at as part of the regulatory review.

**AB13.03.2.2.7** The Chair commented that Academic Board had raised a number of issues about the relationship between learning and teaching approaches and assessment. The Chair was concerned with the comments from ASQCs that 'curriculum refresh' would resolve some of the issues. It was noted that the 15/30 common credit framework had been introduced to reduce the burden of assessment for students but that there still seemed to be a tendency to over-assess. Considerable effort had been put into learning, teaching and Assessment strategies although there could be differences in terms of disciplines and PSRB requirements. The University had to be creative and innovative in curriculum design and there was a need to ensure that staff were learning from each other and that innovation was effectively disseminated. The University must ensure that it is meeting the learning needs of students and that they can engage at the point they need feedback. This was a considerable piece of work which was to be started at April's AQEC meeting.

**AB13.03.2.2.8** It was noted that further innovation and creativity could challenge academic practice in the institution but it was needed to ensure the University stayed up to date with developments Academic Board requested the development of a project plan that took into account flexibility around approaches to learning, teaching and assessment.

**AB13.03.2.2.9** The DVC (Academic) spoke about the nature of practice led curriculum and advised that he was in the process of organising a series of workshops to take this discussion forward. The outcomes of these discussions would be brought to the June meeting of Academic Board

**AB13.03.2.2.10** The Students' Union commented that the responses in the paper were not very student friendly. It was noted that the report had not been designed to directly feed back to students and a formal response would be made in due course.

**AB13.03.2.2.11** The Chair thanked the meeting for their engagement with the issues and

acknowledged that such discussion needed to be at the heart of what went on in the quality management and enhancement processes of the Faculties and Departments and needed to feed into that the governance structure of the University to encourage academic debate and challenge.

**Action: Faculty ASQCs to discuss learning and teaching approaches and assessment and report to AQEC**

**Action: AQEC to report to Academic Board on a plan to implement creative learning and teaching and assessment approaches**

**Action: PVC (LTSE) to ensure review of module types brought into the regulatory review**

**Action: DVC (Academic) to report back to Academic Board on discussions around practice led curriculum**

**Action: DAR to respond formally to the Student Representatives' Forum**

**AB13.03.2.3** Academic Calendar  
*Minute AB12.12.6 refers*

**AB13.03.2.3.1** The PVC (LTSE) provided an update from the Academic Calendar group confirming that they were currently carrying out further testing on the model approved by Academic Board in December 2012, which would bring resits into July with any semester one referrals being taken in semester two assessment period. The model was currently being discussed with programme managers, faculty business managers and students. The group had consulted externally and now wanted to drill down to find out how much flexibility was required. A further meeting was to take place shortly and 2015/16 calendar was expected to come to Academic Board in May.

**AB13.03.2.3.2** The AD LTSE (FBL) expressed concern that the changes could be setting up weak students to fail. There would also be challenges with students who might consider that they have until August to complete. It was suggested that postgraduate students who found the earlier part of their course challenging, 'made good' at a later date and this was often because they came from a different experience.

**AB13.03.2.3.3** The Deputy Academic Registrar confirmed that research had been undertaken into practice at other institutions and where similar practice happened it was felt that students were not disadvantaged. It was confirmed that a focus group of students had consulted with a wider group of students to get additional feedback. It was noted that further information would be supplied to Academic Board in May.

**Action: Academic Calendar group to report to Academic Board in May**

**AB13.03.2.4** MySite for Research Activity  
*AB12.12.14 refers*

**AB13.03.2.4.1** The DVC (Academic) updated the meeting on MySite for research activity and confirmed that this was wrapped up in larger discussions around web pages and readiness for the Research Excellence Framework (REF). There had been lots of cleaning up of current webpages, more showcasing and improvements to individual profiles with links to the repository. Associate Deans (Research) had been asked to assist with the updating. It was noted that MySite would specifically feed the needs of the REF and that the REF

panels would use a general 'Google' type search to find out what staff were doing and would then be referred to the website.

**AB13.03.2.4.2** The meeting specifically asked if MySite now allowed more than 4000 characters to describe research and the DVC (Academic) agreed to find out and report back. It was also suggested that a training session might be helpful as staff were having difficulty updating. It was agreed that feedback on these issues would be reported to the academic community via the ADs (Research).

**Action: DVC (Academic) to report on the character capacity of MySite**

### **AB13.03.3 ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

#### **AB13.03.3.1 Vice Chancellor's Report**

*Paper AB130312 was presented at the meeting.*

**AB13.03.3.1.1** The Chair presented the Vice-Chancellor's Report which provided a brief update on the recent decisions on Politics and International Relations; the recent University Alliance publication 'Growing Global Graduates'; the University Alliance response to the Department of Education; the UWE Strategy for 2020 and engagement with Business West.

**AB13.03.3.1.2** The Board was reminded that they engaged with the discussions around Politics and International Relations at the extraordinary Board meeting held in February, during which some alternative solutions were suggested, although it was agreed that the area remained challenged in an evolving environment. It was noted that on Thursday 21 March the Funding Council would be publishing a report which would explore the impact of themes since the new fees regime was announced and made interesting reading around the subject areas that have experienced challenges. The meeting was advised that the decision had been made to explore a different future for Politics and International Relations at UWE, which alongside Philosophy and Sociology, would create a new opportunity across the Social Sciences and fit the University strategy. This would be challenging and if the market did not respond then this decision would be reviewed. Existing students would be supported to the end of their studies and new students would be offered a new programme which would involve the merging of the three existing pathways. Applications would be monitored and Admissions and International Development were working with students who had already applied to see if they could be converted into single pathway Politics and International Relations. The Masters degree MA Human Rights would be closed based on the usual criteria used to assess the financial and academic health of Masters programmes. The Board was also reminded that postgraduate programmes across the University were being reviewed under parameters previously agreed by the Board. The Departments concerned with the realignment of Politics and International Relations had received formal communication as well as the students and members of staff concerned. The communication reaffirmed the outcome agreed by the Vice Chancellor and Chair of the Board of Governors, and the PVC and Executive Dean (HLS) would be engaging with staff around the transition arrangements. However, it was expected that there would be no substantial changes until August/September 2013.

**AB13.03.3.1.3** The University Alliance had launched their report 'Growing Global Graduates'

which explored the creation of opportunities for international students. This had been well received globally with lots of interest around how other countries engaged with the UK. In addition, the British Counsel and Downing Street were interested in the publication and had suggested wider dissemination.

**AB13.03.3.1.4** It was noted that the Department of Education (Gov) were being challenged by the University Alliance around the decision to publish the number of individual schools pupils who study at Russell Group universities.

**AB13.03.3.2** **University Strategic Plan**  
*Paper AB130304 was received*

**AB13.03.3.2.1** The Chair gave the meeting the opportunity to explore further the draft University Strategic Plan and advised that this would be discussed further at the planned away day with the Board of Governors. The draft strategy had been tested in a number of environments and was based on the ambition for 2020, defining the purpose of the University and how it could focus around that purpose. It was noted that when this was approved by the Board of Governors it would be presented in different ways to different audiences.

**AB13.03.3.2.2** The Chair reminded the meeting that the world was changing around us very rapidly with the current Government keen to accelerate market changes to speed up delivery, encourage students to exercise their choice and to challenge around delivery, value, good student experience and good quality. The meeting asked for clarification on a couple of aspects:

- a) Workstream 2, point 4 on page 34;
  - “All students taught by academic and technical staff who are practitioners in their field, connected to industry and the professions”. It was noted that some technicians were not engaged with practical services and it was suggested to replace ‘practitioners’ with ‘experts’ to be clearer.
  - “A portfolio of ‘first choice’ undergraduate and postgraduate programmes with an applied or professional focus, predicated on practice, research and scholarship ...” The statement might cause anxiety as it comes out as practice led and professionally focused. The notion of an applied focus seemed to be lost in the statement.
- b) Workstream 3, Targets/indicators, page 35. The second target “Income from knowledge exchange activities” the meeting asked if this could be re-phrased as the University would also want to see income for KE activity and from external research funding bodies. It was also noted that the impact was quite hard to evidence although if this was around the Research Excellence Framework (REF) exercise then that should be stated. The question was also asked whether there was a target around an integrated approach to research and teaching, but the meeting was advised that this was detailed at the next level.
- c) Workstream 4, point 4, page 36. “A proactive and systematic approach to partnership development ...” It was suggested that it would be helpful to indicate what was meant by “... a defined number

of key strategic partners ...". Was this a specific number or developing partnerships?

d) Workstream 4, Targets/indicators, page 36;

- The final indicator was "Number/% of staff who are leading or playing a key role ..." It was noted that it was important to know how many of staff were engaged but the question was asked as to whether this could be a bit wider around what UWE gives to this network and what the network gives to UWE.
- It was suggested that this Workstream was focused around the region with international partnerships being in second place. It was understood that global reach did have impact and that the title of the Workstream was still being worked on. Whether partnerships were local, national or international they should all be governed in a similar way and this needed to be thought through. The Chair agreed that the University was interested in quality relationships rather than quantity and it needed to be clear with all partners the benefits of the relationship to both partners. . This needed to be captured and good partnerships celebrated.

#### **AB13.03.3.2.3**

Debate had already taken place in some Faculties over the term 'practice led' and a suggestion was made that 'practice centred' or 'informed by and informing practice' would be more appropriate as this then suggested two-way travel. The Chair agreed that 'practice' was steering the institution in a particular way and this would challenge some parts of the University. The strategy was about challenging the culture and ourselves as an institution. It was agreed that the University needed to have a taxonomy around practice and be clear about what it meant. It was agreed that the practice approach was one of the most important messages of the document and deserved more coverage in the introduction. It was suggested that discussions around what the institution meant by 'practice' needed to take place. This was to be taken forward by the DVC (Academic), see minute AB13.03.3.2.2 above.

#### **AB13.03.3.2.4**

The Students' Union reminded the meeting that the strategy needed to meet the needs of all student groups and that the impact of the strategy could be different on the different groups of students. It was also noted that student feedback, the student voice, Students' Union and engagement with the QAA Quality Code were not mentioned in the strategy, but the Chair advised that the strategy was the 'headlines' and there were a number of other areas covered in more detail in the individual plans that would come out of the workstreams.

#### **AB13.03.3.2.5**

It was noted that the strategy would now be shared with the rest of the University and that there may be some further comments which the meeting might need to reflect on at a future date. The strategy was about travel and direction and not about something that would happen in 2020. The strategy was the plan of a journey and there would undoubtedly be changes as the strategy unfolded. It was a live document and would be kept under review.

#### **AB13.03.3.3**

##### **Update on Research Excellence Framework (REF)**

#### **AB13.03.3.3.1**

The Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic) updated the meeting on preparations for the REF. The end of February had been the deadline for a 'dress rehearsal' for all elements of assessment and the information was being

loaded on to the HEFCE site. At the end of March the final recommendations of staff submissions would be made from the internal REF group to the Vice Chancellor by the end of April 2013 all staff should be informed of the selections made.

- AB13.03.3.3.2** For the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) in 2008, 317 individuals had been submitted and for the current exercise the likely number to be included looked to be 270 with a further 52 possibles. There were still some issues around units of assessment and where submissions were placed. There were presently 37 case studies, with 44 case studies being written at the moment. The largest contribution came from Health and Life Sciences (HLS) - Allied Health Professions Department with 42 staff and Philosophy with 26 staff. There were 17 subject areas, but less units of assessment than last time due to changes in the methodology. The main challenge was identifying where the best research was maintaining quality as well as volume. Reporting for the REF remained a balancing act as two important KPIs were income per FTE member of staff and completion of PhDs per member of staff.
- AB13.03.3.3.3** The preparations split into three areas; those areas who were in a strong place to be ready (e.g. computer science & general engineering); a middle area where some support was still needed; a bottom section where significant re-writes and doubts about feasibility were a concern. Further areas of concern were staff mobility and staff being poached, PhD completions and securing and spending grant income this side of the summer.
- AB13.03.3.3.4** The Associate Dean HLS (Research) commented that the Faculty was comfortable with the preparations and had met targets so far. The Faculty wished to pay tribute to vast amount of support Research and Business Innovation (RBI) had given and to the work of the unit of assessment and case study leaders.
- AB13.03.3.3.5** The Associate Dean ACE (Research) advised that the Faculty had eight units of assessment and had experienced a high turn over of staff so had been forced to use leaders from different areas of assessment. This had been the case for the Education Department in particular.
- AB13.03.3.3.6** The question was asked as to whether the institution was in a similar position to the RAE in 2008 but the DVC (Academic) advised that it was difficult to make that judgement at the present time as the methodologies differed. There continued to be issues although completions were better and outputs at the top end were sustaining, but concerns remained at the bottom. It was anticipated that the University would have a better sense of its position at the end of the summer. The Chair reminded the meeting that the institution was recruiting new staff and should look at every new appointment as an opportunity to add to the academic portfolio. The PVC and Executive Dean Faculty of Business and Law (FBL) remarked that this issue was a problem, particularly for Business as the 'poaching' of staff was a continual possibility with salary inflation adding to the issue.
- AB13.03.3.3.7** The DVC (Academic) commented that the REF was a periodic measure and that to continue with research there was a need to look at grants available and what was being invested as an institution. There was a need to commit in terms of time, emphasis on research governance, research data management



etc and this needed to be sustained, not just for the REF.

#### **AB13.03.3.4 External Examiner Issues**

*Paper AB130035 was received*

**AB13.03.3.4.1** The Deputy Academic Registrar presented a paper of themes that had arisen from the External Examiners' Reports for 2011/12, as under the Terms of Reference of Academic Board the meeting needed to retain an oversight of external examiners. She advised that appropriate actions were being taken by the AQEC. In addition, a paper would be presented later in the meeting regarding the appointment of externals.

It was indicated that some aspects which externals might see as positive might not necessarily be seen as positive from a student point of view and the question was asked as to whether the expectation was that the University would action everything suggested.

**AB13.03.3.4.2** The PVC (LTSE) commented that the report was a high level synopsis but that AQEC had a detailed view of what had been discussed and the appropriateness of comments made by external examiners. Some Faculties had been asked to feed back and there would be a full discussion before any key actions were taken forward. A further report would be made to Academic Board of the outcomes of the actions taken.

**Action: A further report from AQEC to be made to Academic Board of any actions taken as a result of the discussion of the themes indicated by external examiners.**

#### **AB13.03.3.5 Delivery in a Foreign Language**

*Paper AB130306 was received*

**AB13.03.3.5.1** The PVC (LTSE) introduced the paper which had been originally discussed at the Collaborative Provision Committee (CPC) whose comments were included in the paper. The key headline of the paper was that some collaborative partners were asking to be able to deliver programmes in languages other than English. However, the University did not currently do this, nor were there any approved guidelines. It was noted that there were suggested requirements across the sector, although very few institutions undertook this type of delivery as it was seen as very risky. It was suggested that this should be looked at on a case by case basis, but that normal UWE English entry requirements would still be required. The partner would need to have a clear quality management policy and be clear on the student experience. In order to ensure that level descriptors were met the University would have to have all material translated into English and back translated so the institution could be clear that the translation had not changed the context, so as to be assured that students were attaining the level required..

**AB13.03.3.5.2** In addition, point 6 in the recommendations indicated that all student interaction would be in English so students would need to be competent to be able to do this. It would be necessary to use certified translators and this would add to the resource implications and cost. It was noted that CPC had discussed these requirements and had expressed considerable concern about delivery in a foreign language.

**AB13.03.3.5.3** The Associate Dean ACE (LT) commented that he was convinced that this arrangement should only exist in exceptional circumstances. Delivering in another language could miss the nuances in rubric and instructions in exams would be lost, as this was very difficult to translate. The back translation would be considerable in terms of time and resource and fluency in English would be difficult to apply, as there could be an issue of the availability of a sufficient pool of bi-lingual external examiners over a period of several years. These concerns were supported and it was suggested that the paper set out a lot of the complexity but that the rewards for the effort were not evident.

**AB13.03.3.5.4** The Director of CAS advised that such discussions would not be taking place in EU institutions and that perhaps the institution should be looking for bilingual staff. There was a need to seriously look at the market, invest in bilingual staff, look at how other institutions do it and from a practical point of view, look at each case individually. The institution needed to look at this seriously and in a positive spirit. If UWE was a global institution it should embrace this suggestion but perhaps Finnish was not a big enough market to get this off the ground.

**AB13.03.3.5.5** It was suggested that the University needed to establish a principle for such partnerships and that encultured content delivery was the real challenge. Translation was an issue as was having bilingual external examiners who would understand the cultural background.

**AB13.03.3.5.6** The Chair commented that the question should still be asked within UWE Global about what the strategic driver was for what are the institution was trying to do and what it would cost. There were huge risks which could be explored at this meeting but the institution needed to work through the international endeavour in order to ensure the quality of the provision, that we are comfortable with our own quality management, that we meet the requirements of the other institution/country and will not be challenged by QAA. The University was being forward looking in considering this proposal but there was a need to do a focused piece of work to look at the detail of what this would achieve and the implications of taking it further. There was a need to be confident about our standard collaborative provision initially. It was suggested that the Director of Corporate and Academic Services, the PVC (LTSE), the Deputy Academic Registrar and the Director of Student and Partnership Services should discuss the issues and identify how this can be taken forward. The current proposal in Helsinki should be used as a case study. Academic Board agreed to delegate authority on the decision taken as a result of the discussions to the Vice Chancellor.

**Action: Director of Corporate and Academic Services, Pro Vice Chancellor (LTSE), Deputy Academic Registrar and Director of Student and Partnership Services should discuss the issues around delivery of programmes in languages other than English, identify how such proposals can be addressed and report to the Vice Chancellor.**

**AB13.03.3.6** **Safeguarding Policy (Students)**

*Paper AB130307 was received*

*The Chairing of the meeting was taken over by DVC (Academic) at this point.*

The paper was presented by the Director of Student and Partnership Services. The policy presented was an updated version which had been drawn together as a result of changes in information. The revised policy had been widely

discussed and recommended for approval by AQEC. The revised policy related to other work around CRB policies and needed to be approved by Academic Board. The meeting confirmed that the policy was well written and easy to understand. It was noted that there was a need to remind staff that there were students studying undergraduate degrees who were under the age of 18 years. This was covered in the Appendix and relevant staff would be formally alerted to the inclusion of such students in their programmes. It was also noted that the implementation group would roll the policy out appropriately. The Safeguarding Policy and Procedure was approved.

**AB13.03.3.7 Update from the UWE Student Representatives**

*Paper AB130313 was presented at the meeting.*

The paper was presented to the meeting. The paper raised concerns from the Student Representative Form to which student representatives on various committees across the University bring forward issues. As a consequence, it was noted that many of the issues will already have been raised at Student Representative/Staff Forums (SRSFs) and Faculty Academic Standards and Quality Committees (ASQCs) before being drawn to the attention of Academic Board. It was hoped that any problems identified had been resolved by the time they were raised at this meeting and would have been discussed more appropriately in other areas. It was acknowledged that some of the recommendations around pre-preparation for exams had been discussed with Executive Deans and there was a general confidence that year 3 students were being offered revision sessions and years 1 and 2 would have a similar opportunity within the next couple of weeks. Low engagement with the sessions was presently an issue but there was an assurance that generic exam feedback would be given via Blackboard. The Board were pleased to note that SRSFs were working better in the current academic year.

**AB13.03.4 ITEMS TO NOTE**

**AB13.03.4.1 Report of Chair's Actions Taken Since Previous meeting**

*Paper AB130308 was noted.*

**AB13.03.4.2 External Examiner Appointments**

*Paper AB130309 was received and noted.*

**AB13.03.4.3 Minutes of Academic Board Sub Committees**

*Papers AB130310 and AB130311 were received and noted*

**AB13.03.5 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

It was noted that although Dr Stephen Waite had sent his apologies to the current meeting, due to other commitments, this was the final opportunity for him to attend, as he would be shortly leaving Hartpury College to take up an a position as Principal of Writtle College. The meeting wished to give huge thanks to Dr Waite for his contribution to this and other sub-committees of Academic Board.

**AB13.03.6 DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

1 May 2013

26 June 2013

## ACADEMIC BOARD

**Meeting date: Wednesday 13 March 2013**

### ACTION SHEET FROM THE MEETING HELD 13 March 2013

Minute	Substance	Actioning Officer	Reporting Deadline
AB13.03.2.1	Report on the Attendance and Engagement Policy	PVC (LTSE)	May 2013
AB13.03.2.2	Discuss learning and teaching approaches and assessment and report to AQEC	Faculty ASQCs	May 2013
AB13.03.2.2	Report to Academic Board on a plan to implement creative learning and teaching and assessment approaches	AQEC	June 2013
AB13.03.2.2	Review of module types brought into the regulatory review	PVC (LTSE)	June 2013
AB13.03.2.2	Report on discussions around practice led curriculum	DVC (Academic)	June 2013
AB13.03.2.2	Respond formally to the Student Representatives' Forum	DAR	April 2013
AB13.03.2.4	Report on the character capacity of MySite	DVC (Academic)	May 2013
AB13.03.2.3	Academic Calendar Group to report progress	PVC (LSE)	May 2013
AB13.03.3.4	AQEC to report to Academic Board of any actions taken as a result of the discussion of the themes indicated by external examiners	AQEC	June 2013
AB13.03.3.5	The issues around delivery of programmes in languages other than English to be discussed and a report made to Vice Chancellor	Director of Corporate and Academic Services, PVC (LSE), Deputy Academic Registrar and Director of Student and Partnership Services	Asap

## ACADEMIC BOARD

**Meeting date: Wednesday 13 March 2013**

### **\*EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FOR BOARD OF GOVERNORS**

- An attendance and engagement policy was being drafted and would come to the Academic Board shortly.
- The Board discussed the draft strategic plan which will be formally considered at the Board of Governors away day later in March.
- DVC (Academic) updated the Board on the progress with the REF preparations.
- The delivery of provision in a language other than English was discussed. It was agreed that further investigation and discussion was needed before a decision could be made.
- The Safeguarding Policy (Students) was approved.
- The Board thanked Dr Stephen Waite (Hartpury) for his input over the years and wished him well in his new role as Principal of Writtle College.

### **\*EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FOR AQEC**

- An attendance and engagement policy was being drafted and would come to the Academic Board shortly.
- A formal response would be sent to the Students' Union addressing the concerns discussed at Faculty ASQCs.
- AQEC will lead a discussion learning, teaching and assessment practices at the meeting in April.
- DVC (Academic) will take forward discussions on what 'practice-led' means to the University.
- Discussions are continuing with regard to the academic calendar for 15/16. This will come back to the Board in May for approval.
- The VC updated the Board on the outcome of his decision on the future of Politics and International Relations.
- The Board discussed the draft strategic plan which will be formally considered at the Board of Governors away day later in March.
- DVC (Academic) updated the Board on the progress with the REF preparations.
- The delivery of provision in a language other than English was discussed. It was agreed that further investigation and discussion was needed before a decision could be made.
- The Safeguarding Policy (Students) was approved.
- The Board thanked Dr Stephen Waite (Hartpury) for his input over the years and wished him well in his new role as Principal of Writtle College.