UWE University of the
West of England
BRISTOL

ACADEMIC BOARD

Academic Quality and Enhancement Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 05 June 2013 at 2pm in The Dartington Suite, Farmhouse, Frenchay Campus

Present:	Jackie Chelin, John Clarke, Rachel Cowie, Sophie Evans, Beryl Furey-King, Nadine Fry, Paul Gough (Executive Chair), Katie McFadden, Margaret Needles, Billie Oliver, Neeaj Ramyead, Peter Rawlings, Oliver Reid, Kathryn Ross, Neil Willey, Teresa Wood
In Attendance:	Rebecca Smith (Officer), Lucy Dumbell, Megan Edmunds, Manuel Frutos-Perez, Tracey Horton, Judith Ritchie, Jan Richardson, Martin Underwood

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

AQEC13.06.01   Julie McLeod (Chair), Fay Croft, Liz Falconer, James Longhurst, Jonathan Simmons, Sam Thomson, Fiona Tolmie, Rosie Scott-Ward, Karen West

MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETINGS

AQEC13.06.02   Within item AQEC13.02.12 of the minutes the reference to the general management in the SU would be removed. To also change reference to the student led teacher awards to teaching awards.

MATTERS ARISING

AQEC13.06.03   **Governance Structure and Student Representation –**

A paper had been sent to the members identifying issues and trends in relation to the operation of Student Rep/Staff Forums (SRSFs), and proposed actions for enhancement to their effectiveness. The time it takes to identify, recruit and confirm student representatives' needs to be quicker to allow them to engage with the committee structure and feedback the student voice earlier in the academic year. The Students' Union and Governance Team had worked with CETTS to consider how best to timetable SRSFs. An 'engagement' section of one hour per week would be added to each student's timetable, this included time for personal tutoring. SRSFs could be scheduled by academics within this slot as there would be no teaching. Adherence to the October deadline for identifying student representatives was imperative to ensure training and support could be undertaken; in 2012 only 35% of student representatives had been nominated by the deadline.

AQEC13.06.04 Cluster leaders had been contacted requesting confirmation of the mapping to programme clusters, and to confirm who will act as cluster leader in 2013/14. It would be essential to confirm this information as soon as possible. Confirmation would also be needed of the teaching week where the SRSF would take place so they can be added to the timetable. The options for cluster leaders to opt in or out of organising SRSFs had caused many problems with communicating dates and times of SRSFs. This would therefore now only be available at Departmental level.

AQEC13.06.05 Feedback from Student Representatives in 2011/12 identified a lack of understanding of the University Committee Structure, and specifically how SRSFs fed into this. Further training would be provided, which again emphasised the need to adhere to the deadlines. Workshops and further information had been provided for staff in the past; however these had not been well attended. AQEC confirmed the need to provide this. Feedback also confirmed student representatives understood which meetings they needed to attend, helping to raise the profile of student feedback. A member of AQEC suggested moving the deadline by a week as results had shown a good level of response the week after in October. This had mainly been due to the level of chasing done by the Governance Team. The 'engagement' time allocated per week would not be part of the typical contact time allocated per amount of credits in the curriculum. Difficulty had been expressed in scheduling personal tutoring, especially when contact time was scheduled very late in the afternoon or evening; however conversations with timetabling meant this would be an appropriately reserved slot for academics to use outside the Wednesday afternoon non teaching times. Library colleagues would benefit from having access to the SharePoint websites to see what types of issues were being raised. They were attending SRSFs where possible, but it was not always possible to attend every meeting.

AQEC13.06.06 **Online Module Evaluation –** In December 2012 a new online module evaluation method was implemented by the University. The evaluation form sits within Blackboard along with guidance, website support and FAQs available if students have problems using the form. This was communicated via emails and notices, and the evaluation form could be accessed on smart phones. One issue identified early on was the 28 day cut off time; this has been removed so that students could complete the evaluation just before the field board had taken place. A positive outcome was that academic staff could now get instant access to the data. The data gathered from the May 2013 evaluations indicate that 47% of UWE modules were deployed via the online form; the immediate aim was to ensure 100% of modules were deployed. This had ensured an increase in students having the option to feedback from only 29% of modules through the previous paper scanned forms. However, the response rates from students show a drop in engagement. It had been agreed that a strategy for implementation would be needed, but time restraints meant this had not been done at a University level. The Head of the Quality

Management Team would investigate whether there were any Faculty strategies, and work on an overall University strategy to encourage further engagement. The online form allowed students to write comments for the academics; this was not possible through the old scanned forms. Another positive was that 66% of students would recommend the module they had taken. To encourage further analysis of the data, the business objects software would be utilised. Investigations from other HEIs had also shown a reduction in module evaluation in the first year since implementing an online version; however the University would commit to investigating how engagement with the online form could be increased. Generally students have always found it easier to complete evaluation forms in class rather than in their own time. Clickers were suggested as an alternative method of gathering in class feedback although that would not allow the gathering of qualitative data. Success would also be dependent on a process being in place to allow academic staff to be reactive to comments. Mid module evaluations would also help students to see and be affected by any changes made from their feedback; currently less than 30% of students felt that something had been done with their feedback. Some Universities have processes where coursework cannot be submitted until the evaluation has been completed. The timing would also be crucial, as some students could have 6 module evaluations to do at the same time. Nominations to join a group considering how to take this forward were to be sent to the Head of the Quality Management Team.

Action: AQEC Members

AQEC13.06.07 **Student Surveys –** Regular updates have been made to the Vice-Chancellors Executive regarding progress and actions taken. Within the next academic year, more emphasis would be on the Student Experience Survey; overall University-level results of which would be available for discussion at the June Academic Board. Results would be compiled and correlated to the NSS and SRSF feedback, and considered alongside annual monitoring and evaluation processes. The timeline for annual monitoring had been revised to fit with this so that a holistic programmatic overview from all aspects of feedback could be used. Further changes were due to be implemented regarding results and how actions would be taken forward by the University.

AQEC13.06.08 **Annual Report from Complaints and Appeals –** Many of the outcomes identified around assessment had been fed into the April Enhancement AQEC meeting. A LEAN review was also underway to consider recommendations around extenuating circumstances and reasonable adjustments. Issues had also been identified in a number of University policies, and some revised policies were on the agenda for consideration. The Committee was reassured the recommendations and actions were being taken forward.

AQEC13.06.09 **Annual Review of Curriculum Design and Approval –** Recommendations around parity of assessment and assessment overload had been taken forward in the April Enhancement AQEC

meeting. Recommendations to increase the use of TEL and staff development for TEL were being taken forward through the new TEL Strategy. The Quality Management Team was proposing the development of a set of online toolkits, blogs and workshops to provide guidance and ideas to curriculum design and review teams. This would include case studies for innovative forms of assessment, linking to enterprise services and transformation services. One area regarding the obtainment of external reviewer reports prior to programmes being considered at CAP was still an issue, but this would be rectified in the new CAP structure for 2013/14 where external reviewers would be members of CAPs.

AQEC13.06.10 **Foundation Degrees –** The proposal to change the regulations to allow level 2 credits to count towards top up degree classifications for foundation degree students had progressed further since the original request had come to AQEC. The re-modelling of some outcomes for students who graduated in 2011/12 had been considered; out of 167 students, 150 would have graduated with the same outcome. 11 came out slightly lower, therefore showing they may not have come away with the level of degree they graduated with. Only 2.4% of these students would have a better classification under the new calculation, and therefore the regulatory review group agreed that the regulations should remain the same. The previous discussions for postgraduate students using credits from an interim award towards classification had not yet been investigated further. This was still on the list for the regulatory review group.

AQEC13.06.11 **Religious Observance Policy –** It was noted that the comments made at the last meeting of AQEC regarding the development of this new Policy had been considered. The Policy would be submitted to the next meeting of Academic Board.

STUDENT FEEDBACK

AQEC13.06.12 The Students' Union (SU) thanked the Committee for the opportunity to feed into discussions. The new Vice President Education was welcomed to the meeting. The student representatives had found the meetings interesting, and it had been valuable to see the level of engagement that students can have with University staff; contributing to discussions which affect the students directly. One main area for development identified through the Student/Governor Forum was the feedback loop allowing students to see the changes and actions made from their feedback. Training would help students to contribute towards agenda setting, and a lot of Committees already include many agenda items set by students i.e. Academic Board discussing the academic study skills. The SU had noted trends of engagement, with a 50% increase in volume of student reps, and a 50% increase in networks and cultural representation. Within 2012/13 over 600 reps had been recruited, and this was increasing.

AQEC13.06.13 With regard to the academic study skills mentioned above, the DVC (Academic) had held a meeting with Associate Deans Learning Teaching and the Student Experience (LTSE). This

identified that study skills provided, including numeracy and literacy skills, differed from Department to Department. Drawing on the March ALF workshop and other contributions, a paper would be submitted to the next Academic Board meeting. These investigations outlined that although there was significant good practice across the University, there was some lack of signposting students to this specific support. The offer provided to each student needs to be consistent, and feedback also confirmed that a physical space would be beneficial. A website designed by Library Services was currently being tested, and a link would be sent to AQEC members.

Post meeting note: The new study skills web site is now live! It brings together mySkills with the Student Study Support site. Please see it at the following address:

http://www1.uwe.ac.uk/students/studysupport

It can also be found on the following intranet pages –
- *If you go to the main external homepage – http://www.uwe.ac.uk/?page=0 – you can click (or rest the mouse on) the 'Students' link at the top of the page. There you'll see a link to 'study support'.*

- *There is also a link from the Intranet homepage. If you click on 'Learning and teaching' in the left-hand menu you'll see a link to 'study skills'.*

- *Most of the traffic to MySkills (and now study skills) currently comes from Blackboard, which has a number of prominent links.*

- *And the 'study skills' link on the library homepage now points to the new page.*

Please could you help to test the site? Have a look around, try it out, and think about the following:

- *What do you make of the new site?*
- *Is it clear what it's for?*
- *Is anything unclear or difficult to understand?*
- *Did you have difficulty navigating around any part of the site?*
- *Did everything work?*
- *Did you spot any typos?*
- *Is there anything else you want to add….*

Comments to all, to me or to Graham.Wyatt@uwe.ac.uk (our Library IT Development Co-ordinator)

ENHANCEMENT LED AQEC MEETING

AQEC13.06.14   AQEC members confirm the event had been useful. The reference to a module report would be changed to a moderation report. The list of principles also covered all collaborative provision; they had

not been recorded separately as the processes were the same. This was agreed, but it should also be ensured that collaborative partners were involved in the moderation process. The Committee noted that there had not been an opportunity to reflect these outcomes back to the Faculty, and the report would therefore be taken to the first ASQC and possible Departmental Committee meetings within the 2013/14 academic year. Some of the language used meant it was difficult to identify what was a regulation and what was a principle. The Deputy Academic Registrar had discussed the differences between regulations, policy and principles with the PVC LTSE and it would be clarified. The result of the 2020 Strategy meant that there would not be a separate Learning and Teaching Strategy, however there would be separate plans feeding out of the 4 main aims of the Strategy; the principles would feed into these plans. For example, within the research strand, the DVC Academic would be holding a 'research futures' day to discuss this further.

Action: ASQC and Departmental Chairs

AQEC ANNUAL REPORT TO ACADEMIC BOARD

AQEC13.06.15 The Annual Report provided an overview of the flow of Committee business throughout the 2012/13 academic year. The key items noted had been areas identified by the Students' Union, key recommendations made during annual reviews of Quality Management and Enhancement Framework (QMEF) processes, and a number of new or revised policy developments. AQEC has a high level of business, and specifically this year there had been a high volume of new or revised policies. This has mainly been because a lot of work was needed to review recently implemented policy, or tidy up gaps in policy to ensure UWE was clear about what we do. This has been in response to student feedback, aligning with new legislation or articulating current practice in preparation for the Institutional Review. The Committee has had sight of the policy development so that they could make comment on new policy and approve revisions to existing policies, whereas Academic Board has overall responsibility for approving new policy. The April AQEC was set aside to concentrate on enhancement themes. This did cause some problems for Faculty ASQC meetings which had fed actions to AQEC for action and had to wait for 2 meetings to take place. It would also be useful in the future to consider the flow of papers from ASQC to AQEC to ensure it was streamlined. The PVC LTSE was to hold a 'what does practice led curriculum mean' workshop resulting from the new Strategic Plan. The Committee agreed the paper summarised the business undertaken by AQEC, and would be submitted to Academic Board.

Action: Committee Officer

FACULTY ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND QUALITY COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORTS

AQEC13.06.16 **HLS –** The Committee Officer confirmed the template from the

previous year had been used, and therefore any suggestions to update the template would be welcome. HLS have a number of action plans in SharePoint so the report had fed back what actions had gone well. The engagement from the student representatives throughout the year had been positive and constructive, and they were the only Faculty to have had the Student Feedback section of the report written by the student representatives. It had been useful to name the external examiners appointed throughout the year because the Quality Management Team were still awaiting numerous nominations for the forthcoming year (the deadline had been April 2013), however this may not be required in future reports.

AQEC13.06.17   **FET –** The main area to feed back from the FET report was that the Faculty had tried to make every meeting student led, being pro-active to student related issues. Agenda planning meetings had been held with the students, and any issues raised at a meeting would be put as an agenda item at the next meeting.

AQEC13.06.18   **FBL –** The Faculty had also moved to a more student focused approach, with the student voice being the first agenda item. One area identified for further development was the capturing of good practice, and again this would be added as a standing item on the agenda for future meetings. This is a common theme across the University and was being pursued in a number of ways. The student led teaching awards had been one good way of highlighting good practice from academic staff.

AQEC13.06.19   **ACE –** The purpose of the production of an annual report was raised as detailed minutes were produced after every meeting. Each ASQC Officer should produce an Executive Summary which would feed down to Departmental Committees and up to AQEC; these may help identify areas for the annual report. The calibrating of meeting dates had been an issue, the SRSFs and Departmental Committees feeding into ASQCs and AQEC still needed work. Student engagement had also been positive, with students routinely taking part in curriculum design teams.

AQEC13.06.20   **HART –** Hartpury College confirmed the engagement from student representatives had been positive. They had however met challenges in getting student reps to engage with Departmental Committees. One suggested way to overcome this was to have 1 student rep attend all of the meetings to get an overall feel for business across the College.

AQEC13.06.21   **Collaborative Provision Committee –** 2012/13 had been the first year of using the twin track due diligence process for academic partnerships. The relationship between UWE Global Executive and CPC would be kept under review. AQEC queried whether the report contradicted itself with stating that the membership had to be separate from the UWE Global Executive to ensure the correct checks and balances were in place, however it also stated that the membership would be reviewed to ensure it was consistent with the UWE Global Exec. Consideration of the governance structure was being undertaken by the Deputy Academic Registrar.

UKBA. Previously, students had attended an info point with their ID cards to demonstrate their attendance at University, but an audit completed by KPMG identified a new requirement to monitor student engagement through attendance at lectures/seminars. A working group had been led by the PVC LTSE to consider where information should be gathered in terms of attendance, and then how contact should be made with students. The requirements to monitor the majority of students were different to Tier 4 students and some with professional body requirements, but the University needed to demonstrate a consistent approach. The work of the retention project had been built up, but in some instances the approaches within the project had not been manageable. The UKBA requirements needed a controlled approach to encouraging engagement, and to allow UWE to identify and supply support where needed rather than discipline the students. Some lecturers used attendance registers, and electronic access swipe cards were used for some rooms, but this was not full proof and it was more difficult to monitor accurately with bigger cohorts. Students also found that a number of people were contacting them about their attendance, and the outcomes of the retention project were considering this further, i.e. who has responsibility for what. It was suggested there could be a package of indicators in place to determine the level of engagement and to take a holistic view. PAL could also be used to encourage further engagement. The Committee endorsed the Policy to Academic Board, and agreed further work would be needed around implementation.

Action: DAR

AQEC13.06.24   **Student Pregnancy and Maternity Policy –** The need for a policy around student pregnancy and maternity had been identified through the Single Equality Scheme. At present the policy would sit within disability services, however it was noted that pregnancy would not be seen as a disability. Where appropriate, extenuating circumstances could be utilised to support a student. As the University introduced a fit to sit policy issues affecting pregnant students would need to be considered. The policy and implementation would be reviewed in 6-12 months to ensure the level of support was appropriate. A physical space at Frenchay Campus would also be provided for pregnant or breastfeeding woman, this would be expanded across the campuses. PGR students had also been encompassed in the Policy. The Policy was endorsed to Academic Board.

AQEC13.06.25   **DBS Policy –** This would replace the existing CRB Check Policy. Admissions and volunteering work were covered, but the students recruited via the schools and college's partnership service would be included in the staff policy as they were classed as casual staff. The Policy would mainly cover programmes with professional practice elements, such as health related or education programmes, however wider activities across the University had been included. The policy would be updated to reflect new information from the DPS regarding disclosure. The policy had been passed by NHS colleagues who were happy that it met their requirements. The payments of DPS checks would not change

substantially; It was suggested that the university would cover the initial fee but not the annual fee (a new fee introduced recently as part of the change to the DBS scheme). Online registration would reiterate the annual check for all students but this would be supplemented for those on specific programmes to ensure self-declarations were robust. The Policy was endorsed to Academic Board.

REVISIONS TO EXISTING POLICIES

AQEC13.06.25   **Student Conduct –** The policy was established in December 2011, and had been managed by student services. Revisions were around making it more accessible, and making it simpler to read. It also now sets out more clearly the procedures when going through disciplinary action. More guidance had been included on the resolution of issues at an early stage to reduce the amount of issues being presented to SSD which could have been dealt with at a lower level; student services had not held any disciplinary committees over the last year meaning most could be dealt with locally. There were also now expectations on how students should behave on social media sites. Faculties had been consulted on the changes, and the University legal advisers had provided advice. AQEC queried how the University would deal with students who commit criminal offences. This is relatively common, with some being related to custodial sentences. There would be issues in taking additional action and punishment on top of the criminal action taken, especially if it was not related to UWE. New students were not necessarily stopped if they had a criminal conviction, and therefore existing students would be considered on a similar basis. The University needs to be aware of the risks and health and safety aspects; students can be suspended on terms of risk and may not necessarily need to go through lengthy disciplinary action. Alongside the policy further work was needed to clarify the withdrawal, expulsion or time out of students and the financial situations attached to this. AQEC endorsed the policy which would be submitted to Academic Board for approval.

Action: Student Services

AQEC13.06.26   **Assessment Offences Policy –** The Plagiarism Policy was introduced by the University a year ago, and it was currently being reviewed to ensure it was still fit for practice. The name had been changed to ensure all types of assessment offences were covered, not just plagiarism (for example cheating on an exam). The processes which were previously located in the regulations and procedures had been moved and streamlined, and now covered procedures for research students. These would be different from taught students because they would not undertake many components of assessment; therefore more reference had been made to the thesis and viva. Self plagiarism was also now included, for example using a piece of work for assessment which has already been assessed in another module and awarded credit. A mechanism would need to be put in place to identify this as modules leaders may not currently be able to pick this up. Software in blackboard can be used by students to check their

work, and therefore the statement for submission on blackboard would need to be updated along with cover sheets for assessment hand ins. The revised policy would be disseminated to staff, and subsequently asked to disseminate to students. The self plagiarism aspect would also be communicated and made more available to students.

AQEC13.06.27   One of the main aims of the new programme and module handbooks would be to educate students on the different policies which affect them, for example the standard UWE Harvard Referencing Policy. A cover sheet would also be put together to provide advice to students of the changes to the policy. The blackboard guidance available to students is there for them to use, however students have to use the software themselves. Blackboard also provides notifications, for example upcoming deadlines for coursework hand in dates. Lecturers can also make students aware of new or changes to policy and software. The Committee discussed how these new and revised policies would be disseminated to staff and students. The DAR advised that some work was being undertaken at the moment looking at effective ways of communicating with students. The revisions to the policy were approved by AQEC.

AQEC13.06.28   **Fitness to Study Policy –** The revised policy had been in place for 2 years, and was going through minor modification. Again the main change was the addition of guidance to inform the earlier resolution of issues, with more specialist support being in place at an earlier stage. The University would need to be explicit regarding what policy would be appropriate in certain circumstances, for example professional suitability, student conduct or fitness to study policy. Fitness to study and professional suitability were mainly related to mental health issues, although student conduct could highlight issues of a student's mental wellbeing. The revisions to the policy were approved by AQEC, subject to work being undertaken to confirm when different policies should be used.

Action: Student Services

AQEC13.06.29   **Word Count Policy –** The policy had only been in place a year and the Committee were asked to provide feedback regarding how well this had been implemented and was working. The SU had previously looked into this, and confirmed it was very ambiguous and students did not understand it; there were parts which contradicted itself i.e. stating the need to have a minimum and maximum word count, then also stating the word length needed to be exact. It was also not clear whether the policy was aimed at students or staff. Students generally tended to ask module leaders, who then refer them back to the module handbook. It was also unclear whether the + or – 10% was still included. Faculty ASQCs had previously debated the new policy, and therefore it was suggested that this question be referred back to ASQCs for further consideration, together with the work the SU has done regarding this.

EXTERNAL EXAMINERS WORKLOAD

AQEC13.06.30   The Quality Management Team had held a separate meeting to discussion issues previous arisen through FET ASQC regarding workload of EEs when appointed to additional collaborative provision. The paper highlighted the outcomes of this meeting, and recommendations to enhance the process. The fee structure was not proposed to change, just redefined to recognise additional workload as collaborative provision expands. Previously the workload would have been considered on a module allocation basis, and recommendations focused around the need to recognise module runs; some modules were delivered both at UWE and collaborative provision institutions. This realignment would allow External Examiners to discharge their responsibilities. Further work was on-going in CAS around sampling guidance to ensure there was a consistent approach across the University. The area of Chief/lead collaborative provision External Examiners was still un-resolved. Some of the recommendations would not align to the requirements set out in the QAA Quality Code, and therefore would not be appropriate. UWE would not appoint different Examiners to consider collaborative provision, whether field or chief, as the comparison to UWE provision would then be lost. The frequency of additional award boards for collaborative provision had meant that both field and chief External Examiners are unable to attend all boards; this was a big problem due to the numerous delivery calendars agreed for collaborative partners. The University had agreed that assessment calendars would be more aligned to the UWE calendar in the future. Boards should always be run at UWE, and hence the technology to support this needed to be enhanced to allow engagement from External Examiners electronically. There would also need to be more work around the role of the Field Leader and their responsibilities for effective communication with External Examiners. Endorsement from AQEC was sought regarding the recommendations and support for technological enhancements, with the request to change the realignment of the fee levels progressing to Academic Board. The Chair agreed the recommendations would be opened up to Associate Deans for consideration with a deadline of a week to provide any comments. The Chair would then consider providing endorsement under delegated authority.

REPORTS/UPDATES FROM AQEC SUB GROUPS

AQEC13.06.31   **Employability and Enterprise Management Group –** There had been an 86% response rate to the last DLHE survey, and employability had also improved. This showed a 3 year running improvement.

AQEC13.06.32   **Technology Enhanced Learning Group –** Discussions at the TEL Group had been positive and the TEL Strategy was moving

forward. TEL is a major part of the 12 objectives taking the 2020 strategy forward.

AQEC13.06.33 **Learning 4 All Hub Group –** There had not been another meeting since the last AQEC.

AQEC13.06.34 **Institutional Review Group –** Minutes were noted.

AQEC13.06.35 **Widening Participation (Schools and Colleges) Partnership Group and Widening Participation Operations Group –** Minutes were noted.

ACTIONS FROM ASQCS

AQEC13.06.36 **Assistance with printing costs for first year students -**

Printing can be very expensive for students. Some work had been taking place in faculties to support students, but more was needed at a University level to ensure this was consistent. The printing costs verses providing all students with a tablet could be considered, however there was no guarantee that all reading materials could be accessed easily online. Students also confirmed that it was useful to have some resources in hard copy so they could be annotated. Realistically, students would always print some material, but further investigation into better ways to support online resources was essential. The fact that double-sided printing costs were the same as single sided printing also needed further investigation. Members noted that the university were promoting e-learning and other forms of text retrieval and access. Printing was not always the best or most efficient use of resources, nor was it necessarily attuned to wider approaches to learning.

Action: The DAR agreed to look into the current status of tablet provision for students

AQEC13.06.37 **ACADEMIC BOARD MINUTES**

The Executive Summary from the last meeting of Academic Board was noted.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

AQEC13.06.38 The Library was commended on the development of the new Study Skills website. It was also confirmed that the inclusion of student representatives on AQEC had been valuable and they provided the reality of the student experience. The Chair thanked the reps and the VP Education for their input over the year.

AQEC Minutes: R Smith
Unconfirmed: 07 June 2013
Chairs minutes: 12 June 13
Confirmed: 23 October 13

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

Minute	Substance	Actioning Officer	Reporting\other deadline
AQEC13.06.06	Nominations to join a group considering a University Strategy for further engagement with the Online Module Evaluation were to be sent to the Head of the Quality Management Team.	**Committee members**	**14 June 2013**
AQEC13.06.14	The principles and actions resulting from the April Enhancement Led AQEC meeting would be taken to the first ASQC and possible Departmental Committee meetings within the 2013/14 academic year.	**ASQC and Departmental Committee Chairs**	**First meeting of 2013/14**
AQEC13.06.15	The annual report from AQEC would be submitted to Academic Board.	**Committee Officer**	**done**
AQEC13.06.22	The comments made by AQEC would be fed into the final versions of the programme and module handbook templates.	**DAR**	
AQEC13.06.23	To develop an implementation plan for the new Student Attendance and Engagement Policy.	**DAR**	
AQEC13.06.25	Student Conduct policy - further work was needed to clarify the withdrawal, expulsion or time out of students and the financial situations attached to this.	**Student Services**	**Prior to being submitted to Academic Board for approval**
AQEC13.06.28	Fitness to Study - Further work to be undertaken to confirm when different policies should be used.	**Student Services**	
AQEC13.06.29	Faculty ASQCs to consider further how effective the implementation of the policy had been, in conjunction with the work the SU has done regarding this.	**ASQC Chairs**	
AQEC13.06.30	The Chair agreed the recommendations regarding the External Examiner Workload would be opened up to Associate Deans for consideration with a deadline of a week to provide any comments. The Chair would then consider providing endorsement under delegated authority.	**Associate Deans**	**19 June 2013**
AQEC13.06.36	look into the current status of tablet provision for students	**DAR**	

University of the
West of England
UWE
BRISTOL

ACADEMIC BOARD
ACADEMIC QUALITY AND ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE
Meeting date: Wednesday 05th June 2013

*EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FOR FACULTY ASQCS

- Allocated 'engagement' time will be timetabled within 2014/15, for activities such as Personal tutoring and Student Rep/Staff Forums. The deadline to allocate and confirm new student representatives is 13th October 2013;
- 47% of UWE modules were deployed in May 2013 Online Module Evaluation round; in future our aim is to achieve 100%. Overall response rates were down - The Head of the Quality Management Team would put together a group to work on an overall University strategy to encourage further engagement;
- A set of principles and actions arising from the April Enhancement Led AQEC meeting, which focused on the area of assessment, would be sent to ASQCs for further discussion prior to progressing;
- Faculty reports from the Academic Standards and Quality Committees, and the University Collaborative Provision Committee were received and agreed, overall student representation had an extremely positive impact on agenda setting and discussions held;
- The templates for Programme and Module Handbooks were agreed, with some small revisions;
- The new Attendance and Engagement Policy, Student Pregnancy and Maternity Policy, Disclosure and Barring Service Policy and changes to the existing Student Conduct Policy were endorsed for submission to Academic Board for approval;
- Changes to the Assessment Offences Policy and Fitness to Study Policy were approved by AQEC, further communications will be sent to confirm these changes;
- Word count policy - ASQCs to consider further how effective the implementation of the policy had been, in conjunction with the work the SU has done regarding this.

*EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FOR ACADEMIC BOARD

- Allocated 'engagement' time will be timetabled within 2014/15, for activities such as Personal tutoring and Student Rep/Staff Forums. The deadline to allocate and confirm new student representatives is 13th October 2013;
- 47% of UWE modules were deployed in May 2013 Online Module Evaluation round; in future our aim is to achieve 100%. Overall response rates were down - The Head of the Quality Management Team would put together a group to work on an overall University strategy to encourage further engagement;
- A set of principles and actions arising from the April Enhancement Led AQEC meeting, which focused on the area of assessment, would be sent to ASQCs for further discussion prior to progressing;
- AQEC Report was agreed and would be forwarded to Academic Board;

- Faculty reports from the Academic Standards and Quality Committees, and the University Collaborative Provision Committee were received and agreed, overall student representation had an extremely positive impact on agenda setting and discussions held;
- The templates for Programme and Module Handbooks were agreed, with some small revisions;
- The new Attendance and Engagement Policy, Student Pregnancy and Maternity Policy, Disclosure and Barring Service Policy and changes to the existing Student Conduct Policy were endorsed for submission to Academic Board for approval;
- Changes to the Assessment Offences Policy and Fitness to Study Policy were approved by AQEC, further communications will be sent to confirm these changes;

It is the responsibility of the Committee Officer to ensure the Executive Summary is fed to the relevant committees.