



University of the
West of England

ACADEMIC BOARD

Academic Quality and Enhancement Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 20 February 2013 at 2pm in The Dartington Suite, Farmhouse, Frenchay Campus

Present: Jackie Chelin, John Clarke, Rachel Cowie, Fay Croft, Sophie Evans, Liz Falconer, Beryl Furey-King, Nadine Fry, Paul Gough, James Longhurst, Katie McFadden, Julie McLeod (Chair), Margaret Needles, Billie Oliver, Neeaj Rameyad, Olly Reid, Kathryn Ross, Sam Thomson, Fiona Tolmie, Neil Willey, Teresa Wood

In Attendance: Rebecca Smith (Officer), Martin Underwood, Jenny Wills, Tracey Horton, Jamie Darwen

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

AQEC13.02.01 Jonathan Simmons, Stephen Waite, Karen West

MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETINGS

AQEC13.02.02 Within the minute AQEC12.11.06 regarding online evaluation – it had been stated by the students' union that the evaluation should be compulsory, however this would be amended to 'consider whether it would be made compulsory'. The SU were supportive of the online evaluation form, which had now been rolled out and was the only method for collecting student feedback for module evaluation.

AQEC13.02.03 The access agreement within the minute AQEC12.11.28 would be written for 14/15, not 13/14. The Committee agreed that the rest of the minutes were an accurate reflection of the meeting.

MATTERS ARISING

Governance structure and student representation

AQEC13.02.04 The Chair and Deputy Academic Registrar (DAR) had discussed the governance structure with the Students' Union (SU), including how to make Student Rep Staff Forums (SRSFs) work better and what support would be needed. This would be fed back in a future meeting. Further work would also take place to consider support for the SU to follow through actions, the servicing of the SRSFs, the possibility of involving interns to help the SU, and working on the replacement for the Dean of Students' Officer who has recently left the University. Discussions regarding timetabling were also ongoing with CETTS, who were modelling a student engagement slot into the timetable where all student forums would

take place. FET had also been investigating support for actions to be taken forward into the student body, and was encouraged to hear this feedback.

Review of Periodic Curriculum Review in 2010-11

- AQEC13.02.05 Two conditions for the University were being investigated, one regarding CPD (which had also been previously discussed at AQEC) to which a meeting with the CPD office had been arranged to start working through effective practice and possible systems changes. The other action regarding the realigning of student administration in Corporate and Academic Services (CAS) to Faculties was underway through a further consultation and realignment. Problems experienced during the start of the academic year were wider than just registration, and a project board has been set up to include Faculty colleagues, CAS, other relevant Professional Services and the SU.

Short Courses and CPD

- AQEC.13.02.06 It was noted that the TEL Management Group was not an Executive Group, and therefore did not have the authority nor the remit to change the Management of CPD and Short Courses; however discussions and further investigation could be considered regarding blackboard access. It was recognised that this would be dependent on developments within ISIS, and it was hoped that these discussions would drive the issue forward. This issue, including the problems of managing CPD, Short Courses and module gatherers through the infrastructure in ISIS, was also being looked at in RBI through a Technology in Learning project. The TEL strategy could include the development in Blackboard for these issues in particular, and the Blackboard Policy could also be reconsidered. The terminology used would need to be very clear to differentiate between the different types of non standard learners (CPD at present covers many different types).

Action: TEL Management Group

External Examiners' Conference Summary Report

- AQEC13.02.07 The Committee Officer provided feedback from a briefing meeting held between workshop leads and PAAT members, and results from a form stack evaluation which had been sent to all Examiner Examiners who attended the Conference. There was added value in providing this sort of event to External Examiners, and therefore the Quality Team in CAS would organise a further event within 2013/14. A more interactive agenda would be considered, with themed sessions allowing Externals to choose which to attend. Examples of themes could be collaborative provision and supporting curriculum design through the QMEF. Programme Managers would be more involved, and a method of streaming live to enable people to attend virtually would be considered. Further investigation would consider the target market: new, existing or both, and the best time to hold the event. This would include contacting Externals who had not attended the event to find out

why, and when would be the most convenient time to run the event. External speakers would also be considered.

AQEC13.02.08 The HLS representative confirmed the event had been a success and built well on previous Faculty-specific External Examiner annual events. However a few problems were experienced regarding support for the departmental sessions from other services i.e. escorting External Examiners to venues.

AQEC13.02.09 The DAR provided feedback regarding some of the actions identified in the Summary of External Examiners' Annual Reports considered at the last AQEC meeting. Informal feedback from the February 2013 Boards had confirmed that the administrative side had been positive, taking on board the issues identified in the report. There were still some issues where Externals had not received the documents they had expected, and this would be looked at further.

Action: DAR

Programme Reports

AQEC13.02.10 The Associate Head of Department in Health and Applied Social Sciences (HASS) shared good practice regarding the completion of programme reports. An earlier deadline was set within the department to the University deadline, and once received the reports are allocated to pairs of Programme Managers to complete a peer review. One of the aims of this review was to ensure there were evaluative comments, and to consider how to resolve some of the issues highlighted. All programme reports had been submitted on time in HASS. The Chair confirmed that across the University there had been a mixed use of data, but that overall the data had been used well at a programme level and that the effective practice in HASS should be disseminated to all departments.

Non standard entry and Part Time students

AQEC13.02.11 The Director of Facilities had agreed to take forward the issues raised at the last meeting, and had requested that any evidence of these problems be reported to feed into the investigation. The wider elements had been around student access to cafes and receiving ID cards, identified by the FBL ASQC. This was also an issue for ACE with many of the facilities at Bower Ashton Campus closing at 4pm. At Glenside Campus there was a Campus user group which captures these issues (cafes, clamping of cars before 5pm) and dealt with locally; however it would be useful to feed these issues into the wider investigation. Any issues identified at SRSFs would also be useful. A note would be sent to Committee members, with comments being fed back to the DAR.

Action: Officer, Committee members and DAR

STUDENT FEEDBACK

Verbal feedback from the SU

AQEC13.02.12 The SU fed back that the first round of Departmental Forums had been completed, which had usefully picked up department and programme based feedback. The timing of the AQEC had meant that this feedback had not been brought up directly after the round of forums. A meeting had been held to explain the academic calendar, and the SU had attended a sample of the student representative forums; SRSFs being identified as a favourite as they could see the direct actions which enhance the student experience. The Student led Teaching awards were to be run again due to the success of last year's event. At present 66 nominations had been received, and it was agreed this event was a good opportunity to feed back positive aspects of teaching, and say thank you. A Students' Union conference was also planned, covering training for student representatives on University Committees. It was noted that a calendar for all meetings was being developed to ensure effective feedback to relevant committees. A further communication from the SU to encourage staff to subsequently encourage students to engage with the student led teacher awards would also be useful.

Action: DAR and SU

High impact standards to enhance the student experience

AQEC13.02.13 The Committee agreed that it was gratifying to see some of the issues identified in the NSS and SES moving forward. The recommendations were articulated well, and all were deemed important to enhance the student experience. The issues identified regarding the 4 week turn-around time for course work were discussed further. Initially this was used for formative feedback; however more assignments were due at the end of the module. The turnaround time may not be needed for feedback on a summative piece of work, although the process of academic staff marking assessments, moderation and then being administered by the Programme Administration and Assessment Team (PAAT) may cause delays. A recent process review in PAAT would ensure this was quicker in the future. Some students may also not be aware of the 4 week turnaround time; it was essential they know what UWE procedures were. Another main issue identified by the SU was the 4 week turnaround during the Christmas break; the vacation period was additional to the turnaround time and can seem like a long time for students who may also have to complete a second assignment before they have received feedback from the first. Sample answers may help in these instances. Feedback from the SU to identify an appropriate length of time for feedback would be useful. The next AQEC meeting had been allocated to consider enhancement themes, and this issue would be included in the 'assessment, feedback and moderation' theme.

Action: Committee Officer to add to April Agenda

AQEC13.02.14 The SU confirmed that the student body had been grateful to receive a text message alert on the snow day, and they would like

to see this sort of communication extended. The DAR confirmed that this practice was to continue.

AQEC13.02.15 The recommendation to improve the Performance, Development and Review (PDR) process of academic staff was discussed. It would be useful to identify the areas of poor performance which should be challenged i.e. staff not turning up or not engaging. There should also be another method of identifying these issues generally, for example one to ones, as the PDR period was generally every 2 years.

AQEC13.02.16 The DAR confirmed that the response rates for the NSS this year were down from the previous year, and asked staff and the SU to encourage students to complete this.

Action: Academic members and the SU

Student Surveys

AQEC13.02.17 A further paper put together from the outcomes from the NSS and SES was received. The detail from this paper was taken from the qualitative data, and focused on feedback to professional services rather than faculties, which had already extracted this data through NSS action plans. The paper also reflected on positive responses. One key issue emerging was timetabling; there had been some positive aspects but problems had been experienced around scheduling and publication of timetables, particularly exam times.. The draft timetabling policy reflected guidance on some of these issues, and would ensure effective engagement with students.

AQEC13.02.18 Another key theme had been placements. The Associate Dean LTSE in HLS advised that the paper did not reflect the main qualitative themes extracted by the Faculty regarding organisation. Most of these issues would be taken forward by the Faculty, however the paper had identified that these issues were evident across the University, not just HLS.

AQEC13.02.19 The main theme emerging from the Library had been student expectations around journal subscriptions; being able to get the full subscription and then direct access to this. The library managed a high level of journal subscriptions, and had moved to removing some of the abstract included within the library search.

AQEC13.02.20 Weekend maintenance and communications had been identified as a theme for IT Services, together with heating and ventilation for Facilities. WIFI access was also a major concern across all Campuses, and was a long standing problem and although much work had been undertaken there were still some cold spots. An area for consideration could be providing students with laptops and the TEL strategy could consider this. The expectations around the local learning environment 'Alexander Warehouse' would continue to be managed; this was a good facility which needed further encouragement for engagement with the support this provided.

- AQEC13.02.21 The issues identified for CAS and other professional services regarding registration were being looked into by the Start of the Year Project Board. A further recommendation for the Extenuating Circumstance regulation was part of the process review and thus being prioritised for change.
- AQEC13.02.22 It was recognised that the One University Administration project may not have reflected well on the student experience in terms of centralising student services. The Head of Student Services had already been aware of the issues highlighted in the paper. There had not been any consultation with the Service prior to this paper being submitted to AQEC. Additional work around the results of the I-Graduate survey was also being pulled together by Student Services, allowing further discussions with Faculties and Services which was generally more useful to obtain feedback for enhancement of the Service. This report was the first time qualitative comments had been pulled together for Professional Services, which did mean that they could receive some adhoc comments. The reports were useful as the University wanted to pull as much information out of student surveys as possible. It was agreed that further work would be needed to decide how best to capture student feedback regarding these issues, and how to work with the I-Graduate survey, which was a very different survey from the NSS and SES.
- AQEC13.02.23 Discussions in FET had taken place regarding action plans for the NSS, with Programme Managers asking for feedback from relevant Professional Services on some of the issues identified. This collaborative working was essential for ensuring a shared responsibility, with potentially a cross University action plan being developed in key areas. These sorts of analysis reports could also feed into Monitoring and Evaluation to acknowledge that the student feedback had been received and considered, although the main purpose of this activity was to look at academic content. One example of this was FET Faculty Librarians feeding an analysis into the FET Learning Teaching and the Student Experience Executive Committee (LTSEE). Relationships between the Faculty, Departments and Services are key, and it was difficult at times to see the connectivity, especially when considering qualitative comments. The Committee members would be asked to consider these actions and feedback comments to the DAR to enable the University to identify whether they had been picked up in action plans. The University would also endeavour to consider how to capture these comments, and how to use them more effectively for the next academic year. Programme Managers could be asked to consider qualitative data, which may be more valuable in allowing actions to be taken forward immediately.

Action: Committee members and DAR

ANNUAL MONITORING

- AQEC13.02.24 ACE – The Chair asked for a summary of the key findings and good practice identified in the Annual Monitoring and Evaluation

report. The challenging environment and student intakes were a key issue; however the Faculty had moved student numbers around to compensate for resources, helping resolve the problem. Employability and industry links had been highlighted as good practice, and also the inclusion of students in curriculum development and Committees such as ASQCs. Action planning had gone particularly well, with the NSS and SES being a predictor of the sorts of challenges the Faculty might face. These would be looked at sooner to help make enhancement changes for the upcoming level 3 students. Staff development would be a key priority with 2 days a year being set aside for this, and to help engage with compliance of the QMEF. The personal tutoring system would be looked at to identify whether students were engaging, along with the processes for working with International partners to help learn from them.

- AQEC13.02.25 FBL – The Faculty noted that academic performance was on an upward trend, with module pass rates continuing to increase. This year was the first time there had been data available to reflect diversity, and it was interesting to see how all student groups performed; access groups were not showing any different outcomes on withdrawal rates and LPN students were performing as well as other student groups. The data around BME students needed clarification as it was unsure whether direct entry international students were included in this. The data could also be improved to show where overlaps existed. The Faculty also want to increase the amount of placements available and chosen by students. The student experience was identified as a key priority, and the need for a greater understanding of the collaborative provision and QA processes and how to include the student voice was confirmed. The identification and sharing of good practice also needed to be encouraged; it was not always easy to identify what could be disseminated. This was a recognisable problem across the University. When completing the report, the Faculty advised it had been difficult to distinguish between strategic key priorities and areas of further development. The Faculty also found it un-useful having to complete separate action plans for the NSS. A different way of doing this was being considered, and further feedback regarding how this could best be captured would be appreciated.
- AQEC13.02.26 FET – The Faculty confirmed that the form was easier to use this year, although the process of reviewing the pyramid of module and programme reports, the Collaborative Provision Report and Business Plans for both the Faculty and Departments was difficult to bring together. FET had been through a curriculum refresh project, reapproving the UG curriculum to fit into the common credit framework along with other priorities identified within the Faculty (e.g. including placement options). This had been a huge amount of work, and CAS was thanked for the support provided in completing this. The curriculum refresh for PGT would take place in 2013/14. The inclusion of work based learning modules could have an impact on graduate employability and DLHE results. TEL would also be development further. One issue identified was that although good feedback had been received regarding the award

and field boards from External Examiners, there was not enough time to discuss meaningful data. A more qualitative approach would allow for discussions regarding what the data means rather than focussing on numbers. The DAR confirmed that this was under review

- AQEC13.02.27 HART – The representative for Hartpury College had sent their apologies for the meeting. However the Committee noted the introduction of an employability skills week which was reflecting positively on student feedback. The college was looking into placement modules, staff development, learning experiences, student feedback and curriculum review.
- AQEC13.02.28 HLS – Good practice was identified in the setting up of oversight groups which would look at particular programme changes or developments. This allows the Executive to take a lead on curriculum design. KPIs have been identified for the partnership with the Strategic Health Authority and the identification of students being fit to practice. The Module Handbook would be based on the same template used across the Faculty, and 60 day action plans for the NSS had been developed. An area for consideration was the Validation Only Model (VOM) project for the UWE Federation; this would need to be monitored in terms of the impact on academic staff. Other priorities were timetabling, stakeholder involvement needing to be consistent throughout all processes, and further investigation into placement opportunities. The relationship with Professional Services would also be improved, along with consideration of improving assessment feedback and implementing more TEL and internationalisation in curriculum.
- AQEC13.02.29 The Chair confirmed it had been useful to see what each Faculty was taking forward, and the commonality of discussions needed around issues to drive key priorities and strategies forward. The Chair thanked all Faculty members for pulling together the reports, but noted that there were still a few outstanding programme reports. The Faculty QME Account Manager in the Quality Team would circulate the list of outstanding reports.

Action: QME Account Managers

Faculty Collaborative Partnership Annual Monitoring Reports

- AQEC13.02.30 It was noted that the Faculty reports had included evaluation of collaborative partnerships overall. In addition, the Faculty reports specifically on collaborative partnerships had been considered at the Collaborative Provision Committee, and the minutes detailing the discussions were available on the SharePoint website.

GRADUATE DESTINATION REPORT

- AQEC13.02.31 The report would usually be compiled and submitted to AQEC in the Autumn term; however a few delays had been experienced this year, therefore the report focused on students who had graduated in 2011. Overall the outcomes were positive, with UWE

being ahead of the majority of benchmark competitors (for example Bournemouth University). UWE had remained reasonably consistent in the employability league table, being just outside the top 50. There were a number of factors which have influenced this: the engagement with work experience within curriculum development (although there was scope for further improvement), the University's geographical location and regional connections with local enterprise partnerships and small businesses. Individual reports had been shared with each Faculty. The report for graduates who left in 2012 would be published in the Autumn term for 2013/14. The Graduate School would be provided with a PGR destinations report.

- AQEC13.02.32 It would be useful to include definitions of employability and employment; the way the institution thinks about both has changed recently, which may be a factor in receiving positive results. This report enhances the key theme within the new University 20/20 Strategy to have a practice led curriculum. Through the development of the strategy, further work would be completed regarding what practice led and professionally recognised meant, with the observations being discussed within each Faculty. The area of placements had been discussed at the Student/Governor forum, with the agreement that this should be increased across the University. It was agreed that small businesses were an important aspect of our partnerships with local employers; 90% of the Digital Industry partnership within the Department of Creative Industries were with small businesses. The Department also had an Enterprise Team, which could share good practice on cultivating these partnerships.

ANNUAL REPORT ON COMPLAINTS AND APPEALS – 2011/12

- AQEC13.02.33 The Committee agreed the report was fulsome, including a clear summary of the key actions and recommendations. Case studies had also been included as valuable learning points. There had been a decrease in the number of cases received in 2011/12, which could not be explained as complaints received so far this academic year were almost at the same number. The aim was to reduce the amount of academic appeals received (UWE currently received the highest amount in the sector), and to reduce the amount of complaints which progress to the OIA. The top 3 priorities were around provision, the administration of policy and procedures, and support (advice and guidance). The Appeals process has a higher profile on the web over the Extenuating Circumstance (EC) procedure. The EC process therefore needed to be accessible to ensure students were aware and understood this. The area of referrals also needed to be looked at; some students did not realise that they might have to resubmit all elements of assessment within a component if they had failed one element. This would be made clearer in the Module Handbook. There were also some recommendations around online submissions i.e. alerts to advise the student that the 24 hour window has started. If errors are found at a Faculty level it was encouraged that they be actioned locally where possible. The

area of moderation was also discussed; the University should adopt a consistent approach for internal and external moderation as this was the defence used in many academic appeals. UWE has to be able to evidence that this has been through moderation, and there had been instances where the evidence did not exist, even if it had happened.

AQEC13.02.34 For complaints, problems had been encountered when markers had been kind to the student if they had failed, for example not giving them full feedback about where they had gone wrong or only marking them a small percentage below the fail mark when the realistic mark should have been lower. The student may then think they do not have to do much to pass the second attempt, and subsequently fail again. A robust communication strategy was also needed to ensure different types of students received communications relating to curriculum changes.

AQEC13.02.35 The Chair would work with the Complaints and Appeals Manager and the DAR to take the actions forward. The case studies and lessons learnt would help to identify actual issues and how these can be resolved. Although UWE has the highest number of complaints and appeals, it also had the smallest number which progress to the OIA; reflecting that students were happy with the process. It would however be useful to look into whether some which progress the OIA could be avoided. The University would welcome the tracking of academic appeals on a SharePoint website. The specification for the site would be written by Easter, and IT Services would then start to develop. Once this is in place, the Complaints and Appeals Team would like to send mini reports to each Faculty to provide real time feedback.

Action: Chair, DAR and Manager of Complaints and Appeals

ANNUAL SUMMARY REPORT FROM CURRICULUM DESIGN AND APPROVAL 2011/12

AQEC13.02.36 The Officer talked through the areas of good practice and recommendations for the University which were identified through validation/approval Panels and Curriculum Approval Panels (CAPs) within 2011/12. The HLS Associate Dean LTSE confirmed clearer guidance to identify whether a new programme should be considered at a Faculty CAP, or a Special joint CAP/PSRB event needed to be resolved. The action regarding parity of assessments across the University also needed to be urgently addressed to ensure there was consistency and relevant mapping to learning outcomes. The area of assessment loading would also be added as an enhancement theme to the April AQEC meeting. It would also be useful to discuss more imaginative forms of assessment, and how the University ensures these are appropriate for disabled students. The Chair, DAR and Officer would meet to agree particular issues for the University, and how to take these actions forward.

Action: Chair, DAR and Officer

SAFEGUARDING POLICY

AQEC13.02.37 An initial consultation on a new Safeguarding Policy for Children and Vulnerable Adults had taken place a year ago, and work is being undertaken in aligning this to HR in the safeguarding of staff. Key aspects of the new policy were to have designated safeguarding officers in each Faculty and the larger Professional Services to provide training and conduct of best practice for dealing with this particular group. Also to identify how information would be fed through to the authorities who assess this, rather than UWE investigating allegations of abuse. One area for further work would be to identify how these activities would be flagged to the existing officers, and the completion of CRB checks. The policy advised CRB checks were needed, and it would be useful to have clear guidance regarding who this would affect. All staff, including Student Ambassadors, would need to have a satisfactory CRB check, and the CRB Policy was to be updated to reflect this. Information in the guidance should cover whether this include students who volunteer, and who would pay for CRB checks. Should Strategic Health Authorities and Teacher Training organisations be added? They are very expensive and this may be a problem if students have to pay for these. The Head of Student Services would feed this information back to the policy writers, including the request that guidance be developed regarding how we disseminate this information, and what staff need to do in certain circumstances; how we do or do not support certain activities (for example when children visit the ECC for Science Week).

Action: Head of Student Services

UWE FOUNDATION DEGREES

AQEC13.02.38 The paper proposed a change to the Academic Regulations to allow students who have completed a UWE Foundation Degree to carry their level 2 marks into their UWE bachelors top up degree and be used in the final classification of their degree. Other HEIs had been contacted, and there was a 50/50 split of whether they allowed this or not. Discussions with the QAA had highlighted that they did not have a stance either way, but that we would need to be transparent on what UWE agreed and how this was managed. The paper also queried whether the change, if approved, should be brought in only for students starting 2013/14, or for all current foundation degree students. The second option may be difficult to manage, but some students may feel disadvantaged if they found out new students would have this entitlement. Other questions were posed regarding allowing interim awards within the same regulation, and whether these would need to be handed back if the student decided to progress to the full degree. The consensus was that UWE may not need to return CertHE and DipHE interim awards for UG programmes as within the QAA Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) they would be classed as a different level of award. However, a degree without honours and PG programmes would be the same level. ACE and HLS supported the proposal, and agreed that it may depend on the

industry regarding whether it would be useful to show both the interim award and top up, or just the full degree on a CV. The Chair asked the Committee members to consider the proposals put forward in the paper, and provide comments to the DAR within a week.

Action: Committee members

DRAFT RELIGION AND BELIEF POLICY

- AQEC13.02.39 The draft policy was in the early stages of development, and had come to AQEC for initial comments around the area of religious observation and assessment. Consultation would also take place with a number of other groups. The Single Equality Scheme and the Academic Board identified that there was a need for a policy to provide clear and transparent information around religion and belief. Initially the idea had been to develop a code of practice; however it had changed to a policy to provide a clearer statement. There would be 3 main areas: a core statement of principles, a policy around teaching, learning and assessment and the support for this, and facilities around the University. The area of teaching, learning and assessment would be particularly important as some dates in the new academic calendar may have an effect on, for example, Ramadan, highlighting the need to consider how to support these students to complete their assessments along with their religious observations. Other policies developed by UK HEIs had been considered, and the new policy would be in line with, if not doing more, than comparator institutions. There would also be value in considering how other international HEIs manage this. A religious observation form had been developed in CAS for students who experienced difficulty undertaking assessments because of religion. This would allow students to outline their circumstances, and to provide evidence which would be outlined in the policy. The form and policy would make it clear that there was no guarantee assessments would be moved, but it may be something which can be considered as an EC. This would also give the University a greater understanding of certain religious beliefs which may affect assessment times. The draft form was currently with the Student Advisors for comment. The form and policy would need further work, and would not be implemented half way throughout the year as some assessments had already taken place. A clear communication would be essential when the policy had been approved and implemented.
- AQEC13.02.40 Some members had concerns that a policy may prioritise this group of students over other groups, such as non believers; an equality impact assessment would be completed to ensure this was not the case. It would also be essential to ensure the new policy did not become unmanageable with the re-scheduling of lots of assessments. The investigations already undertaken into how other HEIs manage this would be useful to identify whether this was likely. The list of acceptable evidence in the policy would need to be clear regarding what would be accepted. One of the student representatives was from Mauritius, which is a country with many beliefs. These beliefs are kept out of the HE

environment to avoid pressure groups building up; changes to assessments and timetabling are also not considered. They have public holidays around religious festivals which are nationally agreed, and assessment timetables fit around these dates. The policy would be useful to clarify information around dress and food, which would be supportive of the cultural diversity of the University. The Chair again asked the Committee members to consider the draft policy, which would be sent out and could be annotated and sent back to the DAR within 2 weeks of issuing the minutes.

Action: Committee Members

AQEC SUB GROUPS

AQEC13.02.41 The notes from the meetings of each of the AQEC sub groups were noted by the Committee.

ACTIONS FROM FACULTY ASQCS

AQEC13.02.42 The Committee noted that the action from the FET ASQC regarding the roles and responsibilities of External Examiners for collaborative provision would be investigated as part of a wider review outside of the meeting, including relevant UWE colleagues.

Action: CAS

ACADEMIC BOARD MINUTES

AQEC13.02.43 The Executive Summary from the last meeting of Academic Board was noted.

*AQEC Minutes: R Smith
Unconfirmed: 22 February 2013
Chairs minutes: 26 February 2013
Confirmed:*

ACADEMIC QUALITY AND ENHANCEMENT GROUP – ACTION SHEET FROM THE MEETING HELD ON 20 FEBRUARY 2013

Minute	Substance	Actioning Officer	Reporting\other deadline
AQEC13.02.06	To consider recommendations to improve the management of non standard learners through blackboard.	TEL Management Group	
AQEC13.02.09	To continue investigating the issue regarding external examiners receiving incorrect documents prior to field and award boards.	DAR	
AQEC13.02.11	To forward any evidence of issues identified regarding access to facilities for non standard students to the Committee Officer and DAR.	Committee Members	By Friday 15th March 2013
AQEC13.02.12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. To send a communication to staff and students to encourage engagement with the student led teacher awards. b. To develop an academic board committee calendar to ensure effective feedback is streamlined to relevant faculties. 	SU DAR	
AQEC13.02.13	To add to the April AQEC Agenda as an enhancement theme ‘the 4 week turn around time for assessment feedback’.	Committee Officer	
AQEC13.02.16	For staff to encourage students graduating this year to complete the NSS.	Academic Committee members and the SU	
AQEC13.02.23	To consider the actions identified in the Student Surveys report (AQEC13.02.10) and feed back any comments to the DAR to identify where these can be captured and included in actions plans.	Committee members	By Friday 15th March 2013
AQEC13.02.29	To send a list of outstanding Programme Reports to Associate Deans LTSE.	QME Account Managers	
AQEC13.02.35	The Chair would work with the Complaints and Appeals Manager and the DAR to take the actions forward identified in the annual summary report (AQEC13.02.06)	Chair, DAR and Manager of Complaints and Appeals	
AQEC13.02.36	The parity of assessments would also be added as an enhancement theme under the	Chair, DAR and Committee	

CONFIRMED

	area of assessment to the April AQEC Agenda. Also the Chair, DAR and Committee Officer would meet to discuss how to take actions forward.	Officer	
AQEC13.02.37	To feedback the discussions at AQEC regarding the development of a Safeguarding Policy.	Head of Student Services	By the next AQEC meeting
AQEC13.02.38	To consider the proposals put forward in the Foundation Degrees paper (AQEC13.02.09), and forward any comments to the DAR.	Committee Members	By Friday 09th March 2013
AQEC13.02.40	To consider the draft Religion and Belief Policy, and to feed any comments to the DAR.	Committee Members	By Friday 15th March 2013
AQEC13.02.42	To organise a meeting to discuss the issues identified regarding the management of responsibilities for external examiners where there is collaborative provision.	Quality Management Team – CAS	