UNIVERSITY OF ULSTER

ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND QUALITY ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 4 December 2017 by video-conference

PRESENT

Professor P Bartholomew (Chair), Dr D Barr, Dr G Breslin, Mr J Colgan, Professor R Fee, Professor D Hazlett, Ms A Honan, Dr M Keenan, Professor A McKillop, Professor B Murphy, Mrs M Paris, Ms C Reid

APOLOGIES

Ms M Downey, Professor H Farley, Ms R Wasson

IN ATTENDANCE

Mrs C G Avery, Mr A G Faulkner

UNRESERVED

17.93   MINUTES

The confirmed minutes of the meeting held on 23 October 2017 were signed by the Chair.

MATTERS ARISING

17.94   Terms of Reference (Min 17.57)

Mr Faulkner advised members that the newly constituted Senate would receive terms of reference of its committees for approval in January. The Committee's terms of reference would be revised further as under Senate's new Delegated Authority Framework (item 32) authority for the approval of planning of new course proposals and changes to course titles and locations had been given to it. Current term of reference 1g) would consequently be moved to term 4.

17.95   Extenuating Circumstances (Min 17.58)

The Committee noted that the revised Principles for Implementation would be received at the March 2018 meeting.

17.96   Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) Guidance (Min 17.60)

Mr Faulkner reported that two separate meetings had taken place in November with the University Secretary and the Head of the Marketing Unit, and then with the Director of Student Administration and the Head of Admissions. It was noted that responsibility for communication to applicants had moved from Faculties to the central Admissions Unit and Mrs R McEvoy had now been added to circulation lists to ensure that the Admissions team was aware of approved revisions.   The

University Secretary would review progress on outstanding actions from the work of the Consumer Protection Law Working Group including the training for staff.

Professor Bartholomew also reported that an Internal Audit was scheduled to review compliance, which would help to assess the robustness of processes.

17.97   Accreditation of Prior Experiential Learning and Admissions Audit of Partner Institutions (Min 17.78)

At the October meeting, the Committee had discussed serious concerns identified with the application of APEL and admissions policy and processes in partner colleges and asked for a report on proposed sanctions and further actions. The Committee noted that the Annual Course Review Report identified proposed sanctions (mins 17.116 – 17.117 refer).

The Chair reported that he and the Vice-Chancellor had met with College Principals and had emphasised the gravity of such breaches. The University's expectations and requirements with regard to quality and its governance had been made very clear.

17.98   Examination Regulations (Min 17.84)

Senate had approved the revision to regulation 21 of the Regulations Governing Examinations in Programmes of Study to prohibit smart watches or similar devices in examination rooms.

It was noted that Student Administration proposed to amend the restriction on the type of electronic calculator which might be used in an examination room by the addition of a phrase to prohibit those with an SD card slot. As the authority to amend regulations had not been delegated by Senate, this further revision required its approval.

AGREED: that it be recommended to Senate that the following revision to the second sentence of regulation 21 of the Regulations Governing Examinations in Programmes of Study be approved:

'Candidates shall not take mobile phones into the examination room. Electronic calculators, provided that they are operationally quiet, hand-held, contain their own power source, cannot communicate with other devices **and do not have an SD card slot**, may be used by candidates in an examination unless the use of any type of calculator or of particular types of calculators has been expressly forbidden by the examiners.'

COURSE APPROVAL

17.99   Academic Planning Advisory Group

Professor Murphy, who had chaired the meeting, presented the report from the meeting of the Advisory Group held on 21 November 2017 (Paper No ASQEC/17/40a).

17.100   Course Planning (Item 1)

Professor Murphy reported that the Group had noted that new course proposals for partner institutions should be sponsored by an associated Faculty to ensure both Faculty engagement and strategic planning from a Faculty perspective, and that business cases should relate primarily to the Faculty, not the partner institution.

The Group had also noted that the presentation of business cases and course costings was improving and that Finance were continuing to work with Faculties on this matter. Given the lack of strong evidence of demand or market research for some proposals, it was agreed that in future Faculties should confirm consultation with the Marketing and Communications Directorate.

The Committee noted in particular that the Faculty of Life and Health Sciences was working closely with the Northern Ireland Ambulance Service to support the transition from a training environment in the development and delivery of a new HE Foundation degree.

It was also noted that the recommendation in support of a proposed FdSc Food and Drink Manufacture at CAFRE was subject to a satisfactory outcome to discussions between the Faculty of Life and Health Sciences and the Ulster University Business School regarding potential competition or conflict.

AGREED: that the recommendations from the Academic Planning Advisory Group as set out at Appendix 1 be approved.

17.101   Programme Suspensions and Withdrawals (Items 2 and 3)

The Committee noted the partner institution programmes for which 2017/18 intake had been suspended and programme withdrawals approved by Faculties (Appendix 2).

17.102   Course Approvals 2017/18

The Committee noted the recommendations for approval of provision made by four 2017/18 validation panels which had met since 23 October 2017 (Paper No ASQEC/17/40b).

The Chair suggested that it would be preferable for the Committee to exercise its authority to grant approval to new and revalidated provision only when the validation process had been satisfactorily completed, rather than to confirm conditional approval before documentation had been finalised and signed off by Panel Chairs. While the current process provided for ongoing oversight, it did not advance approval. Chair's Action would be available, as at present, in respect of provision which had not fulfilled conditions before the last meeting of the Committee in the year. The ultimate sanction for courses which did not meet conditions of approval would, and should, remain that they do not recruit in the coming year, but judgement would be applied in relation to the specific conditions set and Faculty/College responses.

Professor Bartholomew also raised the question of whether the current three-month deadline by which course/subject teams provide responses and revised documentation in respect of events which take place before March was too long, and whether a shorter timeframe might encourage teams to finalise documentation more promptly (see also min 17.104). Professor McKillop and a number of other members supported the flexibility of the current arrangement in order to allow teams to reflect, liaise, co-ordinate and organise the resubmission, taking account of the scale of the provision and other activities. There was no impediment to early submission, nor to requesting an extension if necessary.

AGREED that:

i)   in future, recommendations from Evaluation and Revalidation Panels for the (re-)approval of provision should only be presented to the Committee when the Panel Chair had confirmed that its conditions and recommendations have been satisfactorily addressed;

ii)   the current timeframes for the submission of documentation remain.

17.103   Course Revisions

The Committee noted course revisions and new short-course modules approved by Faculties and ADDL (Paper No ASQEC/17/40c) (Appendix 3).

17.104   Outstanding Evaluation/Revalidation Documentation

The Committee received a statement on progress in the submission of three outstanding final evaluation/revalidation documents from 2016/17 and 2014/15 (Paper No ASQEC/17/40d).

The Committee noted that documentation for unit 19A Media (UG) (2014/15) and for MA International Journalism (2016/17 but now deferred to September 2018 start) had now been received for checking by the Academic Office. Revised documentation for the Diploma in Foundation Studies (IFP) had been circulated to panel members and was close to final sign-off (January 2018 start [subsequently September 2018]).

17.105   Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body Accreditation

The Committee noted the Annual Report summarising the outcomes of visits/approval activity in 2015/16 and 2016/17 and the statement of courses for which reports and responses had not yet been received at University-level for the period 2013/14 – 2016/17 (Paper No ASQEC/17/40e).

While the Committee welcomed that satisfactory outcomes for all engagements, it noted a number of gaps in each year in terms of formal receipt of PSRB reports and responses. The paper also identified a common issue emerging around the accuracy of information published in the prospectus in relation to the precise description of the accreditation given.

AGREED that:

i) Associate Deans (Education) liaise with Ms G Dooher regarding the missing reports and/or responses;

ii) the Committee receive an update on this matter at its next meeting, along with an updated schedule for 2017/18 activities;

iii) Faculties ensure the accuracy of information published about professional body accreditation.

17.106   EXTERNAL EXAMINERS' REPORTS 2016/17

Professor Bartholomew presented the Annual Overview Report which identified general issues from the reports for the 2016/17 academic year (Paper No ASQEC/17/41).

The Committee noted that 354 reports had been received to date and that the vast majority of external examiners had confirmed that standards were appropriate and many praised certain aspects. A few made critical comments. Course/subject committees were expected to take immediate action to address any concerns and report back on a timely basis to the external examiner. The external examiner reports were considered as part of ongoing monitoring processes.

As a response had not been sent to the external examiner for BA Hons Media Studies and Production in the last two years, the Chair reported that he had written to assure her that the matters raised in her reports had been taken seriously with appropriate action taken.

17.107   Participation in Moderation Process (4)

The vast majority of external examiners expressed satisfaction with their involvement in the moderation process, although some had commented on incompleteness and inconsistency in provision of some documentation, lack of access to the VLE or that they had not been asked to review assessment schema and examination scripts in advance, as was expected. The Chair reminded Faculties that the Office for Digital Learning had a protocol to support external examiner access to Blackboard. The Committee also noted that the University's requirement for external examiner involvement in the approval of assessment schema would be even more important in the light of the proposed introduction of a new classification algorithm.

17.108   Structure and Content (5)

There was almost universal confirmation that the structure and content of programmes were coherent and appropriate to the level, award, subject area and the particular aims of the course/subject.

17.109   Assessment and Feedback (6)

The vast majority of external examiners were satisfied with the assessment strategies employed. As in previous years, the main concern raised was over-

assessment. The Chair considered that some teams appeared to be overly cautious in their rationalisation of assessment and he encouraged Faculties to address this matter by undertaking further review of assessment strategies where needed. They should ensure that all module learning outcomes were assessed and have a clear rationale for variation from the new norm.

Although the University's policy clearly stated the requirement for inclusion of an individual element of assessment in groupwork which contributed to grading/ classification of an award, some external examiners reported student concerns about insufficient recognition of the relative contribution of individuals. The Chair advised that this was among a number of assessment matters which he would wish to discuss at the Learning and Teaching Committee, in the context of the proposed classification algorithm. These included the restriction on postgraduate students who were employed as tutorial assistants and demonstrators undertaking summative assessment of other students' work when it contributed to the final classification of an award.

Only a few external examiners expressed concerns regarding feedback. The predominant comment related to inconsistency between modules within individual programmes in the quantity and quality of feedback provided and on occasion between sites. For some courses a recommendation had been made to encourage more in the way of 'feed-forward'.

While no issues were raised regarding timelines, the Chair considered that the University's normal expectation of 15 working days for the return of coursework and provision of feedback to be quite tight, particularly for modules with large numbers of students. He suggested that this might affect the amount and quality of the feedback provided by some staff and that a four-week norm (and five-weeks for larger modules) might be preferable. Professor Fee considered that a variable approach would not be helpful for staff.

17.110 Marking Standards (7)

Generally marking standards were considered to be appropriate with many externals explicitly praising high standards. Some concerns were raised about absence, or limited evidence, of internal moderation or anonymous marking in coursework. A small number of external examiners reported a reluctance to use the full range of marks and some cautioned against over-generous marking (although this was addressed through moderation).

17.111 Quality of Candidates' Work, Student Learning and Comparability (8)

Generally the quality of candidates work attracted favourable comment and all externals commented positively on comparability with other institutions. It was noted that with regard to Architecture provision, the external examiner for the MArch reported on impressive overall improvements from the previous year, while the BA Hons external had recommended a comprehensive and thorough review of curriculum, learning and teaching strategy, course structure and allocation of work amongst staff. This would be addressed through the revalidation in May 2018.

A number of external examiners had commented on staffing resources. Professor Bartholomew recognised the high staff/student ratios at Ulster and noted that resource matters should be addressed by School/Faculty Executives.

AGREED that:

i) Faculties be congratulated on the generally high standards evidenced by the reports and ensure that specific issues were promptly addressed by the relevant course/subject teams, and monitored through the relevant process, and that external examiners were informed of the actions taken;

ii) Faculties, Associate Deans (Education) and CHERP take account of the matters of concern and identified good practice highlighted in the overview report in their ongoing enhancement work (a 'Word' version and the detailed supporting analysis which informed the report would be provided to Associate Deans (Education) and CHERP for this purpose);

iii) Associate Deans (Education) consider current expectations for groupwork assessment, the involvement of PhD students in assessment, and the timeframe for feedback for future discussion at Learning and Teaching Committee.

17.112 MEETINGS OF BOARD OF EXAMINERS BY VIDEO-CONFERENCE

The Chair reported that in October 2017 the Affiliate College Executive Board for QAHE had asked whether video-conference might be permitted for future meetings of Boards of Examiners.

The Committee received Paper No ASQEC/17/42 on this matter and noted that in 2011 the former Teaching and Learning Committee had discussed the question of video-conference meetings of Boards and noted that University policy expected face-to-face meetings and required attendance of externals at such meetings when results contributing to final classification were being considered. A video link was permitted as a one-off alternative arrangement in emergency situations. The policy was re-affirmed at that time, including the proviso that the Pro-Vice-Chancellor responsible might authorise exceptional departures. The Committee had also approved a specific request for one course.

Mrs Paris strongly believed that video-conferencing of Boards of Examiners in partner institutions should not be permitted as the presence of externals on campus was critical to the moderation process. Professor Fee considered that the specific 2011 decision which related to the fully online PgCert/Dip/MSc Social Research Skills with Specialisms remained valid.

It was suggested that the use of Blackboard Collaborate might also be an appropriate alternative means for meetings of Boards. Professor Murphy supported the use of video-conference or Blackboard Collaborate on a risk-based approach only and subject to appropriate assurances about the discharge of the external examiner's responsibilities.

Professor Bartholomew considered that the face-to-face meetings with external examiners were very valuable. The University would not wish to encourage a culture of external examiner non-attendance or remoteness in view of the benefits from close engagement with course teams and students.

AGREED that the current policy regarding video-conference be re-affirmed, and that the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) be authorised to consider and approve exceptions in the following circumstances:

i) individual cases made by Faculties for specific courses to depart from University policy (when outside the timetable for consideration by the Committee);

ii) waivers to permit one-off arrangements eg use of video-conference, Skype, or Blackboard Collaborate to mitigate the effect of non-attendance of an external examiner owing to exceptional circumstances.

COMBINED STUDIES PROGRAMME

17.113 <u>Annual Report on the Operation and Management of Undergraduate Combined Subjects in 2016/17</u>

The Committee received the composite Annual Report on the operation and management of the Combined Studies programme in 2016/17 based on reports from the Magee, Coleraine and Jordanstown Directors of Combined Studies (Paper No ASQEC/17/43a). Priorities for 2017/18 had been identified by each Campus Co-ordinating Group.

17.114 <u>Annual Reports for 2016/17 from the Chief External Examiners for the Coleraine, Jordanstown and Magee Campuses and the Responses from the Campus Co-Ordinating Groups</u>

The Committee received the positive reports and noted that no issues had been identified (Paper No ASQEC/17/43b).

AGREED: that in future the Committee receive a single composite annual report to cover the overviews from Directors of Combined Studies and Chief External Examiners.

17.115 ANNUAL COURSE REVIEW OF COLLABORATIVE COURSES 2016/17

Dr Keenan presented the Annual Course Review Report for 2016/17 (Paper No ASQEC/17/44). A Sub-Group of the Committee had met to consider the adequacy of action taken on outstanding issues from the 2015/16 review and progress and action in light of the 2016/17 review of individual courses. The report summarised the Sub-Group's findings in relation to each course and made eight recommendations on general matters for consideration at University-level and five course-specific recommendations for action by Faculties. Dr Keenan expressed her thanks and appreciation to Mr Hugh Deighan and other colleagues involved in the Annual Course Review process together with the Sub-Group members.

The Sub-Group confirmed satisfactory progress in relation to outstanding matters from 2015/16. It would meet again on 30 January 2018 to consider the adequacy of responses to the issues identified in the 2016/17 review and provide a subsequent report.

The Committee noted that this year a 'RAG' system was used whereby a programme was classed as 'Red', 'Amber', or 'Green' by the individual reviewer. Where the academic standards and/or resources available to deliver a programme did not meet the University's criteria for the award, 'Red' was used, which would warrant a recommendation to suspend further intakes. 'Amber' courses required a detailed action plan from senior management.

One course had been identified as 'Red' and six as 'Amber'. FdSc Computing Infrastructure at BMC had been classed in the 'Red' category as no substantive action had been taken to address any of the previous year's issues, which still pertained to the 2016/17 submission. The Committee endorsed the recommendations that senior management at BMC provide a detailed action plan to the Sub-Group and if this did not fully address the issues, that the next intake should be suspended.

17.116   Breach of Contract: APEL and Admission Standards

The Sub-Group had noted the Committee's previous discussion of the Collaborative Partnership Forum's report on the admission of students through APEL outside the proper procedures. The Committee had endorsed the urgent measures identified by the Forum and was to receive a report on sanctions and further actions at this meeting (min 17.78 refers). The Sub-Group proposed a further audit and sanctions in the form of suspension of future intakes.

With regard to admissions, Dr Keenan reported that an audit of GCSE English and Mathematics was also being undertaken.

17.117   Breach of Contract: Over-Recruitment

The Committee noted that a number of programmes/Colleges recruited significantly more students than the cohort size approved at validation on the basis of the proposed resources. This was a concern when Faculty/University approval had not been sought. It was noted that the University received capitation fees up to a maximum number determined by an overarching agreement for local colleges, which was not related to the maximum cohort size set by a validation panel.

It was proposed that in future if the maximum intake number agreed at validation were exceeded by more than 20% without Faculty approval, then the following options might be applied:

- suspension of the next intake to the course;

- suspension of several intakes until the maximum permitted intake figure was achieved; further recruitment to be allowed only on receipt of a written guarantee from the College that the agreed number would not be exceeded in future;

- additional levying of the University's capitation fee for all students recruited above the maximum number set by the validation panel.

The Chair noted that the first two options were related to the implications of over-recruitment for the quality of delivery, but proposed that the third would need to have been recorded in the validation agreement and, as it related to the application of the fees agreement, should be considered separately by the University.

17.118   Work-Based Learning

The Sub-Group noted that there had been no problem in 2016/17 with regard to students having access to work-based learning and there had been an increase in the number of international opportunities. It recommended that, in light of the Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) requirements, the Forum give further consideration to the operational aspects of work-based learning.

17.119   General Issues for University Level Consideration

The Sub-Group had drawn together a number of conclusions arising from the review and made eight recommendations which would help address concerns, for action by the Collaborative Partnerships Forum or the University's central Admissions Department. These related to the Subject Partnership Manager's role in monitoring intakes; differences between University and College progress/ retention data; operational aspects of work-based learning; College understanding of the University's expectations for teaching staff, admissions policy and procedures, and early leavers; the use of Turnitin for electronic submission of coursework; and the identification of students and staff in minutes of meetings.

17.120   Good Practice

The Committee noted that the Sub-Group had been impressed by the quality of submissions and noted good practice in chairing of boards of examiners and staff/student consultative committees; joint meetings of the latter across campuses; the development of an online compliments/comments/complaints system; staff engagement with the local community; student engagement with professional bodies; a culture of entrepreneurship and innovation; an audit of Moodle; and detailed analysis of geographic locations of students. It sought clarification of how these would be disseminated. Dr Keenan advised that a paper on good practice would be considered by the Forum and highlighted at the annual conference for Colleges.

17.121   2017/18 Review Process

The Sub-Group made recommendations that, for the 2017/18 review, reviewers should hold Senior/Principal Fellowship of the HEA and that Subject Partnership Managers should not undertake this role. Dr Keenan explained that the proposal related to a need to enhance continuity in membership of the Group and that the expertise of such Fellows, preferably with experience of collaborative provision, would be very helpful. The use of Subject Partnership Managers created a conflict of interest.   Reviewers would also be expected to refer to the approved

evaluation/revalidation document and course revisions since the previous events, and should therefore be able to access a central repository.

Professor Bartholomew asked whether the annual review of collaborative provision should remain as a separate exercise or whether it might benefit from being integrated with the monitoring process for internal provision. Members considered that there would be a risk of insufficient scrutiny from the latter approach.

AGREED that the following recommendations be approved:

i) Belfast Metropolitan College (FdSc Computing Infrastructure)

Senior management to provide a detailed action plan to address issues, and if this was not achieved satisfactorily the September 2018 intake be suspended.

ii) Breach of Contract: APEL

- a further admissions audit to be conducted in the current academic year;

- any malpractice identified to be reported to the Committee and, if a College had failed to implement APEL procedures, it be sanctioned by suspension of further intakes to the specific course; (where a course was offered as part of a network or on more than one campus, only the course/location in breach of procedures to be subject to sanction).

iii) Breach of Contract: Over-Recruitment

Where the maximum cohort number was exceeded without prior approval by more than 20%, the following sanctions be available:

- suspension of the course for the next intake; or

- suspension of several intakes until the maximum intake figure was achieved; further recruitment to be allowed only on receipt of a written guarantee from the College that the agreed number would not be exceeded in future.

iv) General Issues to be Addressed at University Level

(Recommendations 1 – 7 to be taken forward by the Collaborative Partnerships Forum and recommendation 8 by the central Admissions Department.)

1   Subject Partnership Managers to monitor closely actual intake against projected intake to ensure resources were adequate to meet the learning needs of students.

2   In light of the Competition and Markets Authority requirements, further consideration to be given to the operational aspects of WBL.

3   Staff in partner institutions to be reminded of the need to track and record non-returners and implement strategies to encourage the return of these students.

4   Consideration to be given to the variances in data provided by partners on retention and success against University generated figures.

5   Senior managers be reminded of the University's expectations for staff teaching on University approved programmes.

6   Where appropriate, teaching staff to be encouraged to use Turnitin for the electronic submission of coursework.

7   Clarification to be provided on the naming of staff and students in the minutes of meetings.

8   Staff development to be provided to admissions staff in partner institutions on the University's admissions policy and procedures.

v)   Issues to be Addressed at Faculty Level

Faculties to address the issues identified.

vi)   2017/18 Review Process

- membership of the Review Group to be constituted from Senior/Principal Fellows of the HEA;

- the final version of all course documents for validated provision together with all subsequent course revisions to be placed in a central repository for access by members of the Review Group.

- Subject Partnership Managers to be required to be in attendance at meetings of the Review Group.

17.122   UUSU/ULSTER UNIVERSITY STUDENTS-AS-PARTNERS FRAMEWORK

The Committee at its meeting in June 2017 had endorsed a proposal to develop a partnership agreement to support meaningful engagement between the student body and the University at all levels (min 17.46 refers). A Working Group had met three times and there had also been considerable discussions with students.

Ms Honan presented for comment a draft Students-As-Partners Framework (Paper No ASQEC/17/45). This took into account the national expectation and definition of partnership as provided in the UK Quality Code, Chapter B5 (2013). It was noted that the organisation, Student Partnerships in Quality Scotland (*sparqs*), had facilitated the development process.

The proposed Framework would have three parts: Values, an Operational Plan and an Evaluation Plan. At this stage members were invited to comment on the draft Values and the proposed operational priorities. The Committee was also asked to consider a proposal that each School/Department appoint a 'Student Advocate'.

Professor Hazlett welcomed the model of shared responsibility whereby staff and students worked in partnership and considered that the lexicon used aligned well with the developing new Learning and Teaching Strategy. It was noted that the

Strategy and Framework would be seen as complementary and mutually reinforcing.

Ms Honan invited members' views on the appropriateness of the name for the Framework and whether 'staff' should be included. She suggested that 'Framework for Staff and Student Partnership' might be preferable. Professor Bartholomew considered that, while the term as given was in common use in the sector, the name needed to be acceptable to the Students' Union.

With regard to the descriptions for the four proposed Values there was general agreement that 'Trust' should be renamed as 'Authenticity' and that 'Honesty' might be changed to 'Trust'.

The Committee noted that, based on feedback received, the Group had confirmed that the University had sufficient mechanisms for student representation, feedback and engagement but it considered that these could be made more effective. Pending adoption of the Framework, the Students' Union was taking forward in 2017/18 initiatives to relaunch the course representation system with a change to timing of elections, to improve the feedback loop to students, to organise Student Voice Fora on a campus instead of Faculty basis, and to establish a PhD Forum.

Regarding the Operational Plan, the paper identified fourteen priority topics for enhancement covering four broad areas: representation/engagement at committees, involvement in enhancement at programme level, the use of Student Surveys, and SU representation. Each area would be taken forward as a separate work stream. The Working Group, through consultation with students, student representatives and staff, intended to review the activities identified and the outcomes would form the basis of the plan. Professor Bartholomew cautioned that the aspirations of the plan should be realisable within the context of other commitments of students and operational processes.

In terms of overall governance of the Framework, the Chair advised that, as a joint initiative led by the Students' Union with the University, it should not be owned by the Committee. Consequently, he suggested that following finalisation the Framework should be submitted to the joint UUSU Forum for adoption. The Committee would then maintain oversight of related policy developments.

Ms Honan sought members' views on the proposal that each School/Department appoint a Student Advocate who would act as a voice or support for students where they felt uncomfortable about raising issues or ideas, to act as the liaison point with the Students' Union in regard to representation in all relevant School/Department committees, and to provide oversight of the effectiveness of student feedback mechanisms. Professor Bartholomew asked the Associate Deans (Education) to discuss this proposal in their Faculties.

AGREED that:

i)   the Working Group take account of the Committee's comments;

ii) the Associate Deans (Education) discuss the proposal for Student Advocates in their Faculties for further consideration in the Working Group.

17.123   ANNUAL REVIEW OF HEA ACCREDITED PROVISION

Professor Hazlett presented the Annual Overview Report on HEA Accredited Provision for 2016/17, comprising an internal end-of-year report and, for information, the annual report to HEA on the ENHANCE PD&R Scheme (Paper No ASQEC/17/46).

The Committee noted that at the end of academic year 2013/14 the University's overall baseline of academic staff holding HEA recognition had been established as 43%, with a target of 75% set for the end of 2015/16. Professor Hazlett reported that as at July 2016 72% of academic staff held a category of HEA fellowship. During 2016/17 a broad range of staff across Faculties and professional services had engaged with fellowship through both the ENHANCE Scheme and the PgCHEP, and 81.5% of relevant staff now held fellowship. The University was making good progress to achieve the target of 90.5% for academic teaching staff for 2021.

The Committee noted that, benchmarked against sector data, the University would be positioned in the top 20 universities overall and the top five for the proportion of Senior Fellows.

The reported included an analysis of the proportion of academic staff by fellowship category by School. The Chair considered that there appeared to be a loose correlation between the performance of Schools in annual monitoring datasets and quality levels of staff as indicated by fellowship category.

It was noted that the University would need to implement strategies to achieve further growth and to incentivise staff, given that those who were enthusiastic about fellowship would have already engaged. Professor Fee indicated that an online tracking system for management by Heads of School would be helpful. Dr Barr drew attention to the length of time taken to complete the PgCHEP and so achieve fellowship. Professor Hazlett advised that the course had now been reconfigured to reduce its duration to one calendar year.

It was also noted that the graph at Figure 3 of the report was provided by HEA and that one percentage line was not plotted and that another appeared to have an inaccurate label. Dr Barr advised that the numbers of staff for his School (table 6) did not appear to be accurate.

AGREED that:

i)   CHERP and Faculties take forward the recommendations made in the report that:

- opportunities to celebrate, recognise and utilise the skills of our community of fellows be identified and maximised;

- continue to arrange a wide range of staff involved in the student learning experience to seek a category of fellowship, in a timely fashion, via an appropriate route;

- opportunities for SFHEAs to remain in good standing as educational leaders be maximised;

- the feasibility of providing local support for staff engaging with fellowship be considered by Faculties;

ii) Faculties/Schools liaise with Dr Floyd, CHERP, regarding any discrepancies in data.

17.124 PRIZES

The Committee received (Paper No ASQEC/17/47) which set out proposals for the establishment of two new prizes: William Bald Prize (MSc Construction Business and Leadership/MSc Infrastructure Engineering) and KPMG Internship Prize (BSc Hons Accounting (with pathways); and amendment to the value of the DSM Nutritional Prizes.

AGREED: that the new prizes and amended values be recommended for approval on behalf of Council by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education).

Duration 2 hours 35 mins

<u>20 December 2017</u>

AGF/CA/lh

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM ACADEMIC PLANNING ADVISORY GROUP, 21.11.17

i)   New Proposals to Proceed to Planning and Evaluation

September 2018 Intake

BA Hons Modern Irish (PT) (BT)
MSc Animation and VFX (FT, PT) (BT) (DL from 2019)
PgCert/PgDip/MSc Development and Co-Production of Social Care Research (evaluation of new MSc component) (PT) (JN)
PgCert/PgDip/MSc Energy Storage (FT, PT), (JN, DL)
FdSc Food and Drink Manufacture (PT) (CAFRE) (subject to UUBS agreement)
FdSc Paramedic Practice (FT) (Northern Ireland Ambulance Service Health and Social Care Trust)

September 2019 Intake

Access Diploma in Maths and Engineering / Maths and Finance (FT) (BMC)

ii)   New Locations

Access Diploma in Adult Learning at SRC: temporary relocation to Killylea Road Building, Armagh for 2017-2020
Certificate in Counselling Studies at SWC: Dungannon campus (from November 2017) (approved by Chair's Action)
Advanced Certificate in Management Practice: outcentres - Moy Park (Craigavon and Grantham premises) (from January 2018)
Advanced Diploma in Managing the Customer Contact: outcentre - ATOS IT Services UK Ltd (from 2017/18) (subject to external examiner consent and success of application to join Register of Approved Training Providers in England)

iii)   Additional January Intakes to Courses (from January 2018)

PgDip and MSc Biomedical Engineering (FT, PT) (subject to external examiner support)
MSc Data Science (FT) (subject to external examiner support [now received, December 2017])
PgCert/PgDip/MSc Real Estate (FT, PT)

iv)   New Three-Semester, Part-Time Mode (from September 2018)

FdSc Business Services Management (SWC: Dungannon, Enniskillen and Omagh campuses)

v)   <u>Changes to Title</u> (from September 2018):

PgCert/PgDip in Development and Co-Production of Social Care Research (formerly Developing Social Care Research) (subject to approval by the revalidation panel)
PgDip/MSc Civil and Infrastructure Engineering (formerly Infrastructure Engineering)
BSc Hons and MSc Sports Coaching and Performance (formerly Sports Coaching) (subject to approval by revalidation panel [confirmed December 2017])

PROGRAMME SUSPENSIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

a) PROGRAMME SUSPENSIONS AT PARTNER INSTITUTIONS

Suspended for 2017/18 intakes:

Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences

Access Diploma in Adult Learning – Community Development pathway at Southern Regional College (Newry campus) (FT/PT);
Access Diploma in Creative Media Production at South West College (Cookstown, Dungannon, Enniskillen and Omagh campuses) (FT/PT);
Access Diploma in Social Science at South West College (Omagh campus) (FT);
FdA Digital Arts and Technologies at South West College (Dungannon campus) (FT/PT).

Faculty of Computing, Engineering and the Built Environment

Access Diploma in Computing at South West College (Cookstown - FT/PT, Dungannon - FT, Enniskillen – FT/PT, and Omagh - FT campuses);
FdSc Architectural Technology at Southern Regional College (Portadown campus) (FT);
FdEng Engineering with Specialisms at South West College:
- Wind Turbine Technology (Omagh campus: PT/PT 2 year, 3 semester);
- Automotive Engineering (Omagh and Dungannon campuses: FT/PT/PT 2 year, 3 semester);
- Mechatronics (Dungannon campus: PT/PT 2 year, 3 semester);
- Manufacturing Engineering (Dungannon campus: FT/PT 2 year, 3 semester);
FdEng Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering at South Eastern Regional College (Bangor campus) (FT/PT);
FdEng Mechatronic Engineering (PT 2 year, 3 semester) at South Eastern Regional College (Lisburn campus).

Faculty of Life and Health Sciences

FdSc Holistic and Integrative Health Therapies at South West College (Enniskillen campus) (PT).

Ulster University Business School

FdSc Tourism, Hospitality and Events at South Eastern Regional College (Bangor – FT/PT), (Downpatrick – FT/PT), (Lisburn – FT);
FdSc International Hospitality Tourism Management at South West College (Enniskillen campus) (PT);
FdSc International Travel and Tourism Management at South West College (Enniskillen campus) (PT).

b) PROGRAMME WITHDRAWALS

Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences

Last intake 2015/16
Diploma in French (BT);
Undergraduate Hons Subject: French (CE);
Diploma in Spanish (CE/BT/ME);
Undergraduate Hons Subject: Spanish (CE);
BA Hons/MA Hons Applied Languages and Translation (CE).

Faculty of Computing, Engineering and the Built Environment

No intake
FdEng Mechatronic Engineering (PT) at South Eastern Regional College (Downpatrick campus).

Last intake 2014/15
FdEng Mechatronic Engineering (FT) at South Eastern Regional College (Downpatrick campus).

Last intake 2016/17
BSc Hons Clean Technology (JN);
BSc Hons Engineering Science (JN).

Last intake 2017/18
BEng Hons Computer Games Development (ME).

COURSE REVISIONS AND NEW SHORT COURSE MODULES 2017/18

Authority for approval of course revisions, except for course titles, locations and modes of attendance, and short-course modules is delegated by Senate to Faculties and Access, Digital and Distributed Learning.

The following revisions have been approved by them since 23 October 2017.

ACCESS, DIGITAL AND DISTRIBUTED LEARNING

Credit-bearing Short Courses

Certificate of Personal and Professional Development Framework
To add two current Level 4, 20 point modules to the framework: CMM125 and CMM153; to revise the title, rationale, aims and module co-ordinator of module PPD272.

ARTS, HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Course Revisions

Undergraduate Hons Subject: European Studies
To withdraw and permanently archive modules EUS304 and 503;

BSc Hons Social Work (ME, BMC, SWC)
To revise the assessment strategy in module SWK336;

LLM Commercial Law
To revise the assessment strategy in module LAW709.

COMPUTING, ENGINEERING AND THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Course Revisions

BEng Hons Architectural Engineering
To revise the learning outcomes and assessment strategy in module ENE516;

BSc Hons Civil Engineering (Geoinformatics)
BEng/MEng Hons Civil Engineering
To withdraw module CIV333 and expand CIV309 (BEng/MEng) to 30 credit points and ENE301 (BSc) to 20 credit points; to revise the assessment strategies in these modules;

BSc Hons Engineering Science
To replace module EEE570 with BME501.

LIFE AND HEALTH SCIENCES

Course Revisions

PgCert Stem Cell Biology
To remove the erroneously identified PSRB.

ULSTER UNIVERSITY BUSINESS SCHOOL

Course Revisions

FdSc Business and Enterprise at North West Regional College
To restructure the part-time mode;

FdSc Event Management at Belfast Metropolitan College
To swap semesters of modules HTM207 and HTM216;

FdSc International Travel and Tourism Management at Belfast Metropolitan College
FdSc International Hospitality Management at Belfast Metropolitan College
To revise modules HTM384 and 386 (including assessment strategies) from 2018/19;

BSc Hons Business Administration
To remove Dungannon campus of South West College as an outcentre location for teaching five modules (final cohort from January 2018);

MSc Human Resource Management
To revise the assessment strategy in module BMG803.