UNIVERSITY OF LEICESTER

ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE

**Minutes of a meeting held on
1 December 2016**

Present:

Professor J Scott (Chair)

Professor H Atkinson	Dr E Clapp
Dr R Dickinson	Mr G Green
Dr C Hewitt	Mr A Mitchell
Ms C Smith (*vice Dr F Deepwell*)	Dr G Wynn

In attendance: Dr J Dormer (for item M116), Dr J Kaduk (for item M112) and Mr A Petersen (Secretary)

Apologies for absence were received from Dr F Deepwell, Ms R Holland, Dr C Jarvis, Ms L Masterman, Dr B Norman, Ms C Taylor and Dr R Young

UNRESERVED BUSINESS

16/M108 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were made.

16/M109 **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting that had taken place on 14 October 2016.

The Committee **approved** the minutes as an accurate record.

16/M110 **MATTERS ARISING**

Arising from M95, the Committee noted that the proposal for the establishment of the 3+1 model of delivery had been amended in line with the comments from the Committee, and the Chair had taken action to approve the final draft.

Arising from M98 the Committee noted that the revisions to Senate Regulation 11 governing student discipline had been approved by Senate. The Committee noted that the amendments specified at the previous meeting had been incorporate with regard to the definition of 'members of the University' and clarification on the impact of penalties imposed for cheating upon progression and classification. Senate had also specified one further amendment, which was to include an objective measure in order to more clearly define the term 'offensive'.

Arising from M107, the Committee noted that the external examining arrangements for the teach-out phase of the Vaughan Centre for Lifelong Learning programmes had been finalised.

16/M111 **CHAIR'S REPORT**

No items were raised.

16/M112 **PLAGIARISM REPORT**

The Committee received a report and a presentation from Dr Kaduk, Department of Geography, regarding the training and information available to students for the avoidance of plagiarism.

A previous review of plagiarism training had taken place in 2014 and had identified a level of variation in practice across departments. This follow up report demonstrated that although several departments operated very good practice, there remained a range of practice. There had been developments in this period such as enhanced guidance and training materials available via the Library and LLI, however the Committee agreed that it was essential to achieve a consistent threshold for all students in this area.

The Committee discussed a number of potential mechanisms for this. These included a single online portal for students to access all plagiarism training materials and increasing the refresher training for students at key transition points. The Committee thanked Dr Kaduk for his work to date, and requested that he lead a Working Group to develop proposals for setting and delivering a more consistent threshold level of plagiarism guidance materials and training across the institution.

The Committee agreed that the Dean of Students should be a member of the Group, which should also include representation from the Library, Leicester Learning Institute, Quality Office, IT Services and the student body. The Committee requested that the Group formulate an action plan for consideration by the Committee in the Spring term.

16/M113 **CURRICULUM TRANSFORMATION**

The Committee received a verbal update from Dr Wynn on the Curriculum Transformation Project. The Committee noted that the mapping of the multiphase roll-out of Curriculum Transformation was almost complete, with a solution identified for the majority of major minor combinations impacted by the delayed implementation of standardised module weightings. Work was underway to map the assessment and appeal process in the midsummer period in light of the earlier re-sit period. All of the project sub groups had commenced their work.

The Committee received the report of the meeting of the Sub Group of the College of Science and Engineering Academic Committee that had taken place on 28 October to consider the Curriculum Transformation submissions for the Departments of Geography, Geology and Physics and Astronomy. The Committee noted that the Chair had taken action on behalf of the Committee to approve the introduction of the revised programmes for 2017/18. Communications to current offer holders explaining the changes had been drafted for circulation.

The Committee noted that there had been a number of lessons learned following the initial round of Curriculum Transformation approval. The Curriculum Transformation form would be amended to include a section for the programme team to more clearly itemise the changes proposed. There would also be an evaluation form for each programme (or set of cognate programmes), which would be used by the Programme Approval Sub Group to evaluate the extent to which submissions were meeting the

overall aims of the project, and would then be compiled into a database to allow for wider analysis. Finally, as part of the review of initial submissions the Programme Approval Sub Group would, where necessary, involve the Student Records and Timetabling teams to ensure that proposals could be accommodated within core student systems.

16/M114 **MODULE EVALUATION**

The Committee considered an updated paper regarding the operation of module evaluation across the institution. The proposal had been revised following comments received from members at and following the previous meeting.

The Committee welcomed the revised document and approved in full the principle that there should be a single, consistent process for the operation of module evaluation. The Committee considered how the new process would operate where modules were shared across programmes, departments or colleges. Although the owning department would complete the module review, the Committee noted that this would be reflected in the Annual Developmental Reviews for the programmes on which the modules featured. It would therefore be the role of the College Academic Committee to monitor actions taken in response. The Committee agreed that it would be helpful to clarify this within the document. The Committee also identified other minor technical corrections.

The Committee agreed that the paper should be amended in line with the above. The Committee agreed that the new system should be in place to review modules that operated from 2017 onwards. The Committee agreed that the paper should be circulated to College Academic Committees for comment on the operational proposals. Final proposals would then be considered by the Committee for approval and implementation.

16/M115 **TEACHING EXCELLENCE FRAMEWORK**

The Committee considered the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) metrics for the University. The Committee noted that the University had one core negative flag relating to assessment and feedback which had been particularly impacted by the 2014/15 NSS outcomes in this area. There was also a negative flag in the split metrics with relation to retention among mature, BME and disabled students. The Committee noted however that the latter flags only took account of progression from the first to second year in year and so students who had a period of suspense but then progressed were not factored in. The University's provider submission would address this issue.

The Committee also considered a draft initial version of the University's Provider Submission. This narrative contextual document allowed the University to comment upon the data both to set out the case for excellence and to demonstrate the action that the University was taking in response to any areas which had been negatively flagged.

The Committee considered the draft in detail. In particular, the Committee agreed that the institution could emphasis further the exceptional support that was in place from both academic departments and Student Welfare services for students with disabilities, learning difficulties or other complex needs. The Committee also agreed that this could be complemented by highlighting that the University's progression requirements were designed to ensure that students could only proceed where they had demonstrated the necessary skills and knowledge, rather than allow progression where a student did not have a reasonable chance of success. The Committee agreed that an explicit focus on these two factors would provide a robust response to the flags around non-continuation.

The Committee noted that the Students' Union had worked with over 100 students to finalise its contribution to the Provider Submission document.

The Working Group would continue to amend and refine the draft document ahead of submission of a final draft to the January meeting of the Academic Policy Committee. Members were invited to provide further comments on the draft, and these should be directed to the Chair and Geoff Green.

16/M116 **COLLABORATIVE MBChB PROPOSAL**

The Committee considered an initial proposal regarding the establishment of a new collaborative arrangement to deliver the clinical phases of the MBChB programme in the USA. The Committee noted that the model of collaboration proposed did not directly align with any of the individual categories of collaboration set out in the Code of Practice on the Management of Higher Education Provision with Others, and therefore under the Code it had been presented to Academic Policy Committee to consider the underlying principles, the proposed partners, and to agree the framework for the development and approval of the arrangement. As part of this the Committee considered a briefing note on the arrangement, a briefing on the proposed commercial partner and a risk assessment on Wheeling Hospital.

Under the model, students from the USA would study the pre-clinical section of the MBChB programme in residence at the University of Leicester. The clinical element of the programme would be delivered in the USA, at Wheeling Hospital in West Virginia. In addition, the substantial quality assurance and placement management of the clinical element of the programme would be undertaken by a third party private company 'Endeavour Holdings'. The University would therefore be entering into a contractual relationship with both parties.

The University would retain full control over the academic standards of the programme, and as such Endeavour Holdings would be accountable to the quality systems at the University of Leicester. Upon completion of the programme students would graduate with a University of Leicester MBChB. A submission would be made to the GMC in 2017 for this version of the programme to be accredited as a full UK medical degree.

The Committee considered the proposal in detail and explored a number of key themes with a representative of the College of Medicine, Biological Sciences and Psychology, Dr John Dormer.

The Committee noted that under the proposed franchise arrangements students would remain registered with the University of Leicester throughout their studies, and would be governed under UoL processes. UoL assessment and examining structures would be replicated at the partner hospital. The Committee explored whether staff at the partner hospital would be equipped and supported to deliver a UK style medical programme. Dr Dormer noted that the broad teaching style in US medical education aligned well with UK practice. There would be a considerable transition period early in delivery where UoL staff would train US based staff and visit regularly during the initial phases of delivery. US Clinical Block Leads would be appointed in the same structure as the UK based UoL programme, and they would receive direct support from UoL equivalents. CVs for all key academic appointments would be initially run through UoL and the appointment process would run through a collaborative Board with UoL and partner representation.

The Committee noted that although Wheeling was a Catholic affiliated hospital, there was another hospital within the Group (Beaumont) closely located to which students would have access in order to complete any elements of training unavailable at Wheeling. The Committee noted the complexity in terms of governing legislation between the teaching hospital governing under US law and the programme and students being governed by UK law. Although students would be subject to UK requirements the Committee noted that there were elements of US law which may impact upon the format and delivery of medical training, and agreed that an Equality Impact Assessment should be completed to ensure that no elements of the arrangement would contravene the requirements of UK Equalities legislation.

Outside of delivery and assessment, standard UoL processes such as fitness to practice, appeals and complaints would be in place. Although Endeavour would be in place to undertake some of the supporting and investigatory work, the formal processes would be conducted in line with existing UoL practice.

Non-academic support for students would be provided from within the Wheeling Group. The Group included Wheeling Jesuit University which was located close to Wheeling Hospital. Students would be provided with pastoral support and access to supporting resources such as Library and IT access via Wheeling University. The Committee agreed that as this was an additional body within a complex arrangement it would be helpful to expand the table of responsibilities to identify the role of Wheeling Jesuit University.

The Committee noted that students would require full records at UoL to allow for internal management and statutory reporting. The Committee noted that detailed scoping work was required to understand the student records requirements for this arrangement, what would be held by Endeavour and how information would flow to UoL.

The Committee noted that there would be a Service Level Agreement (SLA) which set out in detail all of the operational issues set out above, and generally set the structure of the operational management of the programme. The Committee agreed that this was a critical document and its development should be closely overseen within UoL. The Committee agreed that this document must also contain absolute clarity on which organisation held liability associated with the programme. The Committee noted that the full collaborative contract included clear provision in the instance that Wheeling Hospital sought to pull out of the agreement they were contractually obliged to assist the University in securing means for an alternative teach-out of the programme.

The Committee considered the proposals for the governance of Endeavour. It was noted that it would be essential to ensure a level of academic autonomy within this structure. There would be a Chief Academic Officer whose appointment would be UK based, however would not be a UoL employee. In addition, Endeavour would appoint Quality Assessors for the programme who would be independent of the Board. The Committee welcomed these assurances however agreed that there should be formal UoL representation on the Board of Endeavour.

The Committee considered the risk assessment for Wheeling Hospital. The Committee considered that there was not sufficient evidence provided of the partner's previous collaborative relationships to justify a low risk rating in this regard and agreed that this rating should be raised. Following this, the final risk rating for the proposal was high. Notwithstanding this rating, the Committee noted the extent of the mitigating factors set out above and agreed to approve the risk assessment for the partner.

16/M117 GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE FOR LEARNING TECHNOLOGIES

The Committee considered a paper which set out revised Terms of Reference and reporting lines for two groups: the Learning Technologies Advisory Group (LTAG) and the MOOC Development Group (MDG).

Under the proposals LTAG would report to the Student Experience Enhancement Group (SEEG). In order to enhance the communications around the development and adoption of new learning technologies, all College Academic Committees would include a semi-regular enhancement theme item which would be led by the LLI.

The Committee welcomed the proposals and agreed the broad governance structure. The Committee agreed however that it would be necessary to review the Terms of Reference for both SEEG and LTAG to ensure that the respective responsibilities and powers of each body were clear.

A new MOOC Development Group would be established to inform the University's strategy towards MOOCs. The Group would also consider proposals for new MOOCs and evaluate the current MOOC portfolio. The Group would make an annual report to APC on the strategic development of MOOCs and a separate report would be made to UPMG annually regarding the business development of MOOCs. The Committee welcomed the proposal in principle, however noted that the proposal indicated that College level Programme Development Groups could approve the introduction of new MOOCs. The Committee noted that these Groups may not be best placed to undertake this work and agreed that this should be reconsidered. The Committee further agreed that the terms of reference should be re-considered to more clearly articulate where responsibility lay for the respective development, approval and ownership of policy with respect to MOOCs.

16/M118 PROGRAMME APPROVAL

a)   College of Science and Engineering 'Bolt-on' model for Industrial placements

The Committee considered the response to the report of the Programme Approval Panel that had considered the College of Science and Engineering bolt on model for industrial placements. The Committee noted that this response had been compiled following detailed discussions between the College and the Career Development Service.

The Committee noted that the team had responded to all of the conditions set. The issue of the threshold that students would be required to obtain in order to undertake an industrial placement had been revised so as to not include a specific academic threshold, however the Committee noted that consideration of this issue within the College was ongoing. The Committee also noted that further enhancement of University level provision of placement support would be taken forward by the Student Development sub-group of Curriculum Transformation.

b)   MSc Human-Computer Interaction

The Committee considered the report of the Programme Approval Panel that had considered the MSc in Human-Computer Interaction on 11 November 2016.

The Panel had welcomed the development, however had made a number of requirements for amendment before the programme could be introduced. These included a reconsideration of the programme title, a clearer definition of its USP within

the market and confirmation of the sustainability of the teaching team delivering the programme. The Committee approved the report and authorised the Chair of the Approval Panel to approve the final introduction of the programme upon receipt of a satisfactory response. The Committee required however that the response should also be approved by the Chair of UPMG, and that this include specific confirmation of the sustainability of the teaching complement for the programme.

The Committee also noted that following receipt of a satisfactory response from the programme team the Chair had taken action on behalf of the Committee to approve the introduction of the MA Media and Public Relations (by distance learning) to commence in September 2016.

16/M119   **STUDENT EXPERIENCE ENHANCEMENT GROUP**

The Committee received the minutes of the meetings of the Student Experience Enhancement Group held on 10 November. The Committee noted the Terms of Reference for the Group for 2016/17, however agreed that these would require further consideration in light of M117 above.

16/M120   **REPORTS FROM COLLEGE ACADEMIC COMMITTEES**

The Committee received the minutes of the meetings of the College Academic Committees held on the following dates:

College of Medicine, Biological Sciences and Psychology, 16 November

College of Science and Engineering, 26 October

College of Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities, 8 November

Arising from the above, the Committee noted that the College of Science and Engineering Academic Committee had commenced discussions regarding the upcoming review of Senate Regulation 5. The Committee noted that the discussions underway within the College would, in due course, feed into the University level review of the Regulation, which would consider feedback from across the institution.

16/M121   **APPOINTMENT OF EXTERNAL EXAMINERS**

The Committee considered and **approved** the appointment of the following external examiners:

College of Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities

School of Arts

Dr Mike Allen, Birkbeck, University of London
Period of Office: October 2016 to September 2020
Programme(s):   BA Film Studies and Visual Arts, BA Film Studies and English,
                                 BA Film and Media Studies

Dr Marie-Noelle Guillot, University of East Anglia
Period of Office: October 2016 to November 2020
Programme(s):   MA Translation Studies

The Committee considered the following nomination:

School of Business

Mr Patrick Baughan, City University London
Period of Office: September 2016 to November 2011
Programme(s):   MSc Human Resource Management and Training

The Committee noted that the nomination did not include a detailed rationale for the appointment, and that the nominee's recent academic history appeared to be outside of the subject area in which they would be examining. The Committee requested that the School provide a supporting rationale to demonstrate why the nominee would be an appropriate external examiner for this programme.

The Committee noted that Chair's action had been taken to approve the following external examiner appointments:

College of Science and Engineering

Department of Engineering

Professor Gary Critchlow, Loughborough University
Period of Office: September 2016 to September 2020
Programme(s):   IMPaCT CDT Exit awards

Department of Informatics

Professor Peter Wood, Birkbeck University of London

Period of Office: September 2016 to November 2020

Programme(s):   MSc Advanced Computational Methods, MSc Advanced Computer Science, MSc Advanced Distributed Systems, MSc Advanced Software Engineering, MSc Cloud Computing, MSc Agile Software Engineering Techniques, MSc Software Engineering for Financial Services, MSc Web Applications and Services (including with industry variants)

College of Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities

School of Education

Ms Clair Jenkins, University of Wolverhampton
Period of Office: September 2016 to November 2020
Programme(s):   PGCE Primary

School of Media, Communication and Sociology

Professor Nathaniel Tkacz, University of Warwick
Period of Office: September 2016 to November 2020
Programme(s):   MA New Media and Society

DURATION OF MEETING: Two Hours and Twenty Minutes