PRESENT:
Dr Sarah Gilroy (Chair); Dr Stephen Baysted; Ms Gill Butler; Dr Andy Dixon; Dr Steve Ellis; Dr Hugo Frey; Mr Mark Mason; Mr David Peaty

APOLOGIES:
Dr Pete Bunyan; Dr Sue Churchill; Miss Celica Douglas; Dr Jill Hayes; Ms Anna O’Neill; Mr Ian Worden

IN ATTENDANCE:
Mrs Margaret Guise; Ms Su Longden

1 The Chair welcomed participants to the meeting, particularly Ms Su Longden, Director of Admissions and Academic Registry

2 Minutes of Previous Meeting held on 8 February 2012
The confirmed minutes of the previous meeting held on 8 February 2012 were noted. The following matters arising were noted:-

2.1 Matters Arising

2.1.1 Item 2.2.3: Accreditation by the General Social Care Council
The Committee received, for information, the letter of 13 February 2012 to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) from the General Social Care Council and noted that the low-risk status of the University of Chichester’s Social Work degree programmes (as indicated within the Annual Monitoring Declaration for 2010-2011) had been confirmed.

2.1.2 Item 10.1: Edexcel Institutional Review Report 2010-2011
The Committee noted that the Institutional Review Report, and full supporting documentation, had been forwarded to the Edexcel University Chief Examiner on 1 March 2012.

The Committee noted that a revised version of the Review and Action Plan had been forwarded to Academic Board for consideration at the meeting held on 14 March 2012.

3 Academic Standards Committee Scrutiny Group
The following minutes of the meetings of the Academic Standards Committee Scrutiny Group were noted:-

3.1 The confirmed minutes of the meeting held on 27 January 2012.

3.1 The confirmed minutes of the meeting held on 17 February 2012.
4 Academic Standards Committee Internationalisation Sub-Group
The following minutes of the meeting of the Academic Standards Committee Internationalisation Sub-Group were noted:

4.1 The confirmed minutes of the meeting held on 30 January 2012.

5 QAA

5.1 Institutional Review at the University of Chichester
The Committee received the letter of key findings, dated 13 March 2012 and addressed to the Vice-Chancellor, together with a summary of key dates in relation to follow-up actions, and discussed issues arising. The Chair explained that, under the new methodology, a judgement would be made concerning the publication of key information for Reviews conducted during the following year; since the Review at Chichester had been conducted early, however, there would be no judgement in that area, although it was expected that some reference would be made to it within the draft report, which would arrive during the week commencing 16 April 2012. Similarly, there would be no judgement given in relation to the Review theme – the first-year student experience – but it had been noted that the pre-induction work with students had been cited within the list of good practice. The Committee was pleased to note also the citation of good practice in relation to the MPhil probationer scheme, and the support for individual postgraduate research students 'within the context of an effective research environment’. It was agreed that these were helpful points given that the University was preparing to apply for research degree-awarding powers.

The Committee noted the recommendation that Section E of the Quality Handbook (covering the institutional approval of potential collaborative partnerships) should be revisited before any further institutional approvals were undertaken. The Chair explained that the implications of the recommendation would become clearer once the draft report had been received; in the meantime, however, it was apparent that the University should not proceed further with the intended institutional approval of Auston Institute in Singapore until these matters had been clarified.

It was agreed that the Committee should appoint a Sub-Group to take forward the recommendations of the draft report (as well as those arising from the report produced by the External Consultant), and that the following would be members: the Chair of the Committee; the Deputy Dean (MM); the recently appointed Director of Quality and Standards; the President of the Students’ Union; the Senior Lecturer in Music. It was agreed that the Head of History would act as alternate to the Senior Lecturer in Music, should attendance at a Sub-Group meeting prove problematic for the latter.
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5.2 Code of Practice Section 3 – Disabled Students
The Committee received the final version of the above Code of Practice, published 2010, and a paper mapping University of Chichester policy and practice against its recommendations, and discussed issues arising. It was noted that the mapping document had been considered at the meeting of the Academic Standards Committee Scrutiny Group held on 16 March 2012 and had been recommended for forwarding to the Academic Standards Committee.

The Chair explained that the Committee had received the draft version of this Code of Practice at the meeting held on 10 February 2010, accompanied by a paper from the former Director of Student and Academic Services. The intention had been that a revised mapping document would be returned for the Committee’s consideration but this had been delayed due to staffing
changes. It was explained that the mapping paper was a ‘live’ document which could be revised as necessary to ensure that University practice resonated fully with the requirements of the Code of Practice; when appropriate, it would be the responsibility of the Committee to commission responses from the relevant departments to ensure that this alignment was maintained. The Committee approved the mapping document.

5.3 Code of Practice Section 8 – Career Education, Information, Advice and Guidance

The Committee received the final version of the above Code of Practice, published 2010, and a paper mapping University of Chichester policy and practice against its recommendations, and discussed issues arising. It was noted that the mapping document had been considered at the meeting of the Academic Standards Committee Scrutiny Group held on 16 March 2012 and had been recommended for forwarding to the Academic Standards Committee.

The Chair pointed out that a new Head of Careers and Employability would be taking up post during the next month and that she would forward the mapping document to the new appointee to ensure that all areas for action had been identified. The new Head of Careers and Employability would, when appropriate, be invited to attend a meeting of the Committee to speak to a revised mapping document.
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5.4 UK Quality Code for Higher Education: Chapter B11, Research Degrees – Draft for Consultation

The Committee received, for information, the draft chapter, and the response formulated on behalf of the University by the Director of Research. It was noted that the final version of the chapter would be published by the end of June 2012. It was confirmed that the response had been forwarded to the QAA by the required deadline and that the QAA had confirmed receipt.

5.5 QAA News

The following items of QAA news were noted:

5.5.1 Quality Update International: January 2012
It was noted that the latest issue of Quality Update International had been published and covered a selection of Higher Education and quality assurance news from around the world. It was noted that more information was available to view at:
www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Documents/QUI-Jan-12.aspx

5.5.2 Talking about quality: the impact of quality assurance
It was noted that, in the second paper of this new series, Emeritus Professor John Brennan reflected on the impact and uses of quality assurance. Professor Brennan discussed the reality of today’s Higher Education world, focusing on the responsibility institutions and providers have for their own quality and standards. It was noted that more information was available at:

5.5.3 Research on the student experience aims to strengthen the student voice
It was noted that QAA had published the first two of four mini-reports into the student experience: the first on teaching and learning, and the second on independent learning and contact hours. The QAA had commissioned the research as part of an ongoing twelve-month
project with the National Union of Students. It was noted that more information was available to view at:
www.qaa.ac.uk/Newsroom/PressReleases/Pages/Teaching-and-learning-What-students-are-saying.aspx
and
www.qaa.ac.uk/WorkWithUs/Pages/ReviewerAppointments.aspx

5.5.4 Help with safeguarding the standards of education for early years
It was noted that the QAA was looking for new reviewers, particularly those with experience in early years provision and who demonstrate a passion for early years education, to join teams in reviewing Early Years Professional Status programmes. Full details were available at:
www.qaa.ac.uk/WorkWithUs/Pages/ReviewerAppointments.aspx

5.5.5 UK Quality Code: Progress Update
The Committee received and noted the Progress Update as published on the QAA website on 29 March 2012, in relation to the development of new elements of the Quality Code.

5.5.6 Circular Letter 04/12: Consultation on Draft Guidance for UK Higher Education Providers on Enterprise and Entrepreneurship Education
The Committee received and noted the Circular Letter and Draft Guidance, and noted that confirmation had been received from the University’s Strategic Development Manager that the advice was consistent with existing University practice and that a response would be forwarded to the QAA by the required deadline.

6 HEFCE
6.1 It was noted that there were no issues to discuss in relation to HEFCE.

7 OfSTED
7.1 It was noted that there were no issues to discuss in relation to OfSTED.

8 Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIAHE)
8.1 The Committee received a progress report prepared by the former Head of the Academic Quality and Standards Unit, and discussed issues arising. The Chair explained that the OIAHE was expediting complaints raised by students on professional programmes, due to the potentially adverse impact of delay (for example, in relation to suspension from the programme).

8.2 The Committee received and noted the responses forwarded to the OIAHE by 13 March 2012 by the former Head of the Academic Quality and Standards Unit in relation to the annual return for the number of completion of procedures letters issued. It was noted that the three complaints which had been forwarded to the OIAHE during 2011 had related to service or contractual issues pertaining to the programme, teaching provision, facilities or supervision.

9 Academic Registrars’ Council
9.1 Quality Practitioners’ Group Meeting 28 February 2012
The Committee received, for reference and information, from the Interim Lead of the Academic Quality and Standards Unit, the agenda and presentations relating to the above meeting.
10 Accreditation of International Short Programmes with the British Council

10.1 The Committee received and noted the Annual Declaration 2011-2012 which had been forwarded by the Director of the International Short Programmes Unit to the British Council by the required deadline of 15 February 2012.

10.2 The Committee noted that the Director of the International Short Programmes Unit had responded, by the published deadline, to a survey of key stakeholders conducted on behalf of the British Council by Ipsos Mori.

11 University of Chichester's Quality Assurance and Enhancement Procedures

11.1 Programme Review / Re-approval / Approval

11.1.1 External Adviser Nominations
The Committee received and discussed the following External Adviser nominations:

11.1.1.1 Mr Bill Beynon, Trinity St David, University of Wales, for the Approval of a BA (Hons) Adventure Education and Management (in partnership with the Auston Institute of Management, Singapore). It was noted that the nomination had been considered at a meeting of the Academic Standards Committee Scrutiny Group on 16 March 2012 and had been recommended for forwarding to the Academic Standards Committee. Committee members noted that the nominee had professional contact with the University's Head of Adventure Education and queried whether this raised an issue of reciprocity. It was explained that this issue had been discussed at the meeting of the Academic Standards Committee Scrutiny Group and it had been agreed that, given the small pool of potential nominees for this field, taken with the fact that the nominee would be acting in an advisory capacity only (ie that there was a distinction to be drawn between the roles of an External Adviser and an External Examiner), that the nomination could be recommended for approval. On this understanding, the Committee approved the nomination of Mr Beynon.

11.1.1.2 Mrs Penny Borkett, Sheffield Hallam University, for the Review (with option to move to Re-approval) of the Foundation Degree in Early Childhood. It was noted that the nomination had been considered at a meeting of the Academic Standards Committee Scrutiny Group on 17 February 2012 and had been recommended for forwarding to the Academic Standards Committee. Committee members queried whether the nominee could be considered also as External Adviser for the Level 6 programme to be offered at Auston Institute in Singapore and it was agreed that there would be no barrier in this respect, should the programme team wish to take this further. The Committee approved the nomination of Mrs Borkett for the Review (with option to move to Re-approval) of the Foundation Degree in Early Childhood.

11.1.1.3 Mr Anthony Castro, Trinity Laban (Music Faculty) for the Approval of an MA Musical Theatre. It was noted that the nomination had been considered at a meeting of the Academic Standards Committee Scrutiny Group held on 17 February 2012 and had been recommended for forwarding...
to the Academic Standards Committee. The Committee approved the nomination of Mr Castro.

11.1.1.4 Mrs Sue Davis, University of Leicester, for the Periodic Review (with option to move to Re-approval) of the BA (Hons) Primary Education and Teaching and PGCE Primary programmes. It was noted that the nomination had been considered at a meeting of the Academic Standards Committee Scrutiny Group held on 17 February 2012 and had been recommended for forwarding to the Academic Standards Committee. The Committee approved the nomination of Mrs Davis.

11.1.1.5 Mr Carleton Edwards, Independent Consultant and Practice Assessor, for the Periodic Review of the Graduate Diploma in Professional Studies. It was noted that the nomination had been considered at a meeting of the Academic Standards Committee Scrutiny Group held on 17 February 2012 and had been recommended for forwarding to the Academic Standards Committee. The Committee approved the nomination of Mr Edwards.

11.1.1.6 Mrs Hannah French, Royal Academy of Music, for the Approval of a BMus (Hons) Instrumental Teaching and a BMus (Hons) Vocal Teaching. It was noted that the nomination had been considered at a meeting of the Academic Standards Committee Scrutiny Group held on 17 February 2012 and had been recommended for forwarding to the Academic Standards Committee. The Committee approved the nomination of Mrs French.

11.1.1.7 Professor Mike Hughes, Emeritus Professor, University of Wales in Cardiff, for the Approval of an MSc Sports Performance Analysis. It was noted that the nomination had been considered at a meeting of the Academic Standards Committee Scrutiny Group held on 16 March 2012 and had been recommended for forwarding to the Academic Standards Committee. The Committee approved the nomination of Professor Hughes.

11.1.1.8 Mr Kevin Murphy, Workforce Development Manager, Brighton and Hove City Council, for the Periodic Review of the MA Leadership and Management / Postgraduate Diploma in Strategic Leadership. It was noted that the nomination had been considered at a meeting of the Academic Standards Committee Scrutiny Group held on 17 February 2012 and had been recommended for forwarding to the Academic Standards Committee. It was pointed out that the nominee was a major client for the SEMAL department but confirmation was received that this had been discussed at the meeting of the Academic Standards Committee Scrutiny Group, and it had been agreed that the nomination could be accepted for the External Adviser role, on the basis that it was for a Periodic Review (rather than Approval or Re-approval) and that the nominee would not be considered for an External Examinership for this programme. On this understanding, the Committee approved the nomination of Mr Murphy.
11.1.1.9 **Mr Russell Williams**, University of Aberdeen, for the Approval of an MSc International Business. It was noted that the nomination had been considered at a meeting of the Academic Standards Committee Scrutiny Group held on 17 February 2012 and had been recommended for forwarding to the Academic Standards Committee. The Committee noted that the nominee had known a member of the subject team professionally a few years previously but it was agreed that this need not be a barrier to appointment, since the member of staff concerned was not the Programme Co-ordinator for this programme. The Committee approved the nomination of Mr Williams.

11.2 **Minor Changes to Programmes**

11.2.1 The Committee received and noted the outcomes of the following proposals for Minor Change and, where appropriate, made recommendations for approval to Academic Board:-

11.2.1.1 **Graduate Diploma in Professional Studies**
The proposal for Minor Change had been discussed at the meeting of the Academic Standards Committee Scrutiny Group held on 9 December 2011. The Team wished to amend the assessment for SWK341, Practice Portfolio. The Panel had recommended that the changes be approved subject to four conditions: that the Team revisit the aims to ensure greater resonance with the language of FHEQ Level 6 (for instance by the usage of ‘criticality’); that the Team include the Portfolio under the summative assessment section, indicating that even though it had no weighting it must still be passed (it should also be indicated that the 2000-word evaluative commentary was weighted at 100% of the summative assessment); that the Team re-align the first bullet-point under the learning outcomes; that the Team ascertain whether the programme specification required updating in the light of the Minor Change and, if so, send a revised version electronically to the Academic Quality and Standards Unit. These conditions had been met by the provision of revised documentation to the Academic Quality and Standards Unit by 16 December 2011 and this had been forwarded to the Panel for Review. Confirmation had been received from the Chair of the Panel, on 13 January 2012, that the conditions set at the meeting had been met. The proposal for Minor Change was recommended for approval to Academic Board.

11.2.1.2 **BSc (Hons) Sports Therapy**
The proposal for Minor Change had been discussed at the meeting of the Academic Standards Committee Scrutiny Group held on 9 December 2011. The Team wished to amend the assessment for STL207, Sports Injury Management 2, and to amend the assessment for STL303, Therapeutic and Clinical Electrotherapy. The Panel had recommended that the changes be approved subject to six conditions: that the Team ascertain whether the programme specification needed updating in the light of the Minor Change and, if so, send a revised version electronically to the Academic Quality and Standards Unit; that, for STL207, the Team should amend the 30-minute
practical examination from 1875 words to 1900 words; that, for STL207, the Team should ensure that the module descriptor was labelled as Level 5 and that the ‘Faculty of Sport, Education and Social Sciences’ was removed from the headings; that, for STL303, the Team should ensure that the module descriptor was labelled as Level 6 and the ‘Faculty of Sport, Education and Social Sciences’ was removed from the headings; that, for STL303, the Team should adapt the literature review within the assessment criteria to include a demonstration of current literature instead; that, for STL303, the Team should ensure that all typographical errors were corrected (eg ‘equipe’ within the aims) and that the formatting of boxes was consistent. These conditions had been met by the provision of revised documentation to the Academic Quality and Standards Unit by 16 December 2011 and this had been forwarded to the Panel for Review. Confirmation had been received from the Chair of the Panel, on 13 January 2012, that the conditions set at the meeting had been met. The proposal for Minor Change was recommended for approval to Academic Board.

11.2.1.3 Foundation Degree in Teaching and Learning Support
The proposal for Minor Change had been discussed at the meeting of the Academic Standards Committee Scrutiny Group held on 9 December 2011. The Team wished to amend existing TSL201, Ensuring Every Child Matters, replacing it with TSL201, Children, Young People, Education and Society. The Panel had recommended that the changes be approved subject to five conditions: that the Team should update the programme specification in light of the Minor Change and should forward the revised version to the Academic Quality and Standards Unit; that the Team should ensure that the assessment schedule included within the Student Programme Handbook was updated to reflect current FHEQ levels; that the Team should ensure that, for Assignment 2, the assessment length was clarified as 5000 words; that the Team should check whether successful completion of Level 4 was an entry requirement and either remove this from the module descriptor, or provide further clarification if needed; that the Team should remove ‘School of Teacher Education’ from the module descriptor. These conditions had been met by the provision of revised documentation to the Academic Quality and Standards Unit by 16 December 2011 and this had been forwarded to the Panel for Review. Confirmation had been received from the Chair of the Panel, on 13 January 2012, that the conditions set at the meeting had been met. The proposal for Minor Change was recommended for approval to Academic Board.

11.2.1.4 BSc (Hons) Sports Coaching Science / BSc (Hons) Sport and Exercise Science / BSc (Hons) Sport and Exercise Psychology
The proposal for Minor Change had been discussed at the meeting of the Academic Standards Committee Scrutiny Group held on 9 December 2011. The Team wished to amend the assessment for SPL111, Acquisition and Performance of Sports Skills. The Panel had recommended that the changes be approved subject to three conditions: that the Team ascertain whether the programme specification required updating in the light of the Minor
Change and, if so, send a revised version electronically to the Academic Quality and Standards Unit; that the Team revisit the learning outcomes and assessment criteria to ensure greater resonance with FHEQ Level 4 language (ie inclusion of ‘critical’ and ‘apply’); that the Team should correct the formatting of the module descriptor, specifically the tutor box and the numbering of the learning outcomes. These conditions had been met by the provision of revised documentation to the Academic Quality and Standards Unit by 16 December 2011 and this had been forwarded to the Panel for Review. Confirmation had been received from the Chair of the Panel, on 13 January 2012, that the conditions set at the meeting had been met. The proposal for Minor Change was recommended for approval to Academic Board.

11.2.1.5 BA (Hons) Primary Education and Teaching / BA (Hons) Mathematics and Teaching for Key Stages 2/3
The proposal for Minor Change had been discussed at the meeting of the Academic Standards Committee Scrutiny Group held on 9 December 2011. The Team wished to: revise the content and assessment of PTM201, Probability and Statistical Literacy; to replace PTM102, Teaching and Learning Mathematics with ICT with a new module, Reading and Writing Mathematics. The Panel had recommended that the changes be approved subject to ten conditions: that the Team check the programme specifications in light of the Minor Changes to update these where necessary and to send revised versions electronically to the Academic Quality and Standards Unit; that the Team should ensure that the confirmed Programme Board minutes from 1 November 2011, which included reference to PTM102, were sent electronically to the Academic Quality and Standards Unit; that the Team should ensure that the assessment schedule within the Student Programme Handbook for BA (Hons) Primary Education and Teaching was updated to reflect current FHEQ levels; that the Team should ensure that, for PTM201, under Assessment Criteria, the wording ‘sensible interpretation’ was amended to ‘sensible and appropriate interpretation’ that the Team should ensure that, for PTM201, under the Portfolio section, the word ‘criticism’ was replaced with ‘critical analysis’; that the Team should ensure that, for PTM201, there were separate assessment criteria for the Portfolio and examination; that, the Team should ensure, for PTM201, that checks would be undertaken as to whether entry was dependent upon successful completion of Level 4 of the programme or equivalent, and should either remove or clarify this wording within the entry requirements section; that the Team should ensure that, for PTM102, the Research Journal was listed as 1250-word equivalence; that the Team should ensure, for PTM102, that formative and summative assessments were clearly indicated and distinguished. These conditions had been met by the provision of revised documentation to the Academic Quality and Standards Unit by 16 December 2011 and this had been forwarded to the Panel for Review. Confirmation had been received from the Chair of the Panel, on 13 January 2012, that the conditions set at the meeting had been met. The proposal for Minor Change was recommended for approval to Academic Board.
11.2.1.6 Foundation Degree / BA (Hons) Adventure Education

The proposal for Minor Change had been discussed at the meeting of the Academic Standards Committee Scrutiny Group held on 9 December 2011. The Team wished to amend the assessment for the Level 5 module *Adventure Sports Videography* and to amend the assessment for the Level 6 module, *Adventure Videography*. The Panel had recommended that the changes be approved subject to seven conditions: that the Team should check the programme specifications in light of the Minor Changes, update these where necessary and send the revised versions electronically to the Academic Quality and Standards Unit; that, for FDAE205, the Team should consider inclusion of assessment criteria in the formative assessment section, given the nature of the assessment; that, for FDAE205, the Team should remove 'not more than' from the text regarding the written report in the summative assessment section; that, for AEL306, the Team should revisit the assessment criteria in order to ensure greater resonance with FHEQ Level 6 language (e.g., inclusion of 'decision-making'); that, for AEL306, the Team should consider the inclusion of assessment criteria in the formative assessment section given the nature of the assessment; that, for AEL306, the Team should utilize bullet points within the assessment criteria section; that, for AEL306, the Team should remove the entry requirements from the module descriptor. These conditions had been met by the provision of revised documentation to the Academic Quality and Standards Unit by 16 December 2011 and this had been forwarded to the Panel for Review. Confirmation had been received from the Chair of the Panel, on 13 January 2012, that the conditions set at the meeting had been met. The proposal for Minor Change was recommended for approval to Academic Board.

11.2.1.7 BA (Hons) Theology and Religion

The proposal for Minor Change had been discussed at the meeting of the Academic Standards Committee Scrutiny Group held on 9 December 2011. The Team wished to change Level 4 module, *Religion and the Modern World* to *Introduction to Religious Studies*; to introduce a new Level 5 module, *Religion and Schools*, to introduce a new Level 5 double module, *Work Placement*; to change the Level 5 module *Issues in Christian Ethics* to *Theology, Ethics and Society*; to change the Level 6 module *Buddhism and Sikhism to Buddhism*. The Panel had recommended that the changes be approved subject to nine conditions: that the Team should check the programme specification in light of the Minor Changes, update where necessary and forward a revised version electronically to the Academic Quality and Standards Unit; that, for *Introduction to Religious Studies*, the Team should consider how the learning outcomes could be reflected in greater detail in the assessment criteria; that, for *Introduction to Religious Studies*, the Team should correct the formatting of the learning outcomes; that, for *Religion and Schools*, the Team should revisit the assessment criteria to ensure that there was greater resonance with FHEQ Level 5 language and that there was an explanation of how 'reflection on one's personal views' was assessed'; that, for *Work Placement*, the Team should revisit the assessment
criteria to ensure that there was a greater resonance with FHEQ Level 5 language, especially with regard to the fifth criterion; that, for Work Placement, the Team should ensure that the total wordage for the summative assessment was 7000 words; that, for Work Placement, the Team should ensure that a new module code was arranged; that, for Buddhism, the Team should revisit the assessment criteria to ensure that there was greater resonance with FHEQ Level 6 language (ie ‘criticality’); that, for Buddhism, the Team should ensure that information on the provision of feedback for formative assessment was included, that, for Buddhism, the Team should tidy the page placement of the summative assessment section. These conditions had been met by the provision of revised documentation to the Academic Quality and Standards Unit by 20 January 2012 and this had been forwarded to the Panel for Review. Confirmation had been received from the Chair of the Panel, on 2 February 2012, that the conditions set at the meeting had been met. The proposal for Minor Change was recommended for approval to Academic Board.

11.2.1.8 SEMAL Programmes

The proposal for Minor Change had been discussed at the meeting of the Academic Standards Committee Scrutiny Group held on 9 December 2011. The Team wished to: combine the Level 5 module Financial Decision-Making with Management Accounting for Control to create a new module, Management Accounting; to replace Level 5 module, Audit and Taxation, with a new module, Financial Management; to revise the name of the Level 6 module, Financial Management to Advanced Financial Accounting; to introduce an option module for Level 5 BA (Hons) Accounting and Finance in Semester 2; to revised Level 6 module, Corporate Finance; to revise Level 4 module, Business in Action. The Panel had recommended that the changes be approved subject to twenty conditions: that the Team should check the programme specifications in light of the Minor Changes, update these where necessary and send revised versions electronically to the Academic Quality and Standards Unit; that, for Management Accounting for Control, the Team should ensure that ‘Level 2’ was replaced with ‘Level 5’ within the summative assessment section; that, for Financial Management, the Team should revisit the assessment criteria for the essay and examination in order to ensure greater resonance with FHEQ Level 5 language; that the Team should correct all typographical errors; that the Team should remove reference to Level 2 in the heading; that the Team should remove the word ‘invigilated’ from the description of the examination; that, for Advanced Financial Accounting, the Team should remove reference to Level 2 in the heading; that the Team should include an indicative reading list; that the Team should ensure that there is a description of the case study mentioned in the summative assessment section; that, for Corporate Finance, the Team should revisit the assessment criteria for the coursework in order to ensure greater resonance with FHEQ Level 6 language; that the Team should amend the entry requirements to include Business Decision-Making (instead of Accounting Skills); that the Team should amend the word equivalents in the summative assessment section so that the
total was 3500 words; that the Team should amend the wording of the case study assessment, replacing ‘may satisfy (the learning outcomes)’ and reduce reference to ‘examination’; that the Team should remove reference to Level 3 in the heading; that the Team should ensure consistent size of font throughout the module descriptor; that, for Business in Action, the Team should ensure a learning strategy section was included in the module descriptor; that the Team should include, under the assessment criteria, that a clear and logical structure is ‘defined as’; that the Team should ensure that word equivalents were included in the summative assessment section; that the Team should revisit the wording of the assessment criteria to include further information and clarification for students; that the Team should consider inclusion of web materials and introductory texts within the indicative reading section. These conditions had been met by the provision of revised documentation to the Academic Quality and Standards Unit by 16 December 2011 and this had been forwarded to the Panel for Review. Confirmation had been received from the Chair of the Panel, on 2 February 2012, that the conditions set at the meeting had been met. The proposal for Minor Change was recommended for approval to Academic Board.

11.2.1.9 BA (Hons) History
The proposal for Minor Change had been discussed at the meeting of the Academic Standards Committee Scrutiny Group held on 9 December 2011. The Team wished to introduce a new Level 4 module, Africa and the African Diaspora. The Panel had recommended that the changes be approved subject to four conditions: that the Team check the programme specification in light of the Minor Changes, update where necessary and forward a revised version electronically to the Academic Quality and Standards Unit; that the Team re-arrange the wording in the formative assessment section to read ‘750-word essay (30%) based on oral presentation’; that the Team correct the bullet-pointing within the section on assessment criteria; that the Team remove ‘BAH’ from the heading. These conditions had been met by the provision of revised documentation to the Academic Quality and Standards Unit by 16 December 2011 and this had been forwarded to the Panel for Review. Confirmation had been received from the Chair of the Panel, on 2 February 2012, that the conditions set at the meeting had been met. The proposal for Minor Change was recommended for approval to Academic Board.

11.2.1.10 HNC/D Mechanical Engineering (in partnership with the Isle of Wight College)
The proposal for Minor Change had been discussed at the meeting of the Academic Standards Committee Scrutiny Group held on 27 January 2012. The Team wished to replace four existing modules (Strength of Materials; Engineering Thermodynamics; Advanced CAD Techniques; Energy Management) with four new modules (Quality and Business Improvement; Engineering Work-Based Project; Business Improvement Techniques; Personal and Professional Development). The Panel had recommended that the changes be approved subject to two conditions: that
the Team should make amendments to the module descriptors as recommended by the Panel and submit revised versions to the Academic Quality and Standards Unit; that the Team should ensure that a revised programme specification was submitted to the Academic Quality and Standards Unit by the required deadline. These conditions had been met by the provision of revised documentation to the Academic Quality and Standards Unit by 31 January 2012 and this had been forwarded to the Panel for Review. Confirmation had been received from the Chair of the Panel, on 16 February 2012, that the conditions set at the meeting had been met. The proposal for Minor Change was recommended for approval to Academic Board. 
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11.3 Annual Monitoring of Departments 2010-2011

11.3.1 Action Plans
The Committee received, discussed and approved the completed Action Plans arising from the Annual Monitoring of academic departments within the Faculty. It was noted that the Action Plans had been considered and approved by the Academic Standards Committee Scrutiny Group at the meeting held on 27 January 2012 for forwarding to the Academic Standards Committee. It was explained that the Annual Monitoring of the Department of English, and of the Postgraduate Certificate in Learning and Teaching in Higher Education would be taking place during Semester 2 of the current academic year. The following points were discussed:

11.3.1.1 Distance Learning
Committee members raised the issue of distance learning, noting that cross-programme themes had emerged in this regard: for instance, in relation to access to video-conferencing and Moodle, and the experience of part-time students who were undertaking study at a distance. The Chair confirmed that it was important that all students were ensured comparability of experience, and that distance learning might be an area which the University would wish to explore further in the future.

The Action Plans were approved and it was agreed that cross-University issues would be taken forward by the Deputy Deans.
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11.4 Review of Annual Monitoring Procedures
The Committee received the most recent version (published December 2011) of Section C – Annual Monitoring – of the Quality Handbook. It was noted that amendments to the flow-chart on pages C10-C11 had been recommended at the meeting of the Academic Standards Committee held on 8 February 2012 and that these would be effected as part of the overall review of the new Annual Monitoring procedures. It was agreed that the Sub-Group, as appointed to review the draft report arising from the QAA Institutional Review, would undertake, also, the review of the Annual Monitoring procedures, including the effecting of amendments as required to Section C of the Quality Handbook.
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11.5 Programme Approval 2011-2012

11.5.1 Institutional Approval of Auston Institute, Singapore
The Committee received due diligence documentation and a draft Memorandum of Agreement in relation to the above Institutional Approval, and discussed issues arising. It was noted that the due diligence documentation had previously been reviewed at two meetings of the Academic Standards Committee Internationalisation Sub-Group held on 4 November 2011 and 30 January 2012. The following issues were discussed:

11.5.1.1 Due Diligence Document: Section 1.17, page 5
In response to queries from the Committee, it was confirmed that the Auston Institute had worked with Coventry University since 2000, and that this partnership was continuing. The Deputy Dean (GB) had direct communication with colleagues at Coventry University and had received assurances concerning the satisfactory nature of the partnership.

11.5.1.2 Due Diligence Document: Section 1.23, page 7
It was confirmed that, although the EduTrust report was not attached to the document under review, it had been submitted as part of the evidence base available for scrutiny at the meetings of the Academic Standards Committee Internationalisation Sub-Group.

11.5.1.3 Due Diligence Document: Section 2.3, page 8
In response to queries from the Committee, it was confirmed that photographs of the new campus (which would provide teaching rooms for Chichester students) had been forwarded to the University, but that a further site visit would need to be undertaken to ascertain the suitability of the new premises.

11.5.1.4 Due Diligence Document: Section 2.4, page 8
Committee members queried the response to the question concerning the adequacy of student support services – ie that the latter were appropriate and sufficient ‘within the cultural context’. It was explained that there was not currently a culture of support for students with disabilities in Singapore: young disabled people were not encouraged to fulfil their potential as was the case within the United Kingdom. They therefore tended not to be able to access Higher Education. It was hoped, however, that the intended approval and delivery of the Level 6 Progression to Honours for Early Years would be able to play a part in changing that culture, by opening up a debate about disability.

11.5.1.5 Due Diligence Document: Section 3.8, page 10
In response to questions from the Committee concerning the number of Boards of Examiners to be held, and how this correlated with the visits to be undertaken by the External Examiner to Auston Institute, it was confirmed that Boards of Examiners would be held, as indicated, three times a year and, where necessary, these would be conducted by video-link. The External Examiner would, however, be expected to visit Auston Institute at least once a year, to meet with students and staff. It was agreed that this point should be more clearly articulated within the document.

GB
11.5.1.6 Due Diligence Document: Section 3.14, page 11
It was agreed that the typographical error in the response for this section should be corrected.

GB

11.5.1.7 Due Diligence Document: Section 3.16, pages 11-12
The Committee averred that the response given did not answer the questions satisfactorily and it was agreed that the response should be amended accordingly.

GB

11.5.1.8 Due Diligence Document: Section 3.21, page 12
Committee members queried whether all the methods of interface between Chichester and Auston Institute would prove effective. It was agreed that the response should make it clear that the methods cited would be supplemented by personal visits by University staff.

GB

11.5.1.9 Memorandum of Agreement
It was agreed that the draft Memorandum of Agreement would require revision, specifically to ensure resonance with the QAA’s UK Quality Code. This task was remitted to the newly appointed Director of Quality and Standards.

KA

The Chair pointed out that it would be necessary to report to Academic Board that the Institutional Approval process in relation to Auston Institute would not be progressed, until the outcome of the QAA Institutional Review (and anticipated recommendations concerning the need to review Section E of the Quality Handbook prior to the endorsement of further collaborative arrangements) was known. The Chair and the Deputy Dean (GB) would discuss this issue further, specifically in relation to liaison with the intended partner institution.

SG / GB

12 HEAR Project

12.1 The Committee received, from the Director of Admissions and Academic Registry, a progress report on the HEAR (Higher Education Achievement Report) project and discussed issues arising. It was explained that, whereas it had initially been thought that introduction of the HEAR would be mandatory for all Higher Education institutions, this was now no longer the case. Nevertheless, the University of Chichester had decided to take the project forward as good practice, and had been supported in that process by the establishment of a project board, which was co-led by the Deputy Dean (MM) and the Director of Admissions and Academic Registry. The Students’ Union had also been involved and there had been good cross-stakeholder representation in the project.

It was hoped that the electronic HEAR would be introduced for new undergraduates starting in 2013-2014 but, as an interim measure, it was hoped that electronic transcripts would be introduced from 2012-2013. There was an intention to make the HEAR available to students on collaborative programmes, notwithstanding that not all such students were counted as part of the University’s full-time equivalence student numbers, but the University may be unable to populate the ‘additional information’ section of the HEAR pertaining to value-added, non-academic activities. Population of core HEAR fields would be overseen and administered by staff within Academic Registry
on the basis of information provided within programme specifications which would be signed off by academic departments; students would be able to access the HEAR electronically, although it was conceded that some overseas students might need formal, printed versions, which would be provided by Academic Registry.

In response to queries from the Committee, it was explained that the HEAR would not replace references provided by tutors; it was, rather, a means of providing a report, verified by the University, of course content and results, as well as of voluntary and other extra-curricular activity undertaken by the student. It was anticipated that the reports would be retained for approximately ten years after graduation, although a retention policy had yet to be finally agreed. It was explained, in addition, that the HEAR would replace the Diploma Supplement (but not the Final Award Certificate) given to students. Committee members asked whether the HEAR would also replace Personal Development Planning (PDP) and it was confirmed that this was not the case – although the project board would continue to discuss the articulation between these two processes. The Chair thanked the Director of Admissions and Academic Registry for the clear and helpful explanation.

13 Edexcel

13.1 It was noted that there were no issues to discuss in relation to Edexcel.

14 Research Degrees

14.1 Research Degrees Group

It was noted that a summary of the minutes of the meeting of the Research Degrees Group held on 26 March 2012 would be available for consideration at the next meeting.

15 External Examiners

15.1 External Examiner Nominations

15.1.1 Mr Alex Bernard, Headteacher, Noadswood School, for Secondary School Practice within the BA (Hons) Physical Education (Secondary) with QTS, January 2011 to December 2014. It was noted that this was an amendment to the period of tenure only (originally approved for January 2011 to December 2015) to ensure that the period of tenure would fall within the parameters set within the University’s Regulations. It was noted that the amendment to this appointment had been considered at the meeting of the Academic Standards Committee Scrutiny Group held on 16 March 2012 and had been recommended for forwarding to the Academic Standards Committee. The Committee approved the amendment for forwarding to Academic Board.

Subsequent to the meeting it was confirmed that the nomination had originally been considered, and recommended for forwarding to Academic Standards Committee, at the meeting of the Academic Standards Committee Scrutiny Group held on 17 February 2012, and not at the meeting held on 16 March 2012.

15.1.2 Dr Jennie Batchelor, University of Kent, for Critical, Linguistic and Theoretical Modules within the BA (Hons) English programme, September 2010 to December 2014. It was noted that Dr Batchelor was currently on maternity leave during 2011-2012 and that an interim replacement was being sought as a matter of urgency by the Deputy Dean (MM).
16 Dates of Meetings for 2011-2012
The following dates of meetings were noted for the remainder of 2011-2012:

16.1 Academic Standards Committee 2011-2012
The following dates, times and venues for 2011-2012 were noted:

- Wednesday, 16 May 2012, 1.30pm, Room H149, Bishop Otter Campus
- Wednesday, 18 July 2012, 1.30pm, Room G4, Bognor Regis Campus

16.2 Academic Standards Committee Scrutiny Group 2011-2012
The agreed dates and times of the meetings for 2011-2012 were noted:

- Friday, 20 April 2012, 9.30am
- Friday, 18 May 2012, 9.30am
- Friday, 22 June 2012, 9.30am

16.3 Academic Board 2011-2012
The confirmed dates and times of the meetings for 2011-2012 were noted:

- Wednesday, 2 May, 5.00pm (joint meeting with Board of Governors)
- Wednesday, 9 May, 3.00pm
- Wednesday, 13 June, 3.00pm
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