Meeting of the Academic Board

2.00 - 4.00 pm on Wednesday, 2 November 2016
in 1B27 - Technopark, SE1 6LN

Agenda

No.	Item	Pages	Presenter
1.	Welcome and apologies		PB
2.	Declarations of interest		PB
	Members are required to declare any interest in any item of business at this meeting		
3.	Minutes of previous meeting on 8 June 2016	3 - 10	PB
4.	Matters arising		
	Items to discuss		
5.	Deputy Vice-Chancellor's Report (presentation)		PB
6.	Appointment of Professors to the Promotions Panel (Stage 2)	11 - 12	PB
7.	TEF update (verbal update)		SW
8.	HEFCE Quality Assurance Report	13 - 32	JB
9.	Entry tariffs - Foundation Year and Year 1 / Cert HE	33 - 36	PB
10.	Course validation and information processes	37 - 42	SW
11.	Improving examination boards (verbal update)		JB
12.	Embedding LSBU Educational Framework	43 - 50	SWe
13.	Managing UK and transnational partnerships	51 - 60	SW
14.	Honorary Awards Criteria	61 - 66	PB
	Items to note		
15.	Progress against Academic KPIs	67 - 70	PB
16.	Academic regulations and procedures 2016/17 (verbal update)		JB
17.	National Student Survey results	71 - 78	SW

No.	Item	Pages	Presenter
18.	Reports from sub-committees	79 - 82	PB
19.	Report from joint Strategy Day with Board of Governors	83 - 90	PB
20.	Membership and Terms of Reference, 2016-17	91 - 98	PB
21.	Any other business		

Chair to be notified of any AOB items prior to start of meeting

Date of next meeting
2.00 pm on Wednesday, 22 February 2017

Members: Pat Bailey (Chair), Temi Ahmadu, Sodiq Akinbade, Stephen Barber, Craig Barker, Janet Bohrer, Kirsteen Coupar, Charles Egbu, Paul Ivey, Gurpreet Jagpal, Janet Jones, Raymond Lee, David Mba, Mike Molan, Jenny Owen, Shushma Patel, Lesley Roberts, Tony Roberts, Warren Turner and Shân Wareing

In attendance Janet Bohrer, Michael Broadway, Kirsten Coupar, Joe Kelly, Saranne Weller

Observer Jerry Cope

London South Bank
University

Minutes of a Meeting of the Academic Board
held at 2pm on Wednesday, 8 June 2016
in room 1B27, Technopark, London Road, London SE1

Present

Prof Pat Bailey	Chair
Temi Ahmadu	Vice-President Education (Students' Union)
Stephen Barber	Nominated Research Staff member
Craig Barker	Dean of the School of Law & Social Sciences
Janet Bohrer	Director of Academic Quality Development Office
Paul Ivey	PVC Research and External Engagement
Janet Jones	Dean of the School of Arts & Creative Industries
Raymond Lee	Dean of the School of Applied Sciences
David Mba	Dean of the School of Engineering
Jenny Owen	Nominated Academic Staff member
Lesley Roberts	Member of Professional staff
Tony Roberts	Member of Technical staff
Warren Turner	Dean/PVC of the School of Health & Social Care
Shân Wareing	PVC (Education and Student Experience)

Apologies

Gurpreet Jagpal	Director of Research & Enterprise
Mike Molan	PVC (Enhancement)/Dean of the School of Business
Charles Egbu	Dean of the School of Built Environment & Architecture
Shushma Patel	Nominated Professor

In attendance

Megan Evans	Governance Assistant
Harry Lawner	Principal Lecturer and Academic Director, School of Built Environment and Architecture.
Sally Skillett-Moore	Deputy Director Academic Quality Development Office

London South Bank University

Welcome and Apologies

1.   The Chair welcomed members to the meeting and noted apologies from Mike Molan, Gups Jagpal, Shushma Patel and Charles Egbu. Harry Lawner attended the meeting in place of Charles Egbu.

Minutes of previous meetings

2.   The Board approved the minutes of the meeting of 2 March 2016.

Matters arising

3.   The action tracker was noted. Actions 4, 5 and 13 have been completed and an update on action 20 was due to follow.

Deputy Vice Chancellor's Report

4.   The Board discussed the DVC's report (handout) and noted the following points:

   a. Applications for undergraduate study at LSBU are down 2%, although applications fro the competitor group are down 6% (Sector unchanged). However, acceptances are up 3% on last year and the higher tariff has been maintained.
   b. LSBU is on target to deliver a £1million surplus this financial year, but recruitment is crucial to achieving the same target next year.
   c. A memorandum of understanding has been signed with Morley College and is now in place, with the possibility of joint activities being explored.
   d. EDISON Phase 1 has been completed and there is an enhanced agreement with IBM until 2019.
   e. There is a new definition and process for Visiting Fellow, Visiting Professor and Emeritus Professor (as agreed at the last Academic Board). If applicants do not hold the title of professor, the application will go to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and two Pro-Vice Chancellors for approval.
   f. A new Apprenticeships Manager has been appointed and is now in post to develop LSBU's apprenticeships offering.
   g. New procedures are in place from the 1 June 2016 regarding research ethics. The new procedures mean that ethics requests will go primarily through Schools.

h. The board noted colleagues who had recently received promotions. It was requested that there was some clarification around career progression under the 'professional practice' criteria.

The Board received an update from the Pro-Vice Chancellor Education and Student Experience and noted the following:

i. The Education Framework has been agreed and now incorporates graduate attributes and the LSBU values.
j. That Helen Higson, Deputy Vice-Chancellor at Aston University would be speaking to the Operations Board in July to discuss good practice in offering placements.
k. That 373 staff have been accredited by the Higher Education Academy.
l. The Director of Research Informed Teaching has been appointed and will be starting at LSBU shortly.
m. A working party has been established to prepare for submission to the Teaching Excellence Framework in December 2016.
n. The National Student Survey data will be released in August 2016. Comparative DLHE results will be available in July 2016; the internal DLHE data is already available and is positive.
o. A review has commenced of the Student Records System.
p. A dashboard for learner analytics should be in place for September 2016 and tutors/students will also be able to see their profiles.
q. The Board noted the removal of the Disabled Students Allowance, and that action needs to be taken to ensure flexibility and quality of offer.

The Board noted an update from the Pro-Vice Chancellor Research and External Engagement, as follows:

r. There has been a review of the REF 2014. The board noted some of the results and that implementation of a series of 'mini REFs' was taking place in preparation for the next round.

Discussion item: How does the University stay nimble in an increasingly monitored system – hindrances and opportunities? (AB.11(16))

5. The Board discussed the recent White Paper ('Higher Education: Success in a Knowledge Economy') and the implications for the University. There was a discussion about how the University operates internationally and the risks involved with international work compared to work in the UK. The Board discussed the appetite for risk in respect of international work.

6. There was a discussion regarding validation of new courses and the timelines and resources required for developing new courses. The lead-in time for marketing campaigns was noted. The Board discussed the support required for academic and support staff in preparing validation documents, and discussed how to make this more efficient in that respect. It was noted that the AQDO offered support in this area but are keen to increase capacity. The new academic framework could encourage (or require, at higher grades) more staff to participate in validation processes. The Board noted the importance of maintaining a good reputation and ensuring validation takes place properly. The committee discussed staff involvement in validation and the need to incorporate this into the academic framework and its role in promotions.

7. The Board noted the need to ensure that new courses have the appropriate financial and human resources, which needs flagging up at an early stage in the validation process. The committee agreed that this could be helped by a simplified form, with sign off by designated people at various stages.

Academic KPIs (AB.12(16))

8. The Board reviewed the KPIs. The committee discussed the recent Guardian league table and an encouraging performance, especially compared with other London modern universities.

9. The Board reviewed the amount of students receiving Firsts and 2:1s, which is currently around 60-65% of students. This will be reviewed at a future Academic Board meeting.

10. The Board agreed to discuss entry tariffs at the next meeting.

Academic Regulations (AB.13(16))

11. The Board approved the proposed changes to the Academic Regulations for academic year 2016/7. The regulations are high-level, with more detailed procedures are more detailed which can be amended at Quality and Standards Committee in-year, if required.

12. Academic Board is responsible for academic regulations.

13. The Board discussed the implications of other regulatory bodies on the Academic Regulations such as the Nursing and Midwifery Council. It was

confirmed that all courses have to comply with the LSBU academic regulations, as well as others if applicable.

14. Board agreed Chair's action on wording around interruptions in sections 1.23-1.27.

15. The Board agreed a timeline of two weeks following the meeting for additional feedback on the new regulations (to be sent to the Chair).

Student-led projects

16. The committee noted the success of the student-led projects. The committee also noted that the process had been reviewed and some changes were being by the Student Experience Committee.

White Paper response (AB.15(16))

17. The committee received an update on quality processes and what the White Paper would mean for quality assurance. The committee also received an update on the Teaching Excellence Framework and noted that an internal working party has been set up to prepare for submission.

ACI degree classification (AB.16(16))

18. The Board noted and approved the Chair's action. Professor Pat Bailey agreed as a Chair's Action that for undergraduate degrees awarded to ACI students in 2015-16 we will run both algorithms with the intention of awarding individual students the most beneficial classification that our regulations allow.

Reports from subcommittees (AB.17(16))

19. The reports from subcommittees were noted.

Committee effectiveness (AB.18(16))

20. Chair asked the Board to consider the committee effectiveness questions and send responses to the questions within the following two weeks.

Any Other Business

21. The committee received a paper from the School of Engineering regarding attendance monitoring as a way to try and improve retention and progression,

and also a proposal to include Year 1 marks in the degree classification. The committee discussed the proposal, noting that any weighting for year one would require the support of external examiners, and their involvement in the assessment process.

22.   The committee agreed this pilot in principle, pending consultation with external examiners at level 4, with the details to be approved through Chair's action.

Date of next meeting

23.   The next Academic Board meeting will be on Wednesday 2 November 2016.

The Chair closed the meeting.

Confirmed as a true record:

……………………………………………….. (Chair)

Committee	Date	Minute	Action	Person Res	Status		
Academic Board	08/06/2016	6	To explore incorporating involvement in validation activities into the academic framework criteria	DVC	Verbal update	☐	Completed
Academic Board	08/06/2016	10	To include entry tariffs on the agenda for the next meeting	DVC	Agenda item 9	☐	Completed
Academic Board	08/06/2016	10	To follow up with BIU about the 'spend per student' figures in league tables	DVC	Verbal update	☐	Completed
Academic Board	08/06/2016	15	To work on section 1.23-1.27 of academic regulations (interruption of studies) with SW	DVC	Agenda item 16	☐	Completed
Academic Board	08/06/2016	22	To consult external examiners about any proposed changes to the degree algorithm in the School of Engineering, including their involvement in validating Level 4 assessment	DVC	Ongoing	☐	Completed
Academic Board	08/06/2016	9	Review number of 1sts and 2:1s awarded	DVC	to February meeting	☐	Completed
Academic Board	08/06/2016	15	Feedback on academic regulations to Chair	Academic Board	Complete	☐	Completed

Page 9

Committee	Date	Minute	Action	Person Res	Status		
Academic Board	08/06/2016	20	Responses to effectiveness questions to Chair within two weeks.	Academic Board	Complete	☐	Completed

Page 10

	CONFIDENTIAL
Paper title:	Appointment of Professors to the promotions Panel
Board/Committee	Academic Board
Date of meeting:	02 November 2016
Author:	Pat Bailey, Deputy Vice-Chancellor
Purpose:	To discuss the promotions process, and identify Academic Board representatives to sit on the Stage 2 Panel.
Recommendation:	Academic Board members are asked to make nominations.

Executive Summary

Applications for promotions in the 2016/17 cycle are open until 4th November, for which a Stage 1 Panel meets in December. This Panel considers all applications, and comprises the DVC and the 7 Deans (who do not take part in the discussion of 'their candidates'). Those for which a *prima facie* case is supported are either promoted (for Senior Lecturers), or proceed to Stage 2 (all other cases). The Stage 2 Panel comprises the DVC, PVC (ESE), PVC (REE), an external assessor (typically a DVC/PVC), the SU President, and three LSBU professors nominated by Academic Board. Last year, these were Ian Albery, Lesley Baillie and Jon Warwick; the Stage 2 Panel hears presentations from professorial applicants in February, before considering all Prof/AP applications at a final panel meeting in March, for which external referees' comments are also taken into consideration.

A brief discussion of the promotions process is invited. It is proposed that Academic Board members send nominations for the three professors to the DVC by 4th November, and that the three Stage 2 professorial panel members are then selected by the Deans' Committee later in November, and Academic Board notified.

This page is intentionally left blank

	CONFIDENTIAL
Paper title:	Annual Quality and Standards Report
Board/Committee	Academic Board
Date of meeting:	2 November 2016
Author:	Dr Janet Bohrer, Director Academic Quality Enhancement
Purpose:	To inform Academic Board about the new Quality Assessment System and the Annual Provider Review
Recommendation:	The Board is requested to approve this report for the meeting of the Audit Committee on the 10 November 2016.

1   Overview

1.1 Each year the Board of Governors will be asked by HEFCE to sign a statement to confirm that they are assured that LSBU is maintaining its responsibility for improving student academic experience and student outcomes; and in addition because LSBU holds degree awarding powers, that academic standards are set and maintained appropriately. The statement the Board of Governors will be asked to sign by the 1st December each year can be found in part two of the Annual Assurance Return and is reproduced in appendix one of this report.

1.2 At LSBU the Academic Board is *responsible for academic standards and the direction and regulation of academic matters* (see terms of reference for Academic Board) delegating much of the operational aspects of this responsibility to the Quality and Standards Committee. In their guidance HEFCE state that *it is not the intention that the governing body be drawn into quality management activities itself, but rather that it receives reports and challenges assurances from elsewhere in the provider*.

1.3 Therefore it is proposed to send the Board of Governors each year a standardised report using a template that will summarise the previous year's action as reported through Academic Board and Quality and Standards Committee in respect to the matters that relate to the statement the Board will be asked to sign. Improving student academic experience should result from embedding academic quality and the terms academic standards and academic quality are defined as follows

Academic quality – in what way and how well the higher education provider supports students to enable them to achieve their award. It covers learning, teaching and assessment, and all different resources and processes a provider put in place to help students to progress and fulfil their potential.

Threshold academic standards – the minimum acceptable level of achievement that a student has to demonstrate to be eligible for the award of academic credit or a qualification. For equivalent qualifications, the threshold level of achievement is agreed across the UK.

1.4 Academic Quality and Standards at LSBU are explained in the briefing paper attached to this report [briefing paper one]. This is the first operating year of the new model for the Quality Assessment System using the Annual Provider Review (APR). In order to provide the evidence of the methodologies used by LSBU as the basis to improve the student academic experience and student outcomes the Board of Governors as well as this report will be provided with a grid summarising an audit of the UK higher education Expectations mapped to LSBU processes [briefing paper two]. This audit provides the basis for an action plan [briefing paper three] which will be used in the subsequent yearly reporting to the Board of Governors. Evidence of the inclusion of the student voice in our processes at LSBU will be demonstrated

through a report provided by the Student Union [briefing paper four *to follow*]. All the briefing papers as well as this report will be included in the pack provided to Audit Committee for their meeting on the 10th November 2016.

1.5 The Annual Provider Review that HEFCE will provide to LSBU will provide a judgement about us following the assurances made by the Board of Governors in the December return and after analysis by HEFCE of the intelligence and data they hold about us (see http://www.hefce.ac.uk/reg/QualityAssessment/ . HEFCE will publish the outcomes of the quality and standards aspects of the APR process on the Register of Higher Education Providers (published at www.hefce.ac.uk/reg/register). The importance of engaging in this process is because

The outcomes from the quality and standards aspects of the APR process, including from any Unsatisfactory Quality Scheme investigation, will determine the eligibility of a provider to receive and retain a Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award in Year Two, and to continue to meet the Home Office's requirements for educational oversight for Tier 4 sponsorship. (HEFCE October 2016/29)

1.6 The academic regulations which underpin the integrity of the award made by LSBU electronically links to the relevant procedure which explains how the regulation should operate; these can be found on the LSBU web site at http://www.lsbu.ac.uk/about-us/policies-regulations-procedures

2   Executive summary of the year to report to the Board of Governors

2.1 Academic Board met three times during 2015-16. Elements of risk recorded in the LSBU risk register associated with quality remain in the higher categories and therefore are monitored closely by the members of the LSBU Executive Team that are the owners of those risks.

2.2 Academic Board receives reports from the Deputy Vice Chancellor (DVC) Chair of the Student Experience Committee; from the Pro-Vice Chancellor Education and Student Experience (PVC E&SE) Chair of the Quality and Standards Committee; and from the Pro-Vice Chancellor Research and External Engagement (PVC R&EE) Chair of the Research Committee.

2.3 From the minutes of the last meeting of the Academic Board of the academic year 2015-16 it can be reported that colleagues who had recently received promotions were noted; it was requested that there was some clarification around career progression under the 'professional practice' criteria for promotion; and it was reported that 373 staff had been accredited by the Higher Education Academy. The Director of Research Informed Teaching had been appointed earlier during the year and in continuing to supporting the diversity of provision it was also reported that a new Apprenticeships Manager had been appointed and was in post to develop LSBU's apprenticeships offering. Supporting the LSBU offer the PVC E&SE

announced that a presentation by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor at Aston University would be speaking to the LSBU Operations Board in July to discuss good practice in offering placements which is seen as an area of growth for the LSBU offer.

2.4 It was noted that the Educational Framework had been agreed and would now incorporate graduate attributes and the LSBU values. A review had commenced of the Student Records System. It was also noted that the National Student Survey data would be released in August 2016. Comparative Destination Leaving Higher Education (DLHE*)* results would be available in July 2016; the internal DLHE data was already available and was positive.

2.5 In support of the Learner Analytic project (see below) it was reported that the EDISON Phase 1 work had been completed and an enhanced agreement with IBM had been put in place until 2019. It was noted that a dashboard for learner analytics should be in place for September 2016 and tutors/students would also be able to see their profiles from the following academic year. The removal of the Disabled Students Allowance required that action needed to be taken to ensure flexibility and quality of offers made.

2.6 It was reported and before the start of the new academic year that applications for undergraduate study at LSBU were down by about 2%, compared to competitor institution groups that were down by about 6%. However, acceptances at the time of reporting were up approximately 3% on the same point last year while maintaining the higher tariff. LSBU it was reported remained financially sustainable being on target to deliver a £1million surplus during the financial year, but recruitment remained crucial to achieving the same financial targets for next year.

2.7 There was an update that reported that there were new procedures in place from the 1 June 2016 regarding research ethics. The new procedures will mean that ethics requests will go primarily through Schools. It was also reported that there had been a review of the REF 2014 results and that implementation of a series of 'mini REFs' within LSBU was taking place in preparation for the next REF round.

3   Assuring our academic quality and standards   - (see briefing paper one)

- **Approval processes at LSBU**

3.1 Academic Board had a discussion regarding validation of new courses and the timelines and resources required for developing new courses. The lead-in time for marketing campaigns was noted. The Board discussed the support required for academic and support staff in preparing validation documents, and discussed how to make this more efficient in that respect. It was suggested that the new academic

framework could encourage (or require, at higher grades) more staff to participate in validation processes. The Board noted the importance of maintaining a good reputation and ensuring validation takes place properly.

3.2 The Board noted the need to ensure that new courses have the appropriate financial and human resources, which need flagging up at an early stage in the validation process. The committee agreed that this could be helped by a simplified form, with sign off by designated people at various stages.

3.3 Evidence of the validations undertaken can be seen in the minutes of the School Standards Committees and the papers presented annually to Quality and Standards Committee.

- **Annual Monitoring at LSBU**

  3.4 Overarching annual monitoring reports and the subsequent actions taken by individual Schools for 2014-15 were discussed by Quality and Standards Committee and included a discussion about the development of the Learning Analytics Student Profiles Project about which DESEs will be invited to provide feedback in future annual monitoring. It was agreed that the method of annual monitoring would remain the same for 2015-16 however, the Planning, Performance and Assurance Team (PPAT) would work to develop a system which would enable information to be auto-populated into the reports. The School of Built Environment and Architecture will work with PPAT to test the new system to be rolled out in July 2017 for reporting through the autumn committee timetable and in line for the next year's APR annual sign off. It was agreed that annual monitoring will be conducted at undergraduate and postgraduate level simultaneously. High level reports will be brought to the Quality and Standards Committee annually at its meeting in October and will focus on how processes can be enhanced and good practice shared.

- **Reviewing activities at LSBU**

  3.5 A report on the NSS 2016 was discussed at the Quality and Standards Committee and LSBU's performance, as a whole was noted as average for the sector but with wide variations across the different schools. It was agreed that best practice would be shared across the university.

  3.6 The Quality and Standards Committee also discussed the processes of collecting student feedback through module evaluation questionnaires and welcomed a report that concluded that PPAT would continue to address ways in which the data can be more validly collected including online options which remove potential interaction with lecturer biasing the results, and could resolve timing issues.

  3.7 An Attainment Gap report and the challenges to effective reduction of the gap was discussed by Quality and Standards Committee. The importance of training was

noted, in particular, inclusivity and unconscious bias training for staff. The committee agreed to invite members of staff from courses which were successfully reducing the attainment gap, to present at future meetings, in particular, those from the School of Arts and Creative Industries, as well as others identified by the Planning, Performance and Assurance Team (PPAT).

3.8 The Quality and Standards Committee noted a report on student complaints. While complaints have risen, this may be due to increased promotion of the complaints procedure. However, as most complaints were now closed at stage 1 it was therefore concluded that the conciliation service was working successfully. The number of appeals across Schools it was reported was generally in proportion to the number of students enrolled within each school

- **Benchmarking activities at LSBU**

  3.9 The external examiner reports provide Schools with evidence about how their academic standards compare to other higher education providers and are used in their annual monitoring processes. The Quality and Standards Committee receives updates about how the process across the University and it was confirmed that during 2015-16 that in five reports from approximately two hundred standards had been raised as issues including where standards had been stated as higher than sector expectations and had now been fully addressed. An orientation event for LSBU external examiners will be held on the 23rd Nov 2016 when Dr Geoff Stoakes from the Higher Education Academy is giving a keynote address to explain the national work currently underway to strengthen the external examining system.

  3.10 The Quality and Standards Committee noted the Pearson's license for HND / HNC provision which had been reviewed by both the LSBU legal team and the Pearson legal team had been renewed.

4   **Reporting on improvements to student experience**

Examples of specific initiatives taken at LSBU during 2015-16 to improve the student experience include the following:

- *Learning Resources and Support*

  4.1 LSBU offers students excellent learning resources and support. The Library and Learning Resources department at LSBU have a number of initiatives to monitor and improve the student experience which has led to the success in the NSS, these are highlighted below.

Table 1 - NSS learning resources % agree results for all students

Year	Learning resources (% agree)	16. The library resources and services are good enough for my needs. (% agree)	17. I have been able to access general IT resources when I needed to. (% agree)	18. I have been able to access specialised equipment, facilities or rooms when I needed to. (% agree)
2016	89	90	93	84
2015	88	89	91	83
2014	83	84	88	78

4.2 The library runs pre-enrolment workshops for students to supporting the transition into HE. Feedback for these sessions has been very positive, an online survey showed that 96 % of attendees found the sessions useful and comments included:

"Great idea, helped me start to prepare for returning to Education and lessen any anxieties."

"I learned something new from all the workshop I attended. I appreciate the support and I think it is a good starting point for all students."

4.3 The learning environment is enriched by creating linkages between teaching and scholarship, research and professional practice. Apart from the courses that are specifically professional accredited many of our Schools teach by embedding real world challenges into their course delivery. The importance of how important it is to our staff that research contributes to our course design can be shown through an example from the School of Applied Science full details can be found at http://impact.ref.ac.uk/CaseStudies/CaseStudy.aspx?Id=44530

- *Learner Analytics*

4.4 A learner analytics user group was convened in 15/16 to begin the process of revising a predictive analytics tool created by LSBU in conjunction with IBM. The rollout of the tool will be in three main phases, with the first phase due in semester one 16/17.

4.5 The first phase consists of a revision of the tool to create a dashboard of fixed data for use by academic and professional staff. The dashboard will help staff support students learning by providing details of their academic background as well as contact details and a photograph. Individual interventions can be put in place by personal tutors and support staff, informed by the available data.

4.6 The second phase of the tool will be developed and piloted throughout 16/17 for rollout in 17/18. This phase will use the dashboard of fixed data as a foundation with the addition of the revision of the IBM tool to monitor student engagement in activities such as library use, VLE use and attendance on campus. This engagement tool will be piloted in 16/17 to trial and evaluate possible interventions. Rollout in 17/18 will include training for staff in using the tool to help optimise student learning.

4.7 Phase three is the development of a strategic tool. This will consist of a revision of the IBM analytics tool to provide course level predictions of student completion. The tool will combine analytics with business intelligence that provides a snapshot of cohorts and will allow it to be used to identify targeted course and module level interventions. It will be developed and piloted in 16/17, with rollout due for 17/18.

- *Withdrawals Pilot*
  4.8 In late March 2016 a revised process for withdrawals and interruptions was piloted. Previously students in some cases had been able to interrupt or withdraw from their studies by filling in a form obtained online and handing it to a member of administration staff. The pilot introduced a meeting with a Senior Student Advisor in the student life centre as part of the process, to create opportunities to support the student to continue their studies or interrupt instead of withdrawing. If the student still wanted to interrupt or withdraw this process ensures they are well informed about the implications of their decision and that they know what they need to do to complete the process appropriately, so all loose ends are tied up before they leave or interrupt. Data has been collated data to analyse the initiative with a view to re-launch it with improved processes in the new financial year if the initiative appears to have been successful.

  4.9 Of the 89 students who attended appointments between March 2016-May 2016, their enrolment status on 30 June 2016 was:

  - 30 (34%) were still enrolled
  - 35 (39%) interrupted
  - 19 (21%) withdrew
  - 2 could not be matched with the registry enrolment data provided

  4.10 Therefore this pilot shows that 34 % of those wishing to withdraw changed their mind after attending the meeting which indicates the pilot had a positive effect.

- *LSBU Alumni*

  4.11 In July 2016 we commissioned Alterline to provide an in-depth understanding of the lives of a defined cohort of LSBU alumni and to produce a qualitative research report and series of videos that tell the stories of some of this group in an accessible and meaningful way. The research will analyse the interviews with a range of alumni

and inform future student/alumni engagement that supports the student experience, based on an improved understanding of the perceptions, wants, needs, motivations and lifestyle of key alumni cohorts.

4.12 The report is the second phase of our alumni research. In 2015 the research demonstrated that LSBU stakeholders see alumni as crucial in increasing students' employment prospects, collaborating with research, promoting Schools, recruitment and promoting the university. The alumni survey, completed by 4,663 respondents, explored alumni's university experience, their university connections, their level of interest and motivation for involvement and the role of personal values.

5. Specific annual items: In 2015-16 reviewing the assurance of collaborative arrangements

5.1 During 2015-16 an academic audit process was developed with the first audit focusing on quality and standards procedures in relation to collaborative and partnership work. Work commenced in May 2016 and lasted approximately six months. The report was taken to the first meeting of the Academic Board in 2016-17 and the recommendations included in the action plans are provided with this summary see briefing paper three.

Appendix one

Annual Assurance Return: part two statement:

Part 2
As a governor and on behalf of the governing body, I confirm that for the 2015-16 academic year and up to the date of signing the return:
The governing body has received and discussed a report and accompanying action plan relating to the continuous improvement of the student academic experience and student outcomes. This included evidence from the provider's own periodic review processes, which fully involve students and include embedded external peer or professional review. The methodologies used as a basis to improve the student academic experience and student outcomes are, to the best of our knowledge, robust and appropriate. For providers with degree awarding powers: The standards of awards for which we are responsible have been appropriately set and maintained.
Please indicate here if you are not yet in a position to provide a full set of assurances: The governing body is providing partial assurance for 2015-16. Please set out below the areas in which your governing body is not able to provide full assurance, together with an account of the action you are taking to ensure that you are able to provide full assurance next year.   Signed by the Accountable Officer as a governor on behalf of all of the governors: Signed: ………………………………………………… Print name: ………………………………………………… Date: …………………………………………………

Briefing paper one
Quality and Standards: Quality assurance processes at LSBU

1   Overview
1.1   Quality assurance protects the LSBU brand. This paper explains the concepts used for quality and standards, how they are assured and enhanced in higher education, and summarises what happens at LSBU.

2   Introduction
2.1   Everyone makes judgements about quality and standards. When we buy products we usually expect that some form of quality control means we can trust in what we buy and we usually expect the services we use to be checked by regulators on our behalf. There are therefore certain assumptions we make that allows us to place that trust in the product we buy or the service we use to do what we expect, and if not we may complain. Higher education is no different. Judgements about quality and standards are made by students, staff, employers and the public.

2.2   In higher education *Quality Assurance* can be thought of as the ability of a university to answer a series of questions:
- What are you trying to do?
- Why are you trying to do it?
- How are you doing it?
- Why are you doing it that way?
- Why is that the best way of doing it?
- How do you know it works?
- How can you demonstrate that it is working?
- How can you do it better?

2.2   Like other sectors there are many things we have put in place in higher education and have done for many years that enable us to answer those questions and to assure ourselves, our students and the public of the quality and standards of our products and services. UK higher education has a high regard internationally and that includes the quality assurance of our higher education.

2.3   Over time the quality control processes and the mechanisms that have checked they are in place and operating correctly have changed and developed. We find ourselves in one of those periods of change at present. **However, fundamentally the principles of quality assurance and the processes we use have not changed.**

3.   The Higher Education Quality Code
3.1   Universities are autonomous. We have the power to award our own degrees and are therefore responsible for our own degrees and must be able to assure the

quality and standards of what we award. Universities do this by adhering to their academic regulations which operate through set procedures. Regulations and procedures vary to some extent between different universities.

3.2	We don't invent our regulations from scratch. While we are autonomous we write our regulations based on national guidelines which ensure the currency and transferability of the award we make in our name. This national guidance is encapsulated in the UK Quality Code for Higher Education. More details about the quality code can be seen on this short animation www.qaa.ac.uk/publications/films/film?PubID=206

3.3	The UK Higher Education Quality Code was developed by the Quality Assurance Agency for the UK working with representatives from higher education. The UK Quality Code sets out the sectors' expectations of HE services and products. LSBU academic regulations and operating procedures ensure and demonstrate how we meet those expectations in a way that is suitable for our mission, for our students and for the types of courses we offer.

3.4	The higher education sector has agreed definitions for quality and standards published in the Quality Code, and all higher education providers (HEP) are checked to ensure engagement with the UK Quality Code Expectations. The checks that take place provide assurance that the HEP engages appropriately with:
Threshold academic standards – the minimum acceptable level of achievement that a student has to demonstrate to be eligible for the award of academic credit or a qualification. For equivalent qualifications, the threshold level of achievement is agreed across the UK.
Academic quality – in what way and how well the higher education provider supports students to enable them to achieve their award. It covers learning, teaching and assessment, and all different resources and processes a provider puts in place to help students to progress and fulfil their potential.

**4.	Quality Assurance at LSBU**
4.1	At LSBU our regulations are short, written at high level principle, and cover all the higher education awards we make. We received a Plain English Crystal Mark for our academic regulations for 2016/17. By writing our regulations clearly we hope that everyone can understand the rules that protect our awards. The academic regulations electronically link to the relevant procedure which explain how the regulation should operate; these can be found on the LSBU web site at http://www.lsbu.ac.uk/about-us/policies-regulations-procedures

4.2	LSBU has a Quality and Enhancement Team that monitors whether we use these regulations and procedures consistently across the University. If it is found that we are not being consistent, and there is no acceptable reason for the inconsistency, the Quality and Enhancement Team helps the University to remedy the situation.

4.3   Like most other universities, we review our practises, procedures and regulations against the UK wide Expectations and this audit allows us to develop an action plan. The Expectations audit are presented through a grid in briefing paper two; and the resulting action plan arising from the Expectations audit can be found in briefing paper three. These will be updated and presented to the Board of Governors annually. This is to provide them assurance in their completing of the Annual Provider Return in November.

4.4   The life of a course is checked by our internal quality control mechanisms and the external auditing (non-financial) that happens. Academic Board is responsible for overseeing that this checking has happened. It does this by delegating responsibility for different aspects through its committees: the Quality and Standards Committee, the Student Experience Committee and the Research Degrees Committee.

4.5 All LSBU awards must have been **approved** by the university. We do this through a risk based process of validation, and once any conditions arising from that validation process have been met students are then allowed to enrol to study for that award.

4.6 Annually we ask that Schools monitor how those awards have performed and through course monitoring reports the Schools can develop an action plan to continuously improve their courses. Schools report to the university through the Quality and Standards Committee highlighting issues and good practice that arise from the **annual monitoring**.

4.7 The university **periodically reviews** provision checking that the validated awards are still fit for purpose and by undertaking academic audits can understand how a particular aspect of university provision can be improved across the whole university.

4.8 The annual monitoring and the periodic reviewing of university provision are continually **benchmarked against national standards** for example through the external examining process and by analysis of how well we are doing against our competitors. The Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) exercise will formalise this benchmarking activity in a national format.

4.9 Internal quality processes are checked through **external reviews and audits** (non-financial). Where a course has professional body recognition this accreditation is checked by the relevant professional body, and the provision we offer under licence from Pearson's who own HNC and HND awards is checked by completion of an annual return about those particular awards. Occasionally a representative from Pearson's will visit us to check the data we provide in the annual return to them. We also report to HEFCE on an annual basis and they similarly periodically visit to check the data we provide. These visits are every five years. It is the signing off of our annual assurance return to HEFCE that this briefing paper one is providing background.

5   The role of the Board of Governors

5.1   Each year the Board of Governors will be asked to sign off statements that show they are assured that the Academic Board is maintaining the responsible for quality and standards. It is therefore proposed to send the Board each year a standardised reporting template that will summarise the previous year's reporting under the following headings:

- Introduction and executive summary of the year based on Academic Board minutes
- approval processes at LSBU
- annual monitoring at LSBU
- reviewing activities at LSBU
- benchmarking activities at LSBU
- Improvements to student experience illustrative initiatives
- Reporting on specific items of risk activity from that year for example the assurance of collaborative arrangements

5.2   The Board of Governors will also have access to the Expectations audit grid mapping LSBU processes to national Expectations, subsequent action plan and a summary from the student union about their involvement with the quality assurance processes at LSBU.

Briefing paper two: a mapping exercise of LSBU processes to national expectations - see attached Excel spread sheet

Briefing paper three: Action Plan for 2016-17 – see attached grid

Briefing paper four: report from Student Union – to follow

Part A: Setting and Maintaining Academic Standards			
Expectation	**How LSBU comply**	**Monitored by**	**reported**
A1: UK and European Reference Points for Academic Standards	Alignment to Framework to Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) and subject benchmark statements is required for all new course approvals.	Validation panels, annual monitoring, periodic review panels, external examiner system (examiners report on standards and level of awards)	Reported through School Academic Standards Committee(SASC) to Quality and Standards Committee(QSC)
A 2.1: In order to secure their academic standards, degree-awarding bodies establish transparent and comprehensive academic frameworks and regulations to govern how they award academic credit and qualifications.	LSBU has an ongoing commitment to revising Academic Regulations and Procedures to make sure they are fit for purpose. These are made public on the web site http://www.lsbu.ac.uk/about-us/policies-regulations-procedures	QSC can make in year changes to procedures in the best interest of students and if it is made clear they are being added as amendments to existing procedures	Academic regulations are revised annually at the start of the academic year and are agreed through Academic Board. These do not change in-year
A 2.2: Degree-awarding bodies maintain a definitive record of each programme and qualification that they approve (and of subsequent changes to it) which constitutes the reference point for delivery and assessment of the programme, its monitoring and review, and for the provision of records of study to students and alumni.	The definitive information made available to students and the recording any local protocols of differences from the Academic Regulations, for example because of professional body requirements, are made in the Course Specification	Validation panels, annual monitoring, periodic review panels, and through the external examiner system (examiners report on standards and level of awards)	Changes are made and reported through SASC. Requires an Annual Audit of Course Specifications to be completed reported to QSC **Action required - see action plan**
A 3.1: Degree-awarding bodies establish and consistently implement processes for the approval of taught programmes and research degrees that ensure that academic standards are set at a level which meets the UK threshold standard for the qualification and are in accordance with their own academic frameworks and regulations.	LSBU use an approval process which assigns risk to the type of validation event required	Validation panels, annual monitoring, periodic review panels, external examiner system (examiners report on standards and level of awards)	Academic Planning Panel reports to QSC, annual report of validations to QSC. *Paper provided for AB Nov 2016 about 2016-17 number of new courses linking growth to quality requirements*
A 3.2: Degree-awarding bodies ensure that credit and qualifications are awarded only where: a) the achievement of relevant learning outcomes (module learning outcomes in the case of credit and programme outcomes in the case of qualifications) has been demonstrated through assessment b) both the UK threshold standards and the academic standards of the relevant degree-awarding body have been satisfied.	Verified for new courses by the validation event and checked through annual monitoring of courses monitoring reports.	Academic Board - with authority delegated to QSC, and checked through the external examiners system for qualification types. Each course monitored by SASC	Reported to QSC. Need to embed more inclusive assessment provision and check that because of the highly modulised system at LSBU there is not a bias to over assessment. **Action required Assessment practices used across the universities should be a topic for a future Academic Audit**
A 3.3: Degree-awarding bodies ensure that processes for the monitoring and review of programmes are implemented which explicitly address whether the UK threshold academic standards are achieved and whether the academic standards required by the individual degree-awarding body are being maintained.	Individual modules are reviewed every year and this is used for course monitoring reports which feed into School action plans for making continuous improvement.	Checked through validation and re-validation events and by individual external examiners. Monitored by course teams through annual monitoring and through periodic review.	UG and PG courses reported to SASC which make annual overarching reports to QSC. **Action required Schools to be visited to discuss quality processes at a local level as aligned with plans for future growth**.
A 3.4: In order to be transparent and publicly accountable, degree-awarding bodies use external and independent expertise at key stages of setting and maintaining academic standards to advise on whether: a) UK threshold academic standards are set, delivered and achieved b) the academic standards of the degree-awarding body are appropriately set and maintained.	External advisers are used in validation events and external examiners report on academic standards annually	External examiner reports are used in annual monitoring reports and actions resulting from external examiner comments are discussed at SASCs	An annual external examiner report goes to QSC. To enhance the effectiveness of the external examiner system it has been proposed to AB to recruit and develop the role of an Institutional Examiner **Action required** - see action plan

QAA Quality Code Part A
http://www.qaa.ac.uk/assuring-standards-and-quality/the-quality-code/quality-code-part-a

Part B: The quality of student learning opportunities Standards			
Expectation	How LSBU comply	Monitored by	reported
B1: Higher education providers, in discharging their responsibilities for setting and maintaining academic standards and assuring and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities, operate effective processes for the design, development and approval of programmes.	Course design by course teams is further supported through Centre for Research Informed Teaching (CRIT) and checked through validation events, (including using external specialists) with course teams meeting subsequent conditions before a new course is signed off for students to be allowed to enrol. This is checked through being annually monitored and periodically reviewed.	School Academic Standard Committees (SASC) and Quality and Standards Committee (QSC)	Academic Board - with authority delegated to Academic Planning Panel, and Quality Standard Committee see A3.1
B2: Recruitment, selection and admission policies and procedures adhere to the principles of fair admission. They are transparent, reliable, valid, inclusive and underpinned by appropriate organisational structures and processes. They support higher education providers in the selection of students who are able to complete their programme.	Through the specific LSBU Admissions and Enrolment Procedure, Enrolment Declaration and a Complaints and Appeals Procedure for admissions decisions. http://www.lsbu.ac.uk/about-us/policies-regulations-procedures#collapseTwo	Currently PVC Education and Student Experience signs off Procedure.	Gov-Legal is responsible for writing the enrolment declaration
B3: Higher education providers, working with their staff, students and other stakeholders, articulate and systematically review and enhance the provision of learning opportunities and teaching practices, so that every student is enabled to develop as an independent learner, study their chosen subject(s) in depth and enhance their capacity for analytical, critical and creative thinking.	Development and embedding the Educational Framework through course design supported by CRIT, checked through validation events. There is annual monitoring of courses, which are also periodically reviewed; external examiners report on university standards and student achievement in relation to those standards.	Through annual course monitoring, periodically reviewed and through academic audit as required.	Reported through SASC to QSC See A3.2 *paper to AB Nov 2016 about embedding the Educational Framework.*
B4: Higher education providers have in place, monitor and evaluate arrangements and resources which enable students to develop their academic, personal and professional potential.	LSBU Student Services include: Disability & Dyslexia Support; Student Advice, Careers Service, Library and learning resources and includes the learner analytics work and the support for learning team.	The Director of Student Support and Employment	Annual performance reported and discussed by the Student Experience Committee
B5: Higher education providers take deliberate steps to engage all students, individually and collectively, as partners in the assurance and enhancement of their educational experience.	Course boards; feedback surveys e.g. National Student Survey (NSS), Module Evaluation Questionnaires (MEQs), student participation in Academic Board, QSC, Board of Governors and other committees and sub-committees	Annual monitoring, periodic reviews and academic audit panels as required.	Reported through SASCs(Currently SASCs do not have any student representation) to QSC. Schools are starting to set up Student Voice Committees. **Action required:** to work with the Student Union to review the student participation in quality assurance in particular to review the Student Charter
B6: Higher education providers operate equitable, valid and reliable processes of assessment, including for the recognition of prior learning, which enable every student to demonstrate the extent to which they have achieved the intended learning outcomes for the credit or qualification being sought.	Courses design supported by CRIT and checked through the validation events and then subsequently through annual monitoring, periodic reviews and academic audits as required. There is an Academic Misconduct Procedure embedded in the Assessment and Examination Procedure available on the web http://www.lsbu.ac.uk/about-us/policies-regulations-procedures#collapseTwo	Validation and re-validation events. Annual external examiner reports are used in annual monitoring.	Reported through SASC to QSC **Action** AP(E)L /RPL will be reviewed for consistency across the university though the use of an academic audit. **Action** review the Academic Misconduct Procedure and make available separately on the web page
B7: Higher education providers make scrupulous use of external examiners.	External examiners report on university standards and student achievement in relation to those standards, this information is used in annual monitoring. Details about the LSBU external examiner system can be found in the in the Assessment and Examination Procedure available on the web http://www.lsbu.ac.uk/about-us/policies-regulations-procedures#collapseTwo	Reported through SASCs and an annual report to QSC. Any individual external examiner report signalling a not meeting of standards goes directly to PVC E&SE who checks a response from the relevant School is made and recorded at SACs	Annual report and check of external examiners recruitment by Academic Board see A3.4
B8: Higher education providers, in discharging their responsibilities for setting and maintaining academic standards and assuring and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities, operate effective, regular and systematic processes for monitoring and for review of programmes.	Annual monitoring of courses though course monitoring reports and periodically reviewing courses, and academic audits as required. Development and maintenance of a PSRB database recording the LSBU courses that have professional body recognition and when this will be reviewed.	Periodic Review and Academic Audit Panels as required	Reported through SASC and QSC. **Action required see action plan** to make the results from the annual monitoring more timely for making appropriate changes to courses and to make the process less burdensome the Course Monitoring Report (CMR) forms will be designed to be semi auto populated
B9: Higher education providers have procedures for handling academic appeals and student complaints about the quality of learning opportunities; these procedures are fair, accessible and timely, and enable enhancement.	Complaints and Appeal can be made using the LSBU procedures available on the web site at http://www.lsbu.ac.uk/about-us/policies-regulations-procedures#collapseTwo At the end of the internal appeal or complaints process, a 'Completion of Procedures' letter is issued to the student which gives them the right to appeal to the OIA.	All Appeals and Complaints handling have moved to the Gov legal team from 2016-17	Reported to QSC before Academic Board. The OIA use a calendar year for reporting so the main reporting occurs at the Spring committees to discuss the previous year internal reporting has been discussed previously.

B10: Degree-awarding bodies take ultimate responsibility for academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities, irrespective of where these are delivered or who provides them. Arrangements for delivering learning opportunities with organisations other than the degree-awarding body are implemented securely and managed effectively.	This follows the same procedures for other course development approval processes checked through validation events. This was the topic for an academic audit in Autumn 2016-17	Validation panels, SASCs QSC, external examiner system (standards and level of awards)	Reports about collaborative arrangements are made through the course monitoring report and reported annually thought SASC and to QSC. Larger transnational partnership also require institutional processes to be reported directly to QSC *Paper provided to AB Nov 2016 with recommendations from the academic audit* **Action - see action plan for developing robust reviewing and reporting from larger partnerships**
B11: Research degrees are awarded in a research environment that provides secure academic standards for doing research and learning about research approaches, methods, procedures and protocols. This environment offers students quality of opportunities and the support they need to achieve successful academic, personal and professional outcomes from their research degrees.	The LSBU research degrees code of practice can be found online at http://www.lsbu.ac.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/84355/research-degree-code-of-practice.pdf	Through supervision and annual monitoring of students development plan	Research Degrees Committee,
QAA Quality Code Part B	Note: LSBU processes for how each of these are operated can be found in the LSBU Quality Code being revised for 2016-17 to be a Quality Assurance and Enhancement Manual		

http://www.qaa.ac.uk/assuring-standards-and-quality/the-quality-code/quality-code-part-b

Part C: Information about Higher Education Provision			
Expectation	**How LSBU comply**	**Monitored by**	**Owner**
UK higher education providers produce information for their intended audiences about the higher education they offer that is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy.	CMA Compliance, LSBU Marketing Guidelines		see A2.2

QAA Quality Code Part C

http://www.qaa.ac.uk/assuring-standards-and-quality/the-quality-code/quality-code-part-c

Briefing paper three

Action planning for quality assurance and enhancement at LSBU:2016-17

		Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evidence
1	Alignment of each LSBU School's quality assurance with university processes for plans for future growth	• Discussion in Schools about quality processes as completed at the local level and aligned with plans for future growth.	March 2017	• PVC E&SE and Director of AQE with the relevant AQE staff members, School Dean and DESE	• Seven meetings held and reports written	SASC QSC	• Report from each School
2.	Annual review of course specifications	• Centralised database of courses specifications • Audit to check for changes since validation	July 2017	• Deputy Director of AQE	• Database created • Audit completed and reported to individual Schools if any recommendations made	SASC QSC	• Minutes of SASC • Minutes of QSC
3.	Audit of assessment practices used across the universities. This is a topic for an academic audit	• Review amount of assessment methods and means reviewed for consistency and inclusivity • AP(E)L /RPL reviewed for consistency across the university	July 2017	• AQE staff with relevant School based staff	• Recommendations made to School to align to consistent practices across the university	QSC	• Report from the Academic Audit
4	Academic Misconduct	• Review the Academic Misconduct Procedure	July 2017	• Gov-legal and Student Admin teams	• Work on a revised procedure published on the web	QSC	• Procedure published on web

		• Make Procedure available separately on the web page					
5	Institutional Examiner Role	• Recruitment and development of new role	Dec 2016	• PVC E&SE	• Institutional Examiner appointed	QSC	• Annual report made by Institutional Examiner from external Examiners reports
6.	Embed the student voice in quality assurance processes	• Work with the Student Union to review the student participation in quality assurance in particular to review the Student Charter	July 2017	• AQE working with SU	• Work on revising the LSBU student Charter	Student Experience Committee	• Student Charter published on web
7.	Annual monitoring	• To make the results from the annual monitoring more timely for making appropriate changes to courses and to make the process less burdensome	July 2017	• PPAT working with AQE and DESEs	• the CMR forms will be semi auto populated	SASC	• Overarching reports to QSC available by Oct 2017
8.	Monitoring and reviewing existing partnerships	• Revising and developing the review mechanism for partnerships	Jan 2017 and ongoing	• Academic Director for collaborative partnerships	• robust reviewing and reporting from larger partnerships • MOCs reviewed and updated annually	QSC	Minutes of QSC

	CONFIDENTIAL
Paper title:	Entry tariffs, Foundation Year and CertHE
Board/Committee	Academic Board
Date of meeting:	02 November 2016
Author:	Pat Bailey, Deputy Vice-Chancellor
Purpose:	Discussion of the issues concerning entry routes onto degree courses at LSBU, especially CertHE.
Recommendation:	None

Entry routes to LSBU degree courses

In September 2016, the DVC established a Task & Finish Group to review our Foundation Year (FY) provision; the group comprises Louise Andronicou, Steve Faulkner, Tony Moss, Alison May, Emily Rubython, James Chapman, Jennifer Hackett.

Current FY provision and issues

In 2015/16, we had around 380 FY (or 'extended degree') students, making us a significant recruiter of such students, although a number of other London universities take considerably more (notably London Met, UEL and Kingston – each roughly double our numbers). The remit was to consider whether our current model (8 recruiting courses last year, and 11 this year) was the best structure, with provision mainly being run by Schools. There is also an urgent need for maths and English provision at Level 3 in support of Apprenticeships, and clearly this could form part of the FY delivery. Finally, there is concern that only 44% of FY students successfully transfer into Year 1, and only half of these complete their degree at LSBU. There was particular urgency if significant revisions were to be put in place for September 2017 intake.

There are some important funding and tariff issues relating to FY students. If they enrol onto an extended degree then they can draw a student loan, and their entry tariffs are included in the calculation of LSBU's average 'degree entry tariff'. If they exit with an FY qualification, they must then apply for entry onto Year 1; their entry qualifications do not count towards our tariff, but also they are not eligible for a student loan for their FY. The Task & Finish Group has met three times, and no changes to the structure of the FY for 2017 intake are currently planned although some significant improvements to the delivery and support are proposed.

CertHE

Another option for students missing our entry grades by a small amount is to offer them entry onto the CertHE. This makes it clear that they have not met our entry standards, and they enrol effectively on our first year degree courses (student loan available), for which they would receive a CertHE if successful; those students could then apply to join our degree courses onto Year 2, applying for a further two years of student loan. The numbers have been modest (12/13 – 6; 13/14 – 4; 14/15 – 45; 15/16 – 53), but progression has been quite good. The CertHE route does not feed their entry tariffs into our overall average degree course entry tariff.

Pedagogic issues for the CertHE

The anomaly here is that we effectively offer them a qualification that we don't think they're able enough to achieve but, if they do, then they join the same students who we accepted directly onto the degree course. However, even though they may

be offered some additional support, we do not identify their specific weaknesses, or require them to undertake additional studies. This is questionable from a pedagogic standpoint, but also fails to perhaps develop the CertHE potential adequately.

Options for improving the CertHE

From brief discussions with a range of colleagues, there are a range of options, of which the main ones are:

1) status quo (which has significant merit and success);
2) add more learning requirements … but all of the evidence is that over-burdening students whose performance is weak (perhaps due to external pressures on their time) is likely to disadvantage them further;
3) restructure all year 1 courses to provide an elective module which, for CertHE students, would be explicitly designed to address their learning needs – this could be done in several ways, but would necessitate wholesale change to current Year 1 provision (which might have other advantages);
4) commit to **embedding** compulsory additional workshops/seminars into Year 1 courses to provide extra tuition, within the disciplines.
   It could be argued that this final option means that we are investing extra resource in those students who haven't met our entry standards and, that if this enhances the learning experience, it should be offered to all students. But the resource implications of option 4 for all Year 1 students are probably undeliverable in terms of staffing and room availability, whilst targeted interventions by the Skills for Learning team have proven to be highly effective.

What is being asked of Academic Board?

Academic Board is asked to discuss the CertHE options, and identify issues, concerns and alternative options; this will help inform the Task & Finish Group, which will bring specific recommendations back to AB in due course.

This page is intentionally left blank

London South Bank
University

	PAPER NO:
Paper title:	Course Validation at LSBU
Board/Committee	**Academic Board**
Date of meeting:	2 November 2016
Author:	Shân Wareing
Executive/Operations sponsor:	Shân Wareing
Purpose:	To inform Academic Board of developments regarding the marketing of new courses, to update the Board on validation activity in 2015/6 and 2016/7, and to alert the Board to possible concerns and suggest a way forwards.

Executive Summary	
Context	The University is validating new course provision at a rate which is stretching university resources and without necessarily achieving the anticipated growth in return on the activity and possibly with unintended negative consequences on quality and student experience, progression and achievement.

Of the 22 new courses validated in 2015/6, so far one third have recruited nearly all the students. 72 validation events have been requested for 2016/7. |
| **Question** | Is it possible to undertake a more strategic approach to validation which delivers strategic growth within our capacity to develop, approve and implement new provision? |
| **Conclusion & Recommendation** | That Academic Board considers the attached paper and commissions a review by the Planning, Performance and Assurance Office of how to maximise the recruitment patterns of new courses. |

1   Marketing "Subject to Validation"

1.1   In September 2016, a question was raised within the University about whether courses which had begun but not completed the approval process could be advertised either without the caveat 'subject to validation' or with a reduction to the prominence of information about validation. This triggered a review of the approach to validation within the university, to ensure we are aligned with sector practice and expectations. The pro vice-chancellor undertook an online review of other universities, and the position regarding the CMA.

1.2   The CMA's powers will be increasing under the new HE bill, and a failure in quality will now have the possible consequence that degree awarding powers are removed from providers. Information about the provision in relation to consumer protection is a current issue and an easy area for a reviewer to look at, so we should assume they will look. It is therefore not a small risk.

1.3   A selection of other higher education provider websites demonstrated the sector is responding in line with this legal position.

   a) http://www.arts.ac.uk/lcc/courses/undergraduate/ba-hons-design-for-branded-spaces/
   b) http://www.manchester.ac.uk/study/undergraduate/courses/2016/10111/biology-4-years-msci-subject-to-approval/
   c) https://www.masterscompare.co.uk/masterscourse/queen-mary-university-london/craniofacial-trauma-reconstruction-distance-learning-subject-approval-msc-49225
   d) http://coursefindr.co.uk/institutions/queens-university-belfast/courses/20109
   e) https://www.royalholloway.ac.uk/iquad/services/academicqualityassurance/programmevalidation-newprogrammesandmajorrevalidations.aspx
   f) http://www.staffs.ac.uk/course/USSL-10128.jsp
   g) https://www.ucl.ac.uk/srs/academic-manual/c3/prog-approval
   h) https://www.uel.ac.uk/Postgraduate/Courses/MA-Interior-Design

1.4   The conclusion of the review was that we have a legal and enforceable responsibility to make the status of the course clear to students, and that means we cannot use a form of words, or organise the way we present the information, to mask its status. The wording 'subject to approval' or 'subject to validation' is therefore expected to be clear in all advertised courses prior to the completion of approval processes.

2.   Validation Schedule and timeframe

2.1   It was noted during the review that some universities avoid advertising courses as 'subject to validation' by ensuring the course has completed validation processes prior to its being advertised. This approach would fit the University's wish to increasing the proportion of undergraduate students recruited through UCAS not Clearing, to

increase progression and success, and the entry tariff which affects the university's reputation.

2.2   In the light of this, Academic Board is asked to consider the following information about recent and planned course validations:

2.2.1 43 validation events were conducted in 2015/6. 37 courses were fully validated, with 156 conditions and 111 recommendations. 13 events were revalidations, there was 1 review, 1 franchise, and 22 new courses were validated.

2.2.2 Of the 22 new courses validated in 2015/6, so far 7 courses have recruited 96.5% of the students (see table 1).

2.2.3 72 validation events are being requested by six Schools for 2016/7 (excludes BEA). The number of awards and courses is higher as some of the courses have pathways with different awards e.g. a recent validation event was for BA (Hons) Human Geography and the pathways it included were BA (Hons) Human Geography with Planning, BA (Hons) Human Geography with Housing, BA (Hons) Human Geography with Tourism Development.

2.3   Validation presents a number of issues across the university.

2.3.1 The timeframe should enable successful marketing, including time for UG courses to have UCAS listing to fulfil the goal of decreasing the university's dependence on Clearing.

2.3.2 LSBU has a commitment to implement the Educational Framework; the Centre for Research Informed Teaching team (CRIT) can work with the course team to integrate the Educational Framework into course design with longer lead-in times.

2.3.3 Many university systems are impacted by new course provision. The library has to order resources in advance, ahead of knowing student numbers recruited, and without additional resource. Timetabling requires course information in advance to optimise room utilisation. All pathways and options have to be built in QL by Academic Quality Enhancement staff. It takes up to 10 minutes to create a module in QL, and up to five hours to create a new course.

2.3.4 The same individuals in Schools and AQE undertake academic quality annual monitoring and review processes as undertake approval. Higher numbers of validations reduce the capacity to undertake other quality review and monitoring processes which assure standards, drive enhancements to improve students' experience, retention and outcomes, and underpin our governors' confidence in standards and quality.

2.3.5 CMA requirements need to be recognised in the developments of new courses, such as the provision of accurate information in marketing.

London South Bank University

Conclusion

The University combines a commitment to growth with commitments to recruiting via UCAS rather than Clearing, to the implementation of the Educational Framework, and to robust quality processes. We therefore need to concentrate in validation on developments most likely to generate growth without compromising other activities, obligations and commitments.

Proposal

It is proposed that Academic Board requests the Planning, Performance and Assurance Office to provide a review of validation activity and projected areas of growth to inform academic planning and ensure the processes the university are strategic and allocate resource optimally.

London South Bank
University

Table 1

Actual student intakes for new courses validated in 2015/6 against projected intakes

	Title	Date of Validation Event	Projected 1st Intake 16/17	Actual First Intake 2016/17
1	MEng Civil Engineering	10 September 2015	10	0
2	BA Business Management Common 1st year	26 November 2015	175	221
3	MSc in General Practice Nursing	26 November 2015	35	0
4	PGCert Obesity Care	01 December 2015	75	0
5	BA (Hons) Web Production and Social Media (Pending)	19 January 2016	20	0
6	BA (Hons) Economics with courses	18 February 2016	30	18
7	MSc Engineering Project Management (4701 FT, 4702 PT)	23 February 2016	15	11
8	BA (Hons) Visual Effects, Special Effects Design and Theatre Technologies	10 March 2016		14
9	LLM International Commercial Law	14 March 2016		10
10	BSc Hons Real Estate	16 March 2016	15	0
11	BSc (Hons) Computer Science	11 April 2016	19	41
12	MA Development Journalism	25 April 2016		0
13	PGCert Leadership in Heath	17 May 2016	50	53
14	BEng (Hons) & MEng Advanced Vehicle Engineering (BEng 4705 FT, 4706 PT, MEng 4707 FT, 4708 PT)	24 May 2016	10	6
15	MSc Palliative Care and end of life St Francis Hospice	26 May 2016	15	0
16	MSc Perinatal Mental Health	31 May 2016	15	0
17	MSc Architecture/Dig Robotic Construction	03 June 2016	30	0
18	BUE BA (Hons) English Language and Literature	07 June 2016	100	
19	MSc International Business Management	23 June 2016	60	75
20	FdSc Health apprenticeships	28 June 2016		
21	BUE Psychology	04 July 2016	100	
22	MEng/BEng Computer Engineering	14 July 2016		0

7 courses recruited 433 students; 15 courses recruited 16 students.

32% of the courses recruited 96.5% of the students

This page is intentionally left blank

	CONFIDENTIAL
Paper title:	Embedding the LSBU Educational Framework in the Curriculum
Board/Committee:	Academic Board
Date of meeting:	2 November 2016
Author:	Saranne Weller, Director, Centre for Research Informed Teaching
Purpose:	Discussion
Recommendation:	The committee is requested to: • note the development of the Learning Pathway into the LSBU Educational Framework as an outcome of consultation in 2015/16 • discuss the outline plan for implementation of the LSBU Educational Framework

Executive Summary

In 2015/16 the university undertook a cross-university consultation on the Learning Pathway and as an outcome of this work developed the LSBU Educational Framework which will frame the actions of the university to prepare students to enter graduate-level work; to adapt successfully to changes during their careers, and to lead progress in their professions, practices and industries.

The LSBU Educational Framework will be underpinned by the definition of university graduate attributes derived from the LSBU Behavioural Values and their development at course level. In addition the framework will bring together into a coherent offer for students and employers the university academic and extra-curricular provision for developing student employability.

This paper summarises an outline plan for the next steps in embedding the LSBU Educational Framework as a 2 year staff, student and employer engagement and enhancement project coordinated by the Centre for Research Informed Teaching in partnership with institutional and external stakeholders.

Embedding the LSBU Educational Framework in the Curriculum

1. Background

1.1 The *London South Bank Corporate Strategy 2015-2020* commits the university to "providing students with an individualised learning experience to develop the skills and aspirations that enable them to enter employment, further study or start their own business".

1.2 The university targets for 2020 include that 80% of LSBU graduates will be in graduate level employment and the university will be in the top 50% of UK universities for both graduate employment and starting salaries.

1.3 Central to fulfilling this strategic commitment was the Learning Pathway that brought together disciplinary academic knowledge with curricular and extra-curricular opportunities for students to develop their employability while at LSBU.

1.4 In 2015-16, consultation on the Learning Pathway with academic and professional services staff, employers and students enabled the refining of these proposals into the LSBU Educational Framework. The LSBU Educational Framework translates the Learning Pathway into a set of educational principles that will be embedded into all new curricula and evidenced during validation. It is intended that all existing curricula will be able map the course to the LSBU Educational Framework to demonstrate for students and employers how their experiences at LSBU contribute to their future careers.

1.5 The LSBU Educational Framework prepares students to enter graduate-level work; to adapt successfully to changes during their careers, and to lead progress in their professions, practices and industries. It:
- is directly informed by employers and professional, statutory and regulatory bodies (PSRBs)
- provides specialist facilities and scheduled time to develop and practice vocational knowledge and skills
- offers structured support to help students develop confidence and networks, and to communicate their aspirations and abilities to future employers
- includes a work placement, internship or professional experience opportunity for every undergraduate student
- takes place in a flexible and supportive environment, focussed on students' success.

1.6 This paper outlines the proposed next steps for developing and embedding the LSBU Educational Framework across the university curriculum portfolio.

2. Implementing the LSBU Educational Framework

2.1 The responsibility for successfully embedding the LSBU Educational Framework falls across a number of academic and professional services teams in the university including:

- Course Directors and Course Teams
- Deans and Directors of Education and Student Experience
- Student Support and Employment
- Teaching Quality and Enhancement
- Centre for Research Informed Teaching (CRIT)
- Research Enterprise and Innovation
- Human Resources including Organisational Development

It is proposed that a project to enable collaboration across these functions will facilitate a joined up approach to the curricula and extra-curricular employability provision at a university level.

2.2 An explicit and coherent articulation of the university offer in relation to developing student employability is fundamental to the success of the framework. It is understood that the transition from study to employment is not about the ability to define a set of skills that students possess but a complex and ongoing identity project. It is important to be able to explain to students the knowledge, understanding, skills and wider attributes they are developing during their studies at LSBU and how they apply beyond the course or university. Developing the capacity of LSBU graduates to provide specific and integrative accounts of their employability is essential because it is recognised that a "graduates' success and overall efficacy in the job market is likely to rest on the extent to which they can establish positive identities and modes of being that allow them to act in meaningful and productive ways" in their future careers and lives.[1]

2.3 Students therefore need to develop as an outcome of study the capacity to define, evidence and communicate their graduate identity effectively to others.[2] The embedding of LSBU Educational Framework will support students to locate their academic and work-related experiences while at LSBU into a clear account of their employability that allows them both to describe and provide warrants for their claims as graduates.

2.4 The framework is also based on the principle that the workplace is not simply a context for the application of knowledge generated in universities. The importance of work-integrated learning opportunities in all curricula, the availability of part-time provision for those students already in employment and

---

[1] Tomlinson, M. (2012) Graduate Employability: A review of conceptual and empirical themes, *Higher Education Policy*, 25: 407–431 (p. 425).

[2] Holmes, L. (2013) Competing perspectives on graduate employability: possession, position or process?, *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(4): 538-554.

the role of employers in the co-design of LSBU curricula within the framework all foreground the validity of the workplace as a context for learning and the mutuality of the relationship between LSBU and employers.

2.5 Operationalising the framework, therefore, is reliant on the successful coordination of academic and professional teams as well as student, alumni and employer input to create a seamless and consistent environment for the development and communication of the employability of, and by, LSBU graduates to prospective employers in a changing job market.

2.6 It is proposed that the LSBU Educational Framework will be embedded through:

- up-to-date, industry- and research-informed curricula content that reflects current subject knowledge and driven by relevant disciplinary, interdisciplinary and interprofessional real-world questions and challenges
- learning opportunities for the development of discipline-, industry- and profession-specific skilful practices in context
- support for the development of student "perceived employability" or "meta-work" skills including job search capabilities, professional networking and how their skills, attributes and experiences map to labour market opportunities
- a range of appropriate work-integrated learning experiences with support to reflect critically on learning gained through internships, employment and simulated work contexts
- co-design of curricula, in collaboration with employers and alumni, to include authentic workplace case studies, simulations and modes of assessment
- continuing professional development of academic staff in relation to teaching, learning and assessment for employability and workplace shadowing and exchanges.

2.7 In line with other UK universities, these elements of the framework will be underpinned by the definition of university level graduate attributes that can be translated, mapped and operationalised at the course level. The university graduate attributes will be developed out of the LSBU Behavioural Values: Excellence, Professionalism, Integrity, Inclusivity and Creativity.

2.8 The interrelationship between all elements of the LSBU Educational Framework is illustrated in Figure 1. For example, the currency and applied nature of the curriculum subject matter is dependent on employer input into the curriculum and up-to-date academic staff understanding of relevant profession(s) or industry. Similarly, student capabilities in relation to their self-efficacy and resilience, central to their capacity for effective career management, are dependent on

appropriate opportunities to undertake, reflect on and communicate the outcomes of workplace experiences.

Figure 1: Operationalising the LSBU Educational Framework

2.9 It is noted that there are a number of initiatives aligned to developing student employability already in place at a university, school and division level. This includes:

- the enterprise curriculum offer by Student Enterprise
- the Employability Service in Student Support and Employment including internships and support related to DLHE survey results

It is important that these different strands of activity inform the development of the LSBU Educational Framework and that the development of graduate attributes and related curriculum and staff continuing professional development activity is supportive of this established work and does not lead to duplication of effort.

3. LSBU Educational Framework Project Objectives

3.1 It is proposed that the project will have the following objectives:

- to define the LSBU graduate attributes and work with course teams to translate and map attributes at the course level

- to coordinate and join up curricula and extra-curricular activity and academic and professional services functions to enhance the development of an holistic approach to graduate employability
- to facilitate employer, student and alumni engagement in the co-design and delivery of curricula
- to establish continuing professional development for academic staff to support the embedding of the LSBU Educational Framework in the curriculum
- to promote the LSBU Educational Framework to staff, students, alumni and employers as a coherent and distinctive offer for the development of graduate employability

4. Project implementation and key milestones

4.1 Working in partnership with academic and professional services staff, employers and students, it is proposed that the project to embed the LSBU Educational Framework will commence in autumn 2016 and close in autumn 2018.

4.2 A project steering group will oversee the development of the full implementation plan and monitor progress and deliverables against the stated project objectives. It is proposed that the steering group membership will include representation from stakeholders as stated in paragraph 2.1 above and will report to the SEC.

4.3 To date, the CRIT is progressing a curriculum development scheme to disburse funding for cross-School collaborative projects related to the embedding of the LSBU Educational Framework into the curriculum. The call for applications for funding will be launched in October 2016 for pilot projects to run in semester 2. In addition, the CRIT has submitted an application for a graduate intern to support the first phase of disciplinary mapping of university graduate attributes at course level.

4.4 Year 1 milestones are:
- university graduate attributes defined through employer, alumni and student focus groups
- volunteer pilot courses working with the university graduate attributes to evidence the process of translating university attributes into course level outcomes with input from employers as course co-designers
- exemplars of learning, teaching and assessment for developing student employability as outputs from the LSBU Educational Framework curriculum development funding scheme
- piloted continuing professional development offer related to, for example, authentic, industry/profession relevant assessment, work-integrated learning and graduate attributes

4.5 Year 2 milestones are:

- all undergraduate and postgraduate courses can be mapped to the university graduate attributes in a form that is accessible for staff, students and employers
- development of resources, tools and workshop programme to support mapping of course level attributes and teaching, learning and assessment for employability
- articulation of the LSBU Educational Framework as a distinctive and coherent curricula and extra-curricular offer to prospective and current students and employers

4.6 The project will include an evaluation process to capture and evidence the value and long-term impact of the proposed interventions for staff, students, employers and other stakeholders.

This page is intentionally left blank

	PAPER NO:
Paper title:	Collaborative and transnational education
Board/Committee	Academic Board
Date of meeting:	2 November 2016
Author:	Paul Ivey, PVC Research / Shân Wareing, PVC Education and Student Experience
Purpose:	To inform Academic Board of the first Academic Audit pilot, and the establishment of a role of Academic Director for Collaborative Partnerships

To ask Academic Board to support a full review of the LSBU approach to collaborative provision and action plan for the next meeting of the Board. |

Executive Summary

Context The paper includes a pilot report from the new academic audit process on LSBU's approach to collaborative provision, and the role description for a new Academic Director for Collaborative Partnerships.

1. In relation to quality and standards we engage strategically with collaborative partners, including UK and transnational partners, developing relationships based on their strategic importance to LSBU and on LSBU's long term plans for the relationship.

2. Our accrediting relationship - i.e. that relating to academic quality and standards - is essential. Transnational Education (TNE) in particular has been established in the sector as often entailing greater risks and is therefore can be expected to be an early area for scrutiny. There have been notable and public issues with the standards and quality of transnational education quality problems in the past, including some with our current partners:

   https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/egyptian-joint-venture-falters/401584.article

   http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/ReviewsAndReports/Documents/Loughborough%20University/Loughborough-University-IA-08.pdf (para 51)

3. Academic Board previously agreed to implement an academic audit process to support the university's approach to quality enhancement, and the Director of Quality Enhancement has implemented this with effect from 2016/7. Collaborative relationships (UK and TNE) was identified as the first area to pilot the audit process and an initial report is appended.

4. It is proposed that the Pro Vice-Chancellor Research & External Engagement and the Pro Vice-Chancellor Education and Student Experience bring to the next meeting of Academic Board proposals for taking forwards our collaborative provision while securing our reputation and brand. It is anticipated that the proposals will take into account the appended academic audit report and include explicit procedures, which may include the following:
   - Regularly review LSBU's financial and quality due diligence reports, and update these if necessary.
   - Clarify the fit between LSBU and the partner's academic quality regulations and articulate and explain any variations.
   - Establish that the collaborative partner has procedures to enact their regulations and clarify how they will report to us on their annual quality cycle.
   - Implement audits to check the procedures and regulations are being followed.
   - Identify the advice and access to the quality processes LSBU will provide to collaborative partners, e.g. concerning threshold qualifications for teaching staff, Continuing Professional Development and HEA accreditation of teaching staff; use of statistical analysis of student data; use of student experience questionnaires.

- Specification of the support we will provide for existing and planned activity, particularly in terms of relationships with link tutors and Deans. In anticipation of the requirements in this area, the role of an Academic Director for Collaborative Partnerships has been established (see appended role description), reporting to the PVC Education and Student Experience. Dr Mandy Maidment has been seconded to the role w.e.f. October 2016.

5. It is anticipated the PVCs' review will include the financial model with the expectations of recommending an amendment to the budget allocation in 2016/7 to:
   - ensure that we can allocate the LSBU resource to the partnership required to secure our reputation
   - ensure the relationship doesn't leave us up of pocket (for example, some partnerships have been closed down due to non-payment)
   - consider whether areas of activity beyond accreditation should be costed separately/additionally.

6. The PVCs will develop a full action plan including the requirement for improved video conferencing facilities which would be expected to reduce the cost and time commitment of transnational travel.

7. Academic Board is asked to

7.1 **Affirm** that in relation to collaborative activity we are committed to ensuring that:

   (1) standards are satisfactorily maintained

   (2) the student experience is sufficiently equivalent to the LSBU experience, e.g. in relation to employability integrated into the curriculum and supported in extracurricular provision.

   (3) we are confident that a quality audit or whistleblowing incident would not negatively affect LSBU's reputation and ability to recruit students and establish future partnerships.

7.2 **Approve** the proposal that the two PVCs bring a full report and action plan to the next meeting of Academic Board.

Academic Audit 2016 - Collaborative Provision

Executive Summary

Introduction

The purpose of academic audit is to provide a periodic check on a specific area of the University's academic framework. Areas selected may include a specific academic mechanism or specific academic discipline. Academic audit is designed to run alongside the University's quality assurance mechanisms, complimenting them but not replacing them.

The area of provision selected for this audit is the University's collaborative provision. This was selected due to both the changes within the University with the move from Faculties to Schools, and also because of the University's shift in emphasis to grow its academic collaborations, most noticeably with the British University in Egypt.

The audit considered the University's processes for collaborative provision, and how these are put into practice within the individual schools and within each collaboration. The audit uses as a benchmark a number of resources, most noticeably *QAA's Quality Code for Higher Education Chapter B10* and the *IU's International Partnerships - a Legal Guide for UK Universities*.

Overarching observations

In light of the recent changes in the University's collaborative provision including for example the significant growth of provision with BUE, an update, made readily available, on the University's strategic **approach** in this area of work would support staff in the pursuit and effective management of collaborations. While there is evidence that the University is committed to this area of work, and staff are aware of this commitment, there is less clarity on what the overarching approach is to fulfil this commitment.

Staff would benefit from clarity in relation to **deployment** of roles with regards collaborations. There are two points here. Greater clarity should be provided as to how the work of collaborations is coordinated, in particular but not exclusive to larger collaborations that offer multiple programmes. Secondly, and there is work taking place on this already, clarity should then also be sought on specific roles of teams and individuals, both central University teams and in the schools. It is evident that staff from across the University are engaged in seeking to make the process work, but would benefit from more targeted guidance in particular in relation to management of collaborations. Templates and guidance documents in relation to collaborative provision are comprehensive, however they are due an overarching review to ensure they are accurate and fit for purpose in light of the University's new approach to collaborative work.

University engagement in the **review** of collaborations once they have been set up is far less evident. There is an acknowledgement amongst staff of these risks, however monitoring, review and evaluation of the collaborations is left largely to the individual schools or just the link tutor. This poses academic, financial, legal and reputational risks to the University, as well as potential missed opportunities to expand on successful collaborations. Specific examples of risk include whether students are inducted to LSBU systems, and how academic standards remain equivalent for franchise courses across different locations.

The lack of a thorough review process being put into action, coupled with the difficulty in accessing information, means there is a missed opportunity to effectively analyse and **improve** the University's collaborative offer. In regards information, for example guidance documents and a register of collaborations, it is not always easy to find and can be outdated. In some cases the guidance documents are repeated across LSBU systems and present different versions, and the register is difficult to use. Making these more accessible and relevant will support staff and the University's ability to evaluate this area of work.

Summary of Findings

	Positive aspects	Areas for development
Approach What objectives is the institution trying to achieve and on what basis does it set the objectives?	A clear commitment to increase and improve collaborative activity as part of the wider internationalisation approach adopted by the university.	Increase staff and university understanding of what the objectives are in relation to developing and managing collaborative activity.
Deployment How does the institution go about achieving its objectives?	Processes, although old, are thorough and recognise the risk attached to collaborative activity. Staff at all levels, in both schools and central teams, demonstrate commitment to achieving successful outcomes in this area of work, at the same time recognising the level of risk the work poses.	Review processes and guidance, including the roles of individual staff, to reflect the changing approach of the university to its collaborative provision. Clarify how this area of work is coordinated in order to provide support and guidance to staff and the university in the development and monitoring of collaborative activity.
Review How does the institution measure achievement of		Ensure processes for review of collaborations (at course and institution

its objectives and what evidence is there that the objectives are being achieved?		level) and the university's portfolio of collaborations, are fit for purpose and put into practice.
Improve What processes are in place for evaluation and improvement?	The implementation of initiatives in recognition of the increased work the University is doing in this area, for example with the introduction of the link tutor forum.	Provide a forum to evaluate the effectiveness of the collaborations, both individually and collectively, to enable the enhancement of the university's work in this area. Establish effective systems for maintaining information relating to collaborations, including up to date processes, guidance and a database of the University's collaborative activity.

Role Description for *Academic Director for Collaborative Partnerships*

<u>Rational</u>

The academic relationship between London South Bank University (LSBU) with British University Egypt (BUE) is evolving as a complex matrix between individual School responsibilities while still necessitating an oversight at Institutional level. For the reputation of LSBU it is important that this relationship is maintained at both School and Institutional level. This paper makes a proposal about how this can be achieved.

Currently there is an element of provision that is already validated and being delivered in Egypt for which oversight of academic quality and standards must be maintained. This is in addition to the already planned for growth for new courses and this differs fundamentally from other growth initiatives that the BUE/LSBU partnership might have identified across the four pillars that define the relationship. The taught provision of both the UG and PG provision that leads to an LSBU award needs nurture, development and maintenance so that LSBU can assure itself that the integrity of the awards it makes are protected.

This proposal suggests that a new role can be created that will sit within Teaching Quality and Enhancement reporting to the PVC SE&E that will provide the academic support role required to maintain confidence in the relationship initially with BUE and consequently with other established partners. The new role of *Academic Director for Collaborative Partnerships* will primarily be supported by AQE but will be able to draw on additional support from CRIT. The *Academic Director for Collaborative Partnerships* will provide BUE a first point of contact in academic matters. It is further suggested that any future developmental activities may need to do so through other contacts at LSBU as it is imperative that we keep our business interactions separate from our academic matters.

Proposal

The role of *Academic Director for Collaborative Partnerships* will be filled by a secondee from existing LSBU staff. The secondment period will last for two years part time with a review of role occurring during the second year of the arrangement. The secondee will become a member of the Quality and Standards Committee for the duration of the secondment and will therefore be able to develop, use protocols that are associated with the BUE partnership and report on the requirements of LSBU quality assurance mechanisms, alongside other collaborative arrangements with other partners. This will provide a level of scrutiny above School level (which will still be necessary) in providing the Institutional assurance required of this and other complex partnership(s).

It is suggested the role will be seconded to Teaching Quality and Enhancement reporting to the PVC E & S E for two days a week in semester one year 2016-17. In the second semester of the 2016-17 year it is suggested that this increases to three days a week and in the first semester of 2017-18 year that this increases again to account for the review /development of other partnerships before decreasing to three days a week in the final semester of 2017-18.

The reason for the part time nature of the role is that it is suggested that maintaining an academic profile within the host School is important for this role to be successful demonstrating the academic integrity with other academics both at LSBU and at BUE that the post holder will have to liaise with. If at any time this is considered to present a conflict of interest at the subject level for example at a validation event then a suitable replacement for that activity will be found most likely from either the Director of AQE or Director of CRIT.

Job role descriptor

The areas of responsibility will include:

- Oversight for the logistics of exam boards
    - Operational details
    - Development of the LSBU exam board chairs
    - Development of moderation procedures
    - Review of the alignment of the BUE regulations with LSBU
- Co-ordination of external examiners
    - Transitional arrangements from LU to LSBU
    - Appointment of new external examiners in conjunction with the relevant Schools
    - Induction and training
    - Review of the action planning and responding to external examiners comments (co-ordination of actions over and above from Schools)
    - Aligning the BUE assessment calendar with LSBU
- Management of the link-tutor scheme
    - Liaison with individual School Deans
    - Development of link- tutor role including the appropriate training and support and taking the chair of the link tutor forum
    - Development of a link tutor JD, handbook, appointment procedures and ways of dealing with link tutors resigning form the role
    - Review of the existing link tutors to check the areas of coverage meet LSBU needs
- Support for validation processes

- Working with AQE to support BUE/LSBU colleagues as new courses are suggested and working with CRIT to make sure that course development opportunities are supported through to successful validation.

- Supervising the extension of the existing CP master sheet as held in the APU that will include further course details including when reviewed, who the link tutor is and who the external examiner is.

In addition, there is likely to be increasing demand from BUE to have PG provision validated and consequently the PG regulations will need reviewing and aligning against LSBU academic regulations. There are further staff development opportunities especially around learning and teaching, in developing good learning outcomes, and around assessment design.

This page is intentionally left blank

	CONFIDENTIAL
Paper title:	Responses to points raised at 2015 meetings of the Honorary Awards Joint Committee
Board/Committee	Academic Board
Date of meeting:	2 November 2016
Author:	Michael Simmons, Director of Strategic Stakeholder Engagement
Purpose:	Decision
Recommendation:	The Board is requested to approve the award criteria.

Executive Summary

The Committee is asked to approve the Award Criteria set out in the paper.

This page is intentionally left blank

Responses to points raised by Honorary Awards Joint Committee 10 December 2015

In response to Point 8 from the Minutes of the Meeting – Conferring of Honorary Fellowships:

"The Committee discussed the current criteria for the award of Honorary Fellowships and agreed that the conditions for making an award and the way in which the University would engage with Fellows should be reviewed. It was agree that the Director Strategic Stakeholder Engagement would provide a one page position paper"

Honorary Fellowships are conferred based on the recipient's "exceptional services to the University". The Committee is seeking further clarification on how we might define "exceptional services" and how this might also demonstrate the nominee's upholding of the principles of LSBU.

To inform the recommendations set out below we have reviewed the honorary award criteria and processes used at 10 other UK universities and considered these in relation to LSBU awards. This review included: Aberystwyth, Anglia Ruskin, Essex, Exeter, Kings College, Lincoln, Newcastle, QML, SOAS, Sussex and UCL.

The Recommendation is that the following Criteria are adopted:

Award Criteria

Honorary Degrees

LSBU may award Honorary Degrees (Honoris Causa) to recognise individuals who have made an outstanding contribution to scholarship in an area relevant to a particular LSBU School. This would usually be considered as showing international standing within their field.

Honorary Fellowships

LSBU may award Honorary Fellowships to recognise individuals who have

   a) made an exceptional contribution to the University
   b) made an exceptional contribution to the University's local or regional community

We define an exceptional contribution to the University as support which goes substantially beyond what might reasonably be expected in the context of their relationship to the University. This is likely to vary depending on the relationship of the individual to the University but should show a significant impact on the

University's ability to deliver its objectives or benefits for the University's key stakeholders.

<u>DUniv</u>

LSBU may award DUniv to recognise individuals who have:

a) made an exceptional contribution in an area or field related to the interests of the University
b) attained distinction in the arts, literature, sport or public life
c) attained distinction professionally or in some other way in a field related to areas of study represented in the University

<u>Eligibility</u>

An honorary award will not normally be conferred on:

- a serving member of the Board of Governors
- a current employee or student of the University
- a 'serving politician' including: Members of Parliament; Front bench members of the House of Lords; Other leading active members of a political party; Persons in similar positions in other countries.

However, honorary awards may be made to: Back-bench members of the House of Lords even if affiliated to a political party; An 'elder statesman' or person retired from high Ministerial office who is unlikely to hold a Cabinet office position again even if they remain a Member of Parliament; Serving Heads of State.

<u>Other points to take into account</u>

1. There should preferably be some connection, whether academic, professional or personal, between the awardee and the University or its geographic area. This may be local residence, former membership of the University, or sympathy with the mission or stakeholders of the University. Evidence of prior engagement with the University will also be taken into account;
2. The University will consider the conferment of an honorary award to someone who already possesses such awards from other UK institutions, dependent on the number of previous awards.
3. In making awards, the University aims for a reasonable balance between the Schools. It also aims at a gender and ethnicity balance.
4. The University does not normally accept a re-nomination after two previous unsuccessful attempts, unless there has been a long interval since the previous nomination and there is a significant change in the case being put forward.
5. Honorary awards (Degrees and Fellowships) are not mutually exclusive, although instances where both awards are made to the same individual are expected to be rare.

6. Fellowships and doctorates are of equal standing but awarded in recognition of different kinds of contribution.
7. DUniv recipients are entitled to use the letters DU LSBU (Hon.) after their name and may be referred to as Dr, but this must always be in conjunction with "(Hon.)" after the surname.
8. LSBU will normally make up to 8 honorary awards of each year
9. All nominations for honorary awards must be treated with the strictest of confidence. There must be no contact with the nominee prior to the nomination being considered by the Honorary Awards Committee.
10. The University will solicit nominations for honorary awards from Staff, Alumni (or alumni consultative group), Students, the Board of Governors. Where a member of the Awards Committee nominates they must declare an interest and take no part in the formal determination of that candidate
11. The Board of Governors may revoke the award of an honorary degree if good reasons have been clearly demonstrated.

Expectations of Awardees

The University welcomes continued engagement with its Honorary Graduates and Fellows to enrich the life of the University and experience of students. It is expected that the recipient of an award will usually:

(a) address the congregation at the Graduation Ceremony at which their award is conferred

(b) be prepared to be involved in University events or promotional activities

(c) be an ambassador for the University

This page is intentionally left blank

	CONFIDENTIAL
Paper title:	Academic KPIs
Board/Committee	Academic Board
Date of meeting:	2 November 2016
Author:	John Baker, Corporate & Business Planning Manager
Purpose:	Discussion
Recommendation:	The Board is requested to identify ways in which Schools can contribute and/or respond to KPIs, or University initiatives which might be undertaken to support the delivery of the KPIs.

As part of the University strategy and Corporate Delivery Plan, a series of KPIs were identified, aiming for 2020; these are important measures against which the Board of Governors is judging the performance of the University.

A significant number of these (1-17 in the attached table) relate directly to academic issues. Clearly, the contribution that each School makes to these targets will vary, but it is important that Local Delivery Plans aim to provide their contribution to the institutional year-on-year performance against these KPIs.

Academic Board is asked to consider how performance against the KPIs can best be used by Schools to inform their academic development, and whether there are University-wide initiatives that should be driven by these KPIs.

This page is intentionally left blank

Outcomes	#	Corporate Strategy Goals	20/20 Success Measures	#	Key Performance Indicators	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	benchmark Competitor Group 12/13 average	Target 2015/16	Forecast RAG rating	Actual Result Rating	Indicator 2016/17	Ambition 2020/21	Exec. Lead	Green	Amber	Red
Student Success	1	Employ-ability	95% students in employment / further study (EPI)	1	DHLE entry to employment or further study (EPI Population)	77.4%	85.5%	90.2%	88.5%	93%	90.4%		94%	95%	PVC (SE)	93 % +	90 - 92 %	<90 %
			Top 10 UK universities for student start ups	2	Number of Student start ups	6	1	30	47.86	50	50		80	150	PVC (R&E)	50 +	43 - 49	< 42
	2	Student Experience	Top quartile of all universities in NSS	3	NSS scores – overall satisfaction	82%	80%	82%	81.7%	84%		82%	86%	89%	DVC	84 % +	81 - 83 %	< 81 %
				4	International Student barometer (% recommending LSBU)	73.00%	72.40%		not available	75%		77.0%	78%	81%		75% +	71 - 74 %	< 71 %
				5	PGT experience (% satisfaction)	75%	77%	74%	not available	77%		74%	80%	82%		77 % +	74- 76 %	< 74 %
				6	Student Staff Ratio	24.2:1	17.2:1	16.4:1	21.2	17:5	17.4:1		17:5	18:1		<=17.5	17.5 - 18.5	> 18.5
Real World Impact	3	Teaching and Learning	Top 50% of universities for graduate employment / starting salaries.	7	Graduate level employment (EPI Population)	56%	49%	68%	n/a (local indicator)	77%	76%		78%	80%	PVC (SE)	77 % +	72 - 76 %	<72 %
	4	Research and Enterprise	Top 50% UK for Research & Enterprise Income	8	Research Income (non Hefce)	£2.2m	£1.8	£2.0m	£6.1	£2.2	£1.9m		2.75m	£6.0 m		£2.2 m +	£2.05 - 2.15 m	<£2.05 m
				9	Enterprise Income	£8.5m	£9.4m	£8.7m	not available	£10.2	£8.7m		12m	£15.0 m		£10.2 m +	£9.7 - 10.1 m	<£9.7 m
Access to Opportunity	5	Access	Top London Modern for LPN recruitment	10	% recruitment from low participation neighbourhoods	7.3%	7.4%	7.7%	6.4%	8.0%		8.4%	8.2%	9.0%	PVC (R&E)	8.0% +	7 - 7.9 %	<7 %
				11	FT UG recruitment pre-clearing applicant %	68.0%	76.0%	79.2%	not available	80.0%	78.4%		81%	90%		80% +	76 - 79 %	< 75 %
				12	First Degree Completion (at or above benchmark)	-6.7%	-9.5%	-7 %	-3.13%	-4%		-5.8%	0%	+3%		>=-4 %	-5 to -7 %	<-8 %
			Exceed expectations on completion	13	Year 1 progression	70.1%	69.1%	69.5%	not available	75%	71.9%		78%	85%	DVC	75 % +	72 - 74 %	<72%
				14	Good Honours		61.0%	61.2%	62.2%	60 - 65%			60 - 65%	60 - 65%		60 % +	58 - 59 %	<58 %
				15	PG completion	67.1%	54.8%	61.5%	not available	70%			80%	85%		70% +	66 - 69 %	< 66 %
	6	International	4 QS Stars	16	QS Star Rating	n/a	2 (prov.)	3 stars	not available	3		3	3	4	VC	3	2	1
				17	Overseas student income	£8.8m	£8.5m	£10.6m	£29.5m	£10.9	£8.8m		14m	20m	PVC (R&E)	£10.9 m +	£10.3 - 10.8 m	<£10.3 m
Strategic Enablers	7	People and Organisation	Rated as a good employer	18	Appraisal completion %	28%	37%	90%	not available	95%			95%	95%	EDHR	95 % +	90 - 94 %	< 90 %
				19	Average Engagement Score as %	58%	-		70%	55%		58%	60%	75%	EDHR	55%	51 - 54 %	< 51 %
	8	Resources and Infrastructure	Grow our income by 25% to £170m annually, deliver an operating surplus of 5% and an EBITDA margin of 15%	20	Surplus as % of income	4.0%	2.3%	0.9%	9.6%	0.7%	2.4%		0.68%	5.0%	CFO	0.7 % +	0.4 - 0.6 %	< 0.4%
				21	Income (£m)	£137.9m	£134.8m	£140.8m	£188.2m	£142.8m	£138.2		£147.3m	£170.0m		£142.8 m +	£137 - 142 m	< £137 m
				22	EBITDA margin (EBITDA expressed as % of income)	12.6%	11.4%	9.2%	9.20%	11.5%	11.8%		11.1%	15.0%		11.5% +	11.1 - 11.4 %	<11.1%
			Student satisfaction with facilities & environment in top UK quartile	23	Student satisfaction ratings with facilities & environment	80.0%	83.0%	87.7%	82.7%	88.5%		90%	89%	90%	COO	88 % +	85 - 87 %	< 85%
				24	Teaching room utilisation rate	23%	22%	21%	not available	25%		21%	30%	48%		25% +	22 - 24 %	<22%
League Tables		Overall	Top London Modern university (excl UAL)	25	TIMES - League table ranking	118/121	122/123	120 / 127	92.3	115		120 / 128	110	80	VC	115 or higher	116 - 119	120 or lower
				26	GUARDIAN – League table ranking	113/119	112/116	111 / 119	87.1	100		107/119	96	86		100 or higher	101 - 106	107 or lower
				27	COMPLETE UNIVERSITY GUIDE – League table ranking	119/124	120/123	119 / 126	85	115		115 / 127	110	93		115 or higher	116 - 119	120 or lower

Report Date: 5th October 2016

This page is intentionally left blank

	CONFIDENTIAL
Paper title:	2016 NSS Presentation
Board/Committee:	Academic Board
Date of meeting:	2 November 2016
Author:	Richard Duke, Head of Planning, Performance and Assurance
Purpose:	Information

Executive Summary

An appraisal of LSBU's 2016 NSS performance compared to the sector, and 2015 considering variations in performance in degree type and in various schools.

This page is intentionally left blank

2016 NSS Presentation

Quality & Standards Committee
5th October 2016

Become what you want to be

London
South Bank
University

EST 1892

NSS Headlines – Comparing 2015 with 2016

- Overall, sector didn't move, however, LSBU saw a slight decrease in scores against overall satisfaction and organisation and management.

- Against aspirational average, LSBU shows an average performance. However the trend amongst the aspirational group was a decline in overall satisfaction.

- Discrepancy between first degree and other undergraduate students results at LSBU. At first degree level, LSBU actually saw an improvement against five of the seven categories.

- LSBU displays significant variation in result between schools, when school results are compared to subject specific results.

Become what you want to be

London South Bank University

EST 1892

LSBU Overall performance compared to England and Sector: % agree scores

Category	London South Bank University			England			Sector		
Metric	% Agree	% Agree: previous year	% Change	% Agree	% Agree: previous year	% Change	% Agree	% Agree: previous year	% Change
The teaching on my course	83	83	0	87	87	0	87	87	0
Assessment and feedback	71	71	0	74	74	0	73	73	0
Academic support	77	77	0	82	82	0	82	82	0
Organisation and management	71	72	-1	79	79	0	79	79	0
Learning resources	89	88	1	86	86	0	87	87	0
Personal development	84	84	0	82	83	-1	83	83	0
Overall Satisfaction	81	82	-1	85	86	-1	86	86	0
I am satisfied with the Students' Union	65	65	0	68	68	0	69	69	0

Become what you want to be

London South Bank University

EST 1892

Aspirational Group Comparison

Aspirational Group - All Students

Question Area	Sector-wide			London South Bank University			Kingston University			Middlesex University			The City University			The University of Westminster			University of East London			University of Greenwich			University of Hertfordshire		
	2015	2016	+/-	2015	2016	+/-	2015	2016	+/-	2015	2016	+/-	2015	2016	+/-	2015	2016	+/-	2015	2016	+/-	2015	2016	+/-	2015	2016	+/-
The teaching on my course	87	87	0	83	83	0	82	79	-3	83	83	0	88	86	-2	79	79	0	81	85	4	84	82	-2	86	85	-1
Assessment and feedback	73	74	1	71	71	0	69	70	1	74	76	2	76	73	-3	66	67	1	70	75	5	73	72	-1	69	70	1
Academic support	82	82	0	77	77	0	78	77	-1	79	79	0	85	81	-4	73	75	2	74	79	5	80	78	-2	81	80	-1
Organisation and management	79	79	0	72	71	-1	73	74	1	75	76	1	83	82	-1	79	79	0	70	76	6	78	74	-4	72	73	1
Learning resources	86	86	0	88	89	1	85	85	0	87	88	1	88	87	-1	83	86	3	85	88	3	85	83	-2	90	88	-2
Personal development	83	82	-1	84	84	0	81	79	-2	83	83	0	85	83	-2	80	80	0	81	83	2	84	81	-3	85	83	-2
Overall Satisfaction	86	86	0	82	81	-1	82	80	-2	83	83	0	87	85	-2	80	81	1	78	83	5	83	83	0	84	82	-2

Aspirational Group - First Degree Students

Question Area	Sector-wide			London South Bank University			Kingston University			Middlesex University			The City University			The University of Westminster			University of East London			University of Greenwich			University of Hertfordshire		
	2015	2016	+/-	2015	2016	+/-	2015	2016	+/-	2015	2016	+/-	2015	2016	+/-	2015	2016	+/-	2015	2016	+/-	2015	2016	+/-	2015	2016	+/-
The teaching on my course	87	87	0	83	84	1	82	79	-3	83	83	0	88	86	-2	79	79	0	81	85	4	85	82	-3	86	85	-1
Assessment and feedback	73	73	0	70	71	1	69	70	1	74	76	2	76	73	-3	65	67	2	70	75	5	73	72	-1	69	70	1
Academic support	82	82	0	76	77	1	78	77	-1	79	79	0	85	81	-4	73	75	2	74	80	6	80	78	-2	81	80	-1
Organisation and management	79	79	0	71	72	1	73	74	1	75	76	1	83	82	-1	79	79	0	70	76	6	78	74	-4	73	74	1
Learning resources	86	87	1	88	90	2	85	86	1	87	88	1	88	87	-1	84	86	2	85	88	3	85	83	-2	90	89	-1
Personal development	83	82	-1	84	84	0	81	79	-2	83	82	-1	85	83	-2	80	79	-1	81	83	2	84	81	-3	85	83	-2
Overall Satisfaction	86	86	0	82	82	0	82	80	-2	83	83	0	88	85	-3	79	81	2	78	83	5	83	83	0	84	82	-2

Become what you want to be

London South Bank University

EST 1892

LSBU Results by First Degree and Other Undergraduate

NSS Metric	First Degree			Other Undergraduate			Overall		
	2016	2015	%+/-	2016	2015	%+/-	2016	2015	%+/-
The teaching on my course	84	83	1	77	85	-8	83	83	0
Assessment and feedback	71	70	1	72	75	-3	71	71	0
Academic support	77	76	1	79	82	-3	77	77	0
Organisation and management	72	71	1	65	78	-13	71	72	-1
Learning resources	90	88	2	87	87	0	89	88	1
Personal development	84	84	0	78	79	-1	84	84	0
Overall Satisfaction	82	82	0	76	85	-9	81	82	-1
Student Union Satisfaction	65	65	0	73	66	7	65	65	0

Become what you want to be

London South Bank University

EST 1892

LSBU 2016 School Results

Question (area):	Applied Sciences	Arts & Creative Industries	Built Environment & Architecture	Business	Engineering	Health & Social Care	Law & Social Sciences
The teaching on my course	-6.5	4.3	-4.6	8.6	-6.0	-7.3	3.7
1. Staff are good at explaining things.	-3.7	3.9	-4.2	8.0	-7.4	-8.6	1.5
2. Staff have made the subject interesting.	-5.7	2.7	-3.7	10.1	-6.0	-9.4	4.8
3. Staff are enthusiastic about what they are teaching.	-8.8	5.2	-4.6	6.6	-5.4	-6.0	2.4
4. The course is intellectually stimulating.	-7.3	6.6	-6.1	9.1	-5.6	-4.2	5.4
Assessment and feedback	-10.3	5.2	0.8	8.1	-5.6	-8.3	9.1
5. The criteria used in marking have been clear in advance.	-12.6	5.7	-0.9	6.2	-3.9	-4.0	11.2
6. Assessment arrangements and marking have been fair.	-9.0	-1.3	-4.5	7.0	-4.9	-11.2	7.6
7. Feedback on my work has been prompt.	-18.1	4.5	8.2	3.6	-6.9	-7.5	10.3
8. I have received detailed comments on my work.	-6.8	8.4	1.0	9.1	-7.2	-10.3	4.9
9. Feedback on my work has helped me clarify things I did not understand.	-5.2	7.1	0.3	13.8	-4.6	-8.6	10.0
Academic support	-3.8	4.8	-6.1	4.6	-7.7	-11.6	3.5
10. I have received sufficient advice and support with my studies.	-1.1	5.4	-5.2	8.0	-8.9	-9.5	4.6
11. I have been able to contact staff when I needed to.	-7.8	5.4	-9.7	-0.9	-4.7	-10.7	-1.9
12. Good advice was available when I needed to make study choices.	-3.1	4.3	-3.8	8.4	-9.4	-12.9	7.1
Organisation and management	-5.8	5.4	-8.0	6.0	-8.4	-13.2	1.9
13. The timetable works efficiently as far as my activities are concerned.	-3.4	5.7	-7.3	8.3	-8.2	-8.1	3.0
14. Any changes in the course or teaching have been communicated effectively.	-2.6	5.1	-8.2	2.3	-8.8	-15.1	-2.6
15. The course is well organised and is running smoothly.	-10.0	5.7	-8.3	7.9	-8.2	-15.6	4.9
Learning resources	-1.1	4.1	3.0	6.1	-2.8	-0.5	8.8
16. The library resources and services are good enough for my needs.	0.2	-0.5	1.5	5.9	-3.5	1.6	8.5
17. I have been able to access general IT resources when I needed to.	3.1	5.1	4.2	6.0	1.7	-1.8	7.5
18. I have been able to access specialised equipment, facilities or rooms when I needed to.	-6.7	7.8	3.0	7.7	-6.3	-2.4	9.7
Personal development	-3.3	1.2	-2.9	10.4	-2.2	-3.4	5.3
19. The course has helped me to present myself with confidence.	-5.9	-0.3	-0.6	13.0	0.1	-2.3	4.7
20. My communication skills have improved.	-0.7	0.2	-6.4	10.5	-5.3	-3.7	5.9
21. As a result of the course, I feel confident in tackling unfamiliar problems.	-2.7	3.4	-1.6	7.7	-1.3	-3.2	5.4
Overall Satisfaction	-5.3	4.1	-6.7	7.8	-8.4	-6.6	1.4
I am satisfied with the Students' Union (Association or Guild) at my institution	-4.9	2.0	-1.3	9.7	-3.9	-9.3	-4.5

Become what you want to be

London South Bank University

EST 1892

	CONFIDENTIAL
Paper title:	Report on Sub-committees of the Academic Board: • Quality and Standards Committee • Student Experience Committee • Research Committee
Board/Committee	Academic Board
Date of meeting:	2 November 2016
Author:	Relevant committee Chairs
Purpose:	To update the Board on Sub-committee decisions and recommendations.
Recommendation:	The committee is requested to note the reports and approve the recommendations of the Sub-committees. To approve the minutes of the final meetings of the Academic Board Sub-committees.

Summary

A summary of committee agenda is provided for information. Minutes of these meetings are available on request. The Academic Board is requested to note the reports, and approve recommendations to Terms of Reference and membership.

QUALITY AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE

The committee discussed:
- The new environment for quality and standards in HE
- Quality assurance processes and the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF)
- National Student Survey results
- Annual Monitoring
- Validations annual report
- Academic Planning Panel review
- Internal and OIA complaints, 2015-16
- External Examiners' report, 2015-16
- Attainment Gap report
- Exceptional thirds

The committee noted:
- Minutes from School Academic Standards Committees
- Pearson's license (HND/HNC provision)

Recommendations

The committee recommended the following amendments to its Terms of Reference:
- Membership - to invite;
  - Deputy Director, Teaching, Quality and Enhancement
  - Head of Division, Human and Food Sciences
  - Director of Research Informed Teaching

- To amend the wording of the purpose of the committee:
  - Old purpose: "The purpose of the Quality and Standards Committee is to assure the Academic Board that standards of academic delivery meet expectations, to advise on effectiveness and recommend enhancement activity."
  - New purpose: "The purpose of the Quality and Standards Committee is to assure the Academic Board that standards of academic provision meet expectations, to advise on effectiveness of processes and effect enhancement."

STUDENT EXPERIENCE COMMITTEE

The committee discussed:
- Student led projects
- LSBU Educational Framework update
- Student Communications Plan
- Student engagement and changes to withdrawal and course changes
- National Student Survey results

- HEPI student mental health report

Recommendations

The committee recommended the following amendments to its Terms of Reference:
- Membership – to invite:
  - Director of Research Informed Teaching

RESEARCH COMMITTEE

1 The research committee has met three times in the 2015/2016 academic year: 4th November, 10th February and 25th May. In the 2016/2017 academic year the committee was due to meet on the 19th October, however this is now scheduled for 25 October.

2 In November 2015, the committee at its first substantive meeting discussed and agreed their understanding of the committee's purpose, the line reporting from the Research Board of Study, responsibility to the Academic Board and synergy with the Quality and Standards Committee.

3 The approach to REF 2020 was reviewed with a focus on the so-called mini REF process and the intent for this to drive QR allocations in budget setting for 2016/2017. Also noted as important in this development was open communication with academics, impact training and annual statements for both impact and research outputs. The committee discussed the policies on Open Access and Research Data Management in response to HEFCE's mandatory requirement for publications from all staff to be open access after 1 April 2016.

4 The committee reviewed the LSBU Postgraduate Research Experience Survey 2015 and developed a four point action plan to enhance participation and outcome.

5 At the February meeting the committee discussed an update to the REF 2020 (now extended to REF 2021) and the delivery timetable for audits of research and scholarship outputs.

6 In terms of Ph.D study completions the decision to examine the HAPLO software tool to manage student data and progress was taken: this system was subsequently purchased. The Committee noted that there were 17 PhD completions between 1 August 2015 and 10 February 2016. This figure is low when taking into consideration there are approximately 200 PhD students currently enrolled.

7   The Committee noted the Research Board of Study's Membership and Terms of Reference: the purpose of the Board of Study is to support the Committee with oversight of postgraduate research activity and standards.

8   At the May meeting the committee discussed the discussed the Open Access policy noting that the repository was now live, with briefings to schools, support for staff in terms of submitting to the repository and using it, with communications to staff about the Open Access policy.

9   There was an overview of the findings from the mini-REF exercise with a follow-on discussion on research centres and the need for external recognition if these were to be established and that a database of Impact Statements is being developed and the deadline for completion is Autumn 2016.

10 Draft Academic Regulations were presented. It was noted that these were high-level principles, rather than detailed regulations, to be approved by the Academic Board at its meeting of 8 June 2016 for academic year 2016/17.

11 Finally the committee discussed Schools' strategic plans for QR funding, a report on the LSS Moodle site as an exemplar of good practice and a PGR Administration review with recommendations for systems and information, development of research community and environment, supervisor development and international PGR students.

12 The substantive topic for the Research Committee in October 2016 was proposals to strengthen the Research Environment: these flow from the recent operations board strategy session.

13 At its meeting on 25 October 2016, the committee discussed:
    • Annual University Research Audit
    • Developing the Research Environment
    • Research Handbook

Recommendations
The committee recommended adding the Annual University Research Audit to the Terms of Reference.

	CONFIDENTIAL
Paper title:	Board Strategy Day draft report
Board/Committee	Academic Board
Date of meeting:	2 November 2016
Author:	Michael Broadway, Deputy University Secretary and Governance Manager
Purpose:	To update the Board on key outcomes of the Board strategy day of 29 September 2016
Recommendation:	The Board is requested to note the report.

Introduction

As part of its annual plan the Board holds a strategy day twice a year. The following draft notes, subject to approval by the Chair, are a record of the strategy day held on 29 September 2016, which had the sustainability of the University as its theme.

The summary conclusions are:

1. LSBU's overall approach and strategy should be able to underpin the sustainability of the University;

2. That LSBU should not move away from its current growth plans and should continue to focus on delivering income growth of 25% to £170m by 2020, a surplus of 5% and an EBITDA margin of 15% (this is consistent with 12 (c) in the report);

3. The meeting agreed that the executive's focus should be on recruitment and retention. Governors agreed that a core strategic objective should be continued improvement in progression on a school by school basis.

4. In addition to that core activity, that evolutionary growth plans should be developed. There was recognition that non-organic growth may be necessary as well, which could include strategic alliances with education partners.

5. The board agreed that any additional borrowing, which could be sensible for the right proposal, should only be used to fund capital development.

6. The board emphasised the need to continue to boldly market LSBU, given the sector-leading academic facilities, for example the DAR lab and Elephant Studios. The social media presence needed to be understood more.

7. The board agreed that further insight into the student experience would be a helpful topic for a future strategy day.

Joint Board and Academic Board strategy day notes – 29 September 2016
Avonmouth House

Theme – the sustainability of the University

1. The Chair welcomed governors, Academic Board members and Executive members to the meeting.

2. The Chair outlined the purpose of the day was to consider the following question: Is the Board optimistic that the actions being taken by the Executive are sufficient to deliver the agreed strategy?

3. The current corporate strategy was until 2020.

4. The meeting noted the numerous achievements that had been delivered over the past year, including:
    a. Moving up the league tables;
    b. Good financial performance for 2015/16;
    c. New brand was launched;
    d. Quality of data had been improved;
    e. Purchase of Hugh Astor Court unlocking estates development plans;
    f. Position in the top 100 of the Stonewall Workplace Equality Index;
    g. Implemented the academic framework providing defined career progression for academic staff;
    h. Developed sector leading apprenticeship provision, including trailblazing, higher and degree apprenticeships;
    i. The number of student appeals was down by 75%;
    j. The Accounting and the Marketing divisions were in the top 20 in the UK in all categories of the National Student Survey;
    k. Parts of the University were delivering sector leading research;
    l. There were sector leading facilities across the University, including Elephant Studios and the DAR lab; and
    m. The opening of the University Technical College in Brixton and the opening of the sixth form in the Academy.

5. The meeting noted the challenging environment in which the university was operating:
    a. The Higher Education Bill;
    b. Removal of student number cap;
    c. EU referendum result;
    d. Demographic changes; and
    e. Increased competition.

Financial scenarios (session 1)

6. The Chief Financial Officer gave a presentation on financial scenarios. The meeting discussed:
    a. The financial KPIs to 2020 and current forecasts;
    b. Financial scenarios showing a 5% and 10% drop in income; and
    c. Current recruitment figures, which were expected to be off target.

7. Conclusions from the session were that:
    a. Recruitment targets would be missed and that the 2750 target would remain tough;
    b. 2016/17 budget was manageable;
    c. Overall 2020 income target was achievable but stretching;
    d. Need to explore online learning opportunities; and
    e. Improving progression remained vital.

8. The Board requested a strategy on online learning to a Board meeting in early 2017.

9. The meeting discussed borrowing and agreed that any borrowing would only be for recognised capital expenditure to meet clear strategic purposes.

Retention and completion (session 2)

10. The Pro Vice Chancellor (Education and Student Experience) gave a presentation on retention and completion. The 2020 target for year one to year two progression was 85% (in 2014/15 it was 71.9%). The meeting noted the importance of improving retention without comprising quality (a discussion on quality took place in session 4).

11. The meeting noted the actions being taken to improve retention and completion:
    a. Sector leading facilities and equipment in some areas;
    b. Good learning resources;
    c. The floor on entry tariffs had been maintained;
    d. Mentors and coaches from industry for students;
    e. Improving communications to students;
    f. Improving feedback to students; and
    g. Improving support and CPD to lecturers

12. The meeting noted the development of learner analytics which would be launched this academic year.

13. The meeting emphasised the importance of improving retention.

Growth plans (session 3)

14. Growth plans for the Schools were discussed in detail. It was noted that based on market share analysis, there was an opportunity for at least the Schools of Applied Science, Arts and Creative Industries, Business, and Law and Social Sciences to increase student numbers.

15. There is a long-list of potential evolutionary growth initiatives, which all link to education, including:
    a. a polyclinic;
    b. a nursing recruitment agency; and
    c. new courses in HLT (hospitality, leisure and tourism) and fashion.

16. In addition, the introduction of the employers' levy for apprenticeships will provide significant opportunity.

17. The estates re-development plans a conference centre, which could be run by students.

18. If any of these initiatives is successful, then they could significantly increase income and surplus, but in considering them the Board would need carefully to balance risks and opportunities.

Quality assurance and Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) (session 4)

19. The Pro Vice Chancellor (Education and Student Experience) gave a presentation on quality assurance and TEF.

20. The regulatory landscape is changing rapidly and is creating a degree of uncertainty in the HE sector. The new HE & Research bill provides for power to remove DAPs where HEIs do not meet required quality standards. LSBU's quality team have been monitoring the changes very closely.

21. A significant change is the requirement for the governing body to make an annual accountability assurance statement to HEFCE. The board agreed that it would be appropriate for the Audit Committee to review the assurance process within LSBU prior to the board signing-off the annual statement.

22. The Executive would provide assurance to the Board on quality through:

    a. An overview of internal processes that assure standards;

b. A summary of the key findings from the reports, referenced to the appropriate committee (Academic Board, Quality and Standards, Student Experience, Research); and

c. An action plan of how LSBU will continue to improve the student academic experience and student outcomes

23. The conclusion from the session is that growth in student numbers is not possible without academic quality.

Conclusions of the day

24. LSBU's overall approach and strategy should be able to underpin the sustainability of the University;

25. That LSBU should not move away from its current growth plans and should continue to focus on delivering income growth of 25% to £170m by 2020, a surplus of 5% and an EBITDA margin of 15% (this is consistent with 12 (c) in the report);

26. The meeting agreed that the executive's focus should be on recruitment and retention. Governors agreed that a core strategic objective should be continued improvement in progression on a school by school basis.

27. In addition to that core activity, that evolutionary growth plans should be developed. There was recognition that non-organic growth may be necessary as well, which could include strategic alliances with education partners.

28. The board agreed that any additional borrowing, which could be sensible for the right proposal, should only be used to fund capital development.

29. The board emphasised the need to continue to boldly market LSBU, given the sector-leading academic facilities, for example the DAR lab and Elephant Studios. The social media presence needed to be understood more.

30. The board agreed that further insight into the student experience would be a helpful topic for a future strategy day.

Present

Board of Governors:
> Jerry Cope (Chair), Andrew Owen (Vice Chair), Temi Ahmadu (Students' Union President), Steve Balmont, Shachi Blakemore, Michael Cutbill, Douglas Denham St Pinnock, Carol Hui (*until lunch*), Neil Gorman, Hilary McCallion, Mee Ling Ng, Jenny Owen, Tony Roberts, Calvin Usuanlele (Chair of Student Council) and Roy Waight (co-opted member of the Audit Committee).

Additional members of the Academic Board:
> Janet Bohrer, Director of Academic Quality Development Office
> Kirsteen Coupar, Director of Student Services
> Charles Egbu, Dean of Built Environment & Architecture
> Janet Jones, Dean of Arts & Creative Industries
> Raymond Lee, Dean of Applied Sciences
> David Mba, Dean of Engineering
> Mike Molan, Pro Vice Chancellor (Enhancement), Dean of Business
> Shushma Patel, Director of Education and Student Experience, Engineering

Members of the Executive:
> Pat Bailey, Deputy Vice Chancellor
> Mandy Eddolls, Executive Director of Organisational Development and Human Resources
> Richard Flatman, Chief Finance Officer
> Ian Mehrtens, Chief Operating Officer
> James Stevenson, University Secretary & Clerk to the Board of Governors
> Shân Wareing, Pro Vice Chancellor (Education and Student Experience)

With:
> Michael Broadway, Deputy University Secretary

Apologies:
> Stephen Barber, Reader and Programme Manager, Business
> Craig Barker, Dean of Law & Social Science
> Paul Ivey, Pro Vice Chancellor (Research and External Engagement)
> Gurpreet Jagpal, Director of Enterprise
> Kevin McGrath, Independent Governor
> David Phoenix (Vice Chancellor)
> Lesley Roberts, Head of Skills for Learning
> Warren Turner, Dean PVC Health & Social Care

This page is intentionally left blank

	CONFIDENTIAL
Paper title:	Terms of Reference and Annual Business Plan
Board/Committee	Academic Board
Date of meeting:	2 November 2016
Author:	Joe Kelly, Governance Officer
Purpose:	Review
Recommendation:	The committee is requested to review the Terms of Reference and Annual Business Plan.

The committee is required annually to review its Terms of Reference. The committee is also requested to review its Annual Business Plan.

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 5 – Academic Board terms of reference and membership

Academic Board

Terms of Reference

The Academic Board is responsible for academic standards and the direction and regulation of academic matters.

1. Remit

1.1 The remit of the Academic Board is to:

    1.1.1   develop academic strategy and monitor progress against academic key performance indicators

    1.1.2   monitor development of academic portfolio

    1.1.3   oversee the development of the academic environment

    1.1.4   have oversight of academic ethics

    1.1.5   approve academic regulations and oversee their enactment, including for:

        i.   admission of students;
        ii.   granting and annulling of degrees, qualifications and titles;
        iii.   exclusion of students for academic reasons;
        iv.   appointment of internal and external examiners;
        v.   assessment and examination of academic performance of students;
        vi.   character of curricula;
        vii.   quality of courses including validation and accreditation by external bodies; and
        viii.   granting distinctions including honorary degrees and academic titles.

2. Membership

2.1 Membership consists of the following:

Holders of Senior Posts (4)	Vice Chancellor (chair)
	Deputy Vice Chancellor
	PVC Students and Education
	PVC Research and External Engagement
Senior Academic Staff and Professors (8)	Deans (x7)
	Nominated professor (x1)
Academic and Research staff (2)	Nominated academic staff member (x1)
	Nominated research staff member (x1)
Non-teaching staff (4)	Director of Research and Enterprise
	Director of Academic Quality Development
	Director of Student Support and Employability
	Nominated member of professional staff
Technician (1)	Nominated member of technical staff
Students (2)	Students' Union President
	Students' Union Vice President (Academic Affairs)

2.2 A quorum consists of 7 members.

2.3 The term of office of nominated members is three years.

2.4 The Academic Board meets three times per year.

3. Reporting Procedures

3.1 The minutes (or a report) of meetings of the Committee will be circulated to all members of the Board of Governors.

Approved by the Academic Board on 8 July 2015

Approved by the Board of Governors on 9 July 2015

This page is intentionally left blank

Academic Board Annual Business Plan 2015/16

	Nov	Mar	Jun
Academic Board business plan	✓		
Academic KPI's	✓	✓	✓
Academic Regulations			✓
DVC's report	✓	✓	✓
Emeritus professor items			✓
Membership & Terms of Reference	✓		
Monitor changes to academic portfolio	✓	✓	✓
NSS Results	✓		
Sub-committees update report	✓	✓	✓

This page is intentionally left blank