

**Meeting of the Educational Character Committee,
at 4pm* on Wednesday 4 June 2014,
in 1B27, Technopark, London Road, SE1**

* Meeting with the Student Union for committee members at 3pm

A G E N D A

<i>Item</i>	<i>Paper</i>	<i>Presenter</i>
1. Welcome & Apologies		Chair
2. Minutes of the meeting of 12 February 2014 (for publication)	EC.09(14)	Chair
3. Matters Arising		Chair
4. Report on Postgraduate courses (to discuss)	Presentation	PVC(A)
5. HESA performance indicators (to discuss)	EC.10(14)	PVC(A)
6. Annual report on academic misconduct and appeals (to discuss)	EC.11(14)	PVC(A)
8. Annual committee report to the Board (to approve)	EC.12(14)	Chair
9. Annual committee plan (to note)	EC.13(14)	Sec
10. Any Other Business		Chair
11. Date of next meeting – 4pm on Wednesday 3 December 2014		Chair

Members: Douglas Denham St Pinnock (Chair), Steve Balmont, Hilary McCallion and Mee Ling Ng

With: Vice Chancellor, Pro Vice Chancellor (Academic), Executive Dean – Faculty of Arts and Human Sciences, University Secretary and Governance Assistant.

**Meeting with Students' Union
at 3pm on Wednesday 4 June 2014
in 1B27, Technopark, London Road, SE1**

AGENDA

1. Meet Union Trustees; SU President; SU CEO
2. SU Future Development presentation (Steve Baker, CEO)

Attendees from Students' Union:

Steve Baker – CEO

Barbara Ahland – Students' Union President

Ilham Abdishakur – Incoming Students' Union President

Nicola Allen – External Trustee

Theodora Anah – Incoming Student Trustee

Abdi Osman – Incoming Student Experience Officer

Ashley Storer-Smith – Incoming Activities and Employability Officer

	PAPER NO: EC.09(14)	
Board/Committee:	Educational Character Committee	
Date:	4 June 2014	
Paper title:	Minutes of the meeting of 12 February 2014	
Author:	James Stevenson, University Secretary and Clerk to the Board of Governors	
Board sponsor:	Douglas Denham St Pinnock, Chairman of the Educational Character Committee	
Recommendation:	That the committee approves the minutes of its last meeting and approves publication subject to the proposed redactions.	
Matter previously considered by:	N/A	N/A
Further approval required?	N/A	N/A
Communications – who should be made aware of the decision?	Published on the University's website	

Executive Summary

The Committee is asked to approve the minutes of its meeting of 12 February 2014. No redactions are suggested.

Minutes of a Meeting of the Educational Character Committee
held at 4pm on Wednesday, 12 February 2014
in Room 1B27, Technopark, London Road, London SE1

Present

Douglas Denham St Pinnock	Chair
Barbara Ahland	SU President
Steve Balmont	
Hilary McCallion	
Mee Ling Ng	

Prof David Phoenix	Vice Chancellor and Chief Executive
--------------------	-------------------------------------

In attendance

Prof Phil Cardew	Pro Vice Chancellor (Academic)
Prof Mike Molan	Executive Dean, Arts and Human Sciences
James Stevenson	University Secretary and Clerk to the Board of Governors
Ruth Sutton	Governance Officer

Welcome and Apologies

1. No apologies had been received.

Minutes of the last meeting

2. The minutes of the meeting of 4 December 2013 were confirmed as a correct record (paper **EC.01(14)**). The minutes were approved for publication, and requested that the two actions in relation to equality data (minute 11) and the NSS action plan (minute 14) are completed.

Matters Arising

3. The Chairman reported that the committee members had just had an informative and encouraging pre-meeting in the Faculty of Business, meeting both students and academic staff.
4. The Chairman noted that a summary of the committee's visit to the AHS faculty before the last meeting had been circulated to all members.

Update on consultation: Developing Our Structures

5. The Vice Chancellor introduced a consultation paper titled “Developing Our Structures” (paper **EC.02(14)**). This outlined the final composition of the seven schools and proposed new professional service groups. The committee noted that the Board would receive a presentation on the proposed change at their next meeting on 20 March 2014. Around 400-500 staff had attended meetings relating to this stage of the consultation. In addition, staff at the Havering Campus and the Students’ Union had been consulted.
6. The committee welcomed the paper and reiterated its support for the move from faculties to schools.
7. In addition, the committee discussed the strategy section of the Consultation paper, which proposes that by 2020, LSBU is externally and internally recognised as “An enterprising civic university that is addressing real world challenges”. The committee debated the meaning and use of the word “civic”, which was intended to convey LSBU’s history, its links to the community and its applied focus. Members commented that the word “civic” may be seen as old-fashioned, although it also noted that the term may be coming back into use.
8. The committee was keen that the professional service groups were built up in an appropriate way to support schools. The committee was concerned about staff redundancy arising from the proposed changes. Members requested that HR consider support packages for staff made redundant.
9. Comments from all stakeholders would be considered at the close of this phase of the consultation in early March 2014.
10. The committee agreed that the latest consultation paper would be circulated to the whole Board of Governors.

Recruitment of Deputy Vice Chancellor (‘DVC’) - update

11. The committee noted the draft job description for the role of DVC (paper **EC.03(14)**) and that Saxton Bampfylde had been appointed as recruitment consultants. The Chair of the Board, Vice Chancellor, Educational Character Committee Chair, Chair of the HR Committee and an external senior academic will form a selection panel to recommend the final candidate to the Board of Governors.

Undergraduate faculty monitoring reports

12. The committee noted the undergraduate faculty monitoring reports (paper **EC.04(14)**). It was noted that this report and the reports at minutes 13, 14 and 15 formed sections of the Academic Board's annual report to the Board.

Annual report on external examiners

13. The committee noted the annual report on external examiners (paper **EC.05(14)**).

Report on Undergraduate Student Progression

14. The committee noted a report on undergraduate student progression (paper **EC.06(13)**). The committee noted that the data is now being monitored to module level to determine factors affecting progression.

Report on complaints

15. The committee noted a report on internal complaints and cases taken by students to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) (paper **EC.07(13)**). It was noted that for 2012/13 there were 124 OIA cases (81 in 2011/12). Actions following the PwC report of October 2013 would be reported to the Audit Committee. The committee agreed that triage and mediation procedures to resolve problems at an early stage should continue.

Hilary McCallion left the meeting.

Educational Character Committee and Academic Board – good governance

16. The committee discussed the role and work of the committee since it was formed in 2011 (paper **EC.08(14)**). The committee had been established to inform governors of key academic matters given that one of the primary responsibilities of the Board of Governors is to determine the educational character of the university.
17. The committee agreed that as the Board and all committees were shortly to undergo a full governance review, its future should be determined as part of that review.

Any other business

18. The committee requested that prior to their next meeting they would like to meet the Students' Union Board of Trustees.

Next Meeting

19. The date of the next meeting was confirmed as Wednesday 4 June 2014 at 4pm, preceded by a visit to the Students' Union.

Confirmed as a correct record

.....
Chair



Committee Action Points

27 May 2014

13:41:29

Committee	Date	Minute	Action	Person Res	Status
Educational Character	12/02/2014	2	Publication of minutes	Secretary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Completed
Educational Character	12/02/2014	10	Circulate consultation paper "Developing Our Structures" to all Governors	Secretary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Completed

	PAPER NO: EC.10(14)	
Board/Committee:	Educational Character Committee	
Date:	4 June 2014	
Paper title:	HESA KPIs 2010-2013: Key Trends	
Author:	Jo Ellett, Academic Quality Project Manager	
Executive sponsor:	Phil Cardew, Pro Vice Chancellor (Academic)	
Recommendation by the Executive:	To note	
Aspect of the Corporate Plan to which this will help deliver?	4. Student Success	
Matter previously considered by:	N/A	On:
Further approval required?	N/A	On:
Communications – who should be made aware of the decision?	N/A	

Executive summary

Key points to note from the report:

- Widening Participation rates remain steady, with some need to continue to address access for applicants from low-participation neighbourhoods.
- Non-continuation and withdrawal continues to be our chief priority, and this remains a central focus of our work on driving up progression rates (especially from level 4 to level 5, into the second year of a full time degree course, but also at higher levels).

- However, in terms of the key indicators for our OFFA Access Agreement, we are able to indicate a reasonable level of improvement (which is certainly in line with the milestones published in the 2012 and 2013 Agreements).

The committee is requested to note the report.

HESA KPIs 2010-2013: Key Trends

UK Performance Indicators provide comparative data on the performance of institutions in widening participation, student retention, learning and teaching outcomes, research output and employment of graduates. They cover publicly-funded higher education institutions in the UK.

Performance Indicators are published each April by the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA), which also supplies separate information to League Table Compilers as a result of specific requests to its Data Service.

Indicators are set against two specific benchmarks: one which provides an indication of performance against an average of all higher education providers covered by the indicators and a second, which provides a 'location adjusted' measure, which takes into account, specifically, the social and ethnographic contexts of the region in which each provider operates.

Performance Indicators are of particular interest to LSBU with respect to, not only, league tables, but also performance against measures relating to progress within our Access Agreement. We have committed, therein, to maintaining current performance with respect to widening participation, whilst driving down levels of non-continuation. This, of course, directly relates to our core strategic objective to increase progression across all levels of study.

Problems with the recording of student activity within the final return made to HESA in 2011 has had an impact upon the accuracy of those measures which concentrate on non-continuation during the last two years. For this reason, HESA (with the approval of the Higher Education Funding Council) have suppressed these data publicly. This continues to have an impact, this year, upon two measures 'Resumption of study after a year out of Higher Education' and 'Projected Outcomes' (as these measure reflect on data that takes an overview over a number of years) and these have been automatically suppressed for external publication again, this year.

Full details of all of the Performance Indicators may be found at <http://www.hesa.ac.uk/content/view/2072/> .

Performance Indicators on the Employment of Graduates (the Employment Indicator) will be published in August.

Introduction: the indicators:

The Indicators published in April, each year, cover:

- Widening participation of under-represented groups:
The percentage of undergraduate students from state schools or colleges, specific socio-economic classes and low-participation neighbourhoods.
- Widening participation of students who are in receipt of the Disabled Students Allowance.
- Non-continuation rates:
HESA measures non-continuation in two ways: 1) By looking at students who start in a particular year, and whether they are still in higher education one year later (full-time students) or two years later (part-time students). 2) By looking at projected outcomes over a longer period (these have been suppressed for LSBU in 2014).
Figures are shown separately for young and mature entrants, for young students from low participation areas and from other areas, and for mature entrants with and without previous higher education qualifications.

LSBU Performance

1. Widening Participation:

LSBU continues to perform well with respect to widening participation indicators, and to maintain the levels of performance indicated within our submissions to the Office of Fair Access, as a part of our Access Agreement appendices in 2012 and 2013.

Location does play some part in terms of benchmarking in this area, particularly with respect to the definition of 'low participation neighbourhoods' which is used by HESA and which depends on postcode-related analysis of census information (a full description may be found on the web site of the Higher Education Funding Council for England (<http://www.hefce.ac.uk/whatwedo/wp/ourresearch/polar/polar3/>)). London postcode and participation information is particularly problematic with the methodology used, due to the diversity of population mix within wards and postcode areas.

We are in discussion with the Office of Fair Access as to the desirability of including targets for applicants from low-participation neighbourhoods. Our proposal would be to increase the numbers of young participants in our activities from Quintile 1 from 5% (current estimation) to 10% next year, with the longer term intention of getting to at least 20%. This would entail a guarantee from the schools that we work with that they send a minimum proportion of participants from low-participation neighbourhoods, but schools

are understandably reluctant to sign up to a single measure which does not give them the flexibility to decide for themselves who the most needful of a widening-participation intervention are. Our outreach team are currently considering the best way forward in this respect, and OFFA are content with the approach we are taking.

2. Non-Continuation:

a. After one-year of study (full-time students):

Performance in the key overall measure, being those students who are no longer in higher education has improved against 2012, with a measure of 12.4% against a benchmark of 10.3%. However, there has been a slight increase in students transferring between institutions (4.2% against 3.7% last year) and a slight decrease in those remaining at LSBU (83.4% against 86.3% last year).

For 10 of the 11 other categories we have seen an increase in the percentage of students who have continued or qualified at LSBU. This reflects that students from low-participation areas, and mature students, are no less likely to progress than others, which does not give us a great deal to work on in terms of targeting particular categories of students for additional support (meaning that other work, such as the monitoring of engagement and the implementation of predictive analysis techniques becomes of heightened importance in supporting those students who can be identified as most at need).

b. After two-years of study (full-time students):

Whilst our performance in this area is lower (at 17%, against 12.4% for full-time students) it should be reflected that the numbers are smaller (270, against 3245 for full-time students) and the benchmark is also lower (20.9%). The progression of part-time students can be more problematic, as they are more prone to interruption (often due to work pressures) and can have 'uneven' progression rates.

It should, of course, be noted that these measures, whilst directly related to (and impacted upon by) our internal monitoring (and performance targets) for undergraduate progression, are not one and the same. Our internal measures focus, for the sake of simplicity, on 'clean' progression between the levels of study of a full-time undergraduate degree. As such, our internal measures are far more stringent than

those used by HESA, but cannot fail to have a positive impact upon these externally-reported indicators.

3. Projected Outcomes:

Whilst these indicators have been suppressed for publication this year, I have included the table as an indicator of the improvement brought about by the work achieved by the HESA reporting team, in Registry, over the past two years. Once the 'tail' of the HESA11 return is out of the system, and other measures continue to have an impact, we would expect to see a year-on-year improvement in this outcome.

The full tables are included as an appendix to the document.

Key Messages

- Widening Participation rates remain steady, with some need to continue to address access for applicants from low-participation neighbourhoods.
- Non-continuation and withdrawal continues to be our chief priority, and this remains a central focus of our work on driving up progression rates (especially from level 4 to level 5, into the second year of a full time degree course, but also at higher levels).
- However, in terms of the key indicators for our OFFA Access Agreement, we are able to indicate a reasonable level of improvement (which is certainly in line with the milestones published in the 2012 and 2013 Agreements).

HESA Performance Data 2010-2013

N.B. POLAR 3: The method used to get the participation rates is broadly similar to the method for POLAR2. There are some noteworthy differences between the two methods. The set of cohorts used to form the classification are more recent. Also information of entrants to HE courses at further education colleges in Wales are not included, though we estimate that this only has a small impact on the classification.

Performance Indicator	2011-2012				2012-13			
	No. of Students	LSBU %	Location Adjusted Benchmark %	Benchmark %	No. of Students	LSBU %	Location Adjusted Benchmark %	Benchmark %
Widening Participation Indicators								
Young students who attended a school or college in the state sector								
FT First Degree	1420	97.9	95.6	96.2	1350	97.8	95.5	96.0
All FTUG	1615	98.1	95.8	96.3	1475	97.7	95.6	96.0
Other FTUG	195	99.5	97.3	96.6	125	96.9	95.7	95.9
Young students who come from categories 4 to 7 of the new National Statistics age-adjusted(#4) Socio-economic Classification (NS-SEC);								
FT First Degree	440	42.4	40.9	40.1	465	47.5	43.0	41.7
All FTUG	510	44.1	42.0	40.7	515	48.4	43.2	41.9
Other FTUG	75	58.4	47.9	45.0	50	58.3	44.6	47.4
Young students who come from a low participation neighbourhood (as denoted by its postcode) using the revised POLAR2 definitions of low participation.								
FT First Degree	140	9.5	8.8	14.3	145	10.4	9.3	15.1
All FTUG	155	9.1	8.6	14.6	155	9.9	9.0	15.1
Other FTUG	15	6.4	7.1	16.3	5	5.3	6.6	15.2

Young students who come from a low participation neighbourhood (as denoted by its postcode) using the revised POLAR3 definitions of low participation.									
FT First Degree	110	7.3	6.7	13.4	105	7.4	7.1	13.8	
All FTUG	120	7.0	6.5	13.6	115	7.2	6.9	13.9	
Other FTUG	10	4.9	3.8	13.9	5	4.4	5.9	15.0	
Mature students who have no previous HE qualification and come from a low-participation neighbourhood (POLAR2)									
FT First Degree	120	7.2	5.8	11.6	90	5.5	5.3	10.7	
All FTUG	130	6.3	5.4	11.1	95	5.3	5.3	11.1	
Other FTUG	15	3.0	3.6	8.4	10	4.1	5.1	14.3	
Mature students who have no previous HE qualification and come from a low-participation neighbourhood (POLAR3)									
FT First Degree	80	4.6	3.7	10.8	50	3.2	3.3	9.9	
All FTUG	85	4.0	3.3	10.4	55	3.1	3.4	10.4	
Other FTUG	5	1.6	1.9	8.2	5	2.5	3.9	13.5	
Students who come from a low participation neighbourhood and have no previous HE qualification (POLAR 2)									
PT Young	5	4.2	9.0	11.7	5	6.1	5.5	9.6	
PT Mature	35	3.2	3.3	6.7	35	1.9	1.5	3.4	
Students who come from a low participation neighbourhood and have no previous HE qualification (POLAR 3)									
PT Young	5	4.2	7.7	12.7	5	9.1	11.4	12.7	
PT Mature	25	2.4	2.6	6.8	20	1.1	1.1	3.4	
Proportion of students who are in receipt of the Disabled Students' Allowance (DSA):									
FT First Degree	580	7.0		7.0	730	8.6		7.4	
FTUG	785	7.1		6.7	860	8.6		7.2	
PTUG	125	4.8		2.7	140	6.1		3.5	

HESA Performance Data 2010-2013

Performance Indicator	2011-2012			2012-2013		
	No. of Students	LSBU %	Benchmark %	No. of Students	LSBU %	Benchmark %
Non-Continuation Rates						
Students who are still in higher education one year later (full-time students)						
FTUG First Degree (All)						
Continue or qualify at same HEI	3135	86.3		2710	83.4	
Transfer to other UK HEI	145	3.7		135	4.2	
No longer in HE	605	15.5	11.7	400	12.4	10.3
Young FTUG First Degree entrants						
Continue or qualify at same HEI	1445	79.8		1230	80.3	
Transfer to other UK HEI	90	5.0		100	6.6	
No longer in HE	275	15.2	11.0	200	13.1	9.6
Mature FTUG First Degree entrants						
Continue or qualify at same HEI	1690	81.6		1480	86.2	
Transfer to other UK HEI	55	2.6		35	2.0	
No longer in HE	330	15.8	12.4	200	11.8	10.9
Young FT First Degree students from low participation areas (POLAR2)						
Continue or qualify at same HEI	145	77.7		115	80.1	
Transfer to other UK HEI	15	8.0		10	8.5	
No longer in HE	25	14.4	11.8	15	11.3	10.1
Young FT First Degree students from low participation areas (POLAR3)						
Continue or qualify at same HEI	105	75.5		90	84.4	
Transfer to other UK HEI	10	7.2		10	8.3	
No longer in HE	25	17.3	12.0	10	7.3	9.6
Young FT First Degree students from other areas (POLAR 2)						
Continue or qualify at same HEI	1265	80.0		1080	80.1	
Transfer to other UK HEI	75	4.8		90	6.5	
No longer in HE	240	15.2	10.5	180	13.4	9.3
Young FT First Degree students from other areas (POLAR 3)						
Continue or qualify at same HEI	1445	79.8		1110	79.8	
Transfer to other UK HEI	90	5.0		90	6.6	
No longer in HE	275	15.2	11.0	190	13.6	9.3

London South Bank
University

	PAPER NO: EC.11(14)	
Board/Committee:	Educational Character Committee	
Date:	4 June 2014	
Paper title:	Annual report on academic misconduct and appeals	
Author:	Patrick Anderson, Assistant Registrar (Student Appeals), The Registry	
Executive sponsor:	Dr Phil Cardew PVC (Academic)	
Recommendation by the Executive:	To note the report	
Aspect of the Corporate Plan to which this will help deliver?		
Matter previously considered by:	Quality & Standards Committee	On: 14 May 2014
Further approval required?	-	-
Communications – who should be made aware of the decision?	N/A	

Executive summary

This report covers academic misconduct in 2013 and appeals in 2013.

Practice in dealing with Academic Misconduct has developed significantly across the University during the past 5 years. This has been achieved by embedding Academic Integrity Co-ordinators in to each department who deal with the majority of cases of poor academic practice and minor misdemeanour. These co-ordinators meet together as a group 3-4 times per year and have developed a university wide approach in dealing with academic misconduct.

The University's approach focuses on education, rather than punishment, the overwhelmingly common penalty being to re-do work where referencing and citation falls below our requirements, for a mark capped at the bare pass.

Dealing with misconduct results in very few appeals (appeal against the decision of a misconduct panel being one ground for appeal). We require a high evidential basis for an application to be made, and do not allow viva voce examination to assert misconduct. The introduction of third-party invigilators into examinations has led to a slight increase in the number of students being found in breach of examination regulations, approximately 250 to 300 each year.

One aspect of our work which has developed over recent years is encouraging all faculties to approach the detection of misconduct more equably (and rigorously). This has led to some evening out of perceived levels of misconduct across the faculties (particularly in Health and Social Care). Further work on electronic submission of coursework and the standardisation of detection tools, such as Turnitin, will undoubtedly have an added impact here.

At the same time, we undertake developmental work, through Learning and Teaching Committee, designed to reflect upon assessment practices which militate against misconduct. This is of particular importance with an increased growth of 'essay mills' within the sector, which provide 'model answers' to students (for an appropriate fee). It goes without saying that where we are able to prove use of such an agency, we treat the matter with the utmost severity.

The Committee is requested to note this report.

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT IN 2013

Report on the annual monitoring of statistics at London South Bank University

Patrick Anderson,
Assistant Registrar
(Student Appeals)
Registry, LSBU

Table of Contents:

1. Annual numbers of academic misconduct investigations in 2013.
 - 1.1 Numbers of academic misconduct investigations in 2013.
 - 1.2 Comparison of academic misconduct investigations by year.
2. AML cases by faculty in 2013.
3. AMIs by type of misconduct in 2013.
4. Seasonal distribution of AM investigations in 2013.
 - 4.1 Seasonal peaks and troughs for academic misconduct in 2013 – distribution by faculty.
5. Academic misconduct investigations in 2013 by outcome and penalty.

1. Annual numbers of Academic Misconduct Investigations (AMIs)

1.1. Numbers of AMIs in 2013

319 students were reported to and/or investigated by the central academic misconduct office located in the Registry in the calendar year 2013. Of these, 17 cases were reported centrally for further investigation and resolution through the University Academic Misconduct Panel. 232 completed cases were reported centrally, having been investigated and concluded locally by relevant Academic Integrity Coordinators (AICs). 54 initial cases were reported centrally and investigated locally but their final conclusion was not, or has not yet been, made known centrally. 16 investigations resulted in having the initial allegation withdrawn and/or having no case to answer.

1.2. Comparison of AMIs by year, 2002-2013

The 319 reported cases of academic misconduct in 2013 compares with 2012's total of 290 reported cases. A comparison of numbers of cases reported since 2002 is illustrated below in Figure 1.

Year	Total	Year	Total
2013	319	2007	263
2012	290	2006	257
2011	293	2005	260
2010	231	2004	204
2009	281	2003	175
2008	229	2002	105

Fig.1

2. AMI cases by Faculty in 2013

The Faculty of Arts and Human Sciences investigated the highest number of cases in 2013, with 121 investigations, knocking the Faculty of Business from its customary top spot for the preceding decade or more. The Faculty of Health and Social Care investigated the least number of cases of the four faculties, with 13 cases. The total numbers of cases investigation by each faculty in 2013 are illustrated below in Figure 2.

Faculty	Number of cases	% of all cases
Arts & Human Sciences	121	38%
Faculty of Business	113	35%
Engineering Science & Built Environment	72	23%
Health & Social Care	13	7%
Total	319	100%

Fig. 2

3. Academic misconduct investigations 2013 by type of misconduct

The most common type of misconduct is the commission of individual plagiarism, followed by infringement of examination rules. There was one reported case of contract cheating in 2013.

Type of misconduct	Number of cases
Plagiarism (individual)	237
Plagiarism (collusion)	23
Plagiarism (contract cheating)	1
Cheating in an exam	52
Unknown offence	7
Total	319

Fig. 3

4. Seasonal distribution of AMIs in 2013 - all Faculties

Reporting of misconduct is normally seasonal, and most reports of cases and investigations follow the major assessment periods in the academic calendar – at the end of semester one and at the end of semester two, as shown in Figure 4. 29 cases originally from 2013 were only reported centrally in March 2014, and have thus been appended to December’s 2013 figures, for the sake of completeness.

Month in 2013	No. of AMIs reported	Month in 2013	No of AMIs reported
Jan	19	July	63
Feb	80	Aug	3
March	10	Sept	7
April	12	Oct	5
May	21	Nov	1
June	69	Dec	(29)

Fig.4

4.1. Seasonal peaks & troughs for AMIs in 2013 - distribution by Faculty

Figure 5 below illustrates the numbers of AMIs investigated by each Faculty per month throughout 2013.

2012	AHS	BUS	ESBE	HSC	Monthly total – all faculties
January	4	7	8	0	19
February	25	20	34	1	80
March	3	6	0	1	10
April	3	9	0	0	12
May	4	5	9	3	21
June	37	24	3	5	69
July	12	39	11	1	63
August	0	1	1	1	3
September	2	2	3	0	7
October	2	0	2	1	5
November	0	0	1	0	1
December	(29)	0	0	0	(29)
Annual total	121	113	72	13	319

Fig. 5

5. Academic misconduct investigations 2013 by outcome and penalty

The range of outcomes and penalties to AMIs in 2013 is given below in Figure 6. The most common penalty imposed was Penalty (ii), including all its variations, which

requires a reduction in marks, usually – but not always – capping at the pass mark. Penalty (ii) was imposed in 31% of all cases with a known outcome. The second most common penalty was Penalty (iii), including all of its variations, which requires the assessment involved to be redone for a capped mark. This penalty was imposed in 28% of all cases with a known outcome. Penalty (iv) – failure in the component of assessment with an opportunity for referral (subject to Exam Board discretion) – was imposed in 21% of all cases with a known outcome.

Outcome/Penalty	Number of cases
No case to answer/allegation withdrawn	16
No penalty/unknown penalty/unresolved	54
Poor Academic Practice (+ no/unknown penalty)	20
Poor Academic Practice + penalty (i)	0
Poor Academic Practice + Penalty (ii)	66
Poor Academic Practice + Penalty (iii)	31
Poor Academic Practice + Penalty (iv)	9
Poor Academic Practice + Penalty (v)	1
Misdemeanour Warning (no penalty &/ or unknown penalty)	0
Misdemeanour Warning + Penalty (i)	0
Misdemeanour Warning + Penalty (ii)	2
Misdemeanour Warning + Penalty (iii)	0
Minor Academic Misconduct + Penalty (i)	0
Minor Academic Misconduct + Penalty (ii)	0
Minor Academic Misconduct + Penalty (iii)	0
Penalty (i)	2
Penalty (ii)	14
Penalty (iii)	44
Penalty (iv)	48
Penalty (v)	2
Penalty (vi)	6
Penalty (vii)	0
Penalty (viii)	4
Penalty (ix)	0
Penalty (x)	0
Total:	319

Fig.6

STUDENT APPEALS IN 2013

Report on the annual monitoring of statistics at London South Bank University

**Patrick Anderson
Assistant Registrar
(Student Appeals)
Registry, LSBU**

Contents

1. Students under appeal:
 - 1.1. Student appeals in 2013, appeals by faculty in 2013
 - 1.2. Numbers of appeals submitted by faculty in 2004-2013
 - 1.3. Increase/decrease in appeals by faculty 2012 to 2013
 - 1.4. Percentage (%) of all appeals submitted by faculty 2004-2013
2. Outcomes of appeals:
 - 2.1. Outcome of appeals in 2013 - all faculties
 - 2.2. Outcome of appeals by individual faculty in 2013
 - 2.3. Outcome of appeals by gender in 2013
 - 2.4. Outcome of appeals by tuition fees status in 2013
 - 2.5. Outcome of appeals by disability in 2013
 - 2.6. Outcome of appeals by ethnicity in 2013
 - 2.7. Outcome of appeals by level of study
3. Seasonal peaks and troughs – all appeals by faculty
4. The Organisation of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA)
 - 4.1. OIA complaints by faculty in 2013
 - 4.2. Outcomes of OIA complaints in 2013

1. Students under appeal

1.1 Student appeals in 2013

774 student appeals were received in the calendar year 2013. This compares with 764 student appeals received in 2012 and 751 received in 2011, representing approximately 4% of the University's total number of 19,796 currently enrolled students.

1.2 Appeals in 2013 by faculty

The breakdown of appeals submitted by faculty in 2013 was as follows:

Faculty	No. of appeals in 2013	% of all appeals in 2013	% of all students enrolled by faculty in 2013, for comparison
AHS	213	28%	21%
BUS	143	18%	20%
ESBE	188	24%	24%
HSC	230	30%	34%
Total	774	100%	99% (+1% Other)

Fig. 1

1.3 Numbers of appeals submitted by faculty 2004-13

The number of appeals submitted in each faculty in each calendar year, 2004 to 2013 is illustrated below in Figure 2.

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
AHS	51	78	64	92	117	112	166	205	223	213
BUS	63	69	71	104	62	114	118	134	134	143
ESBE	35	48	36	92	95	84	115	183	202	188
HSC	159	174	172	161	201	183	180	229	205	230
CH	27	17	24	24	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total	335	386	367	473	475	493	579	751	764	774

Fig.2

1.3 Increase/decrease in appeals by faculty 2012 to 2013

Figure 3 below illustrates the increase or decrease in numbers of appeals submitted in each of the four faculties in 2013 compared with 2012.

Faculty	Increase/decrease in appeals by Faculty 2012-13
AHS	5% decrease
BUS	7% increase
ESBE	7% decrease
HSC	12% increase

Fig.3

1.4 Percentage (%) of all appeals submitted by faculty 2004-13

Figure 4 below illustrates the percentage of all appeals submitted per faculty in the years 2004 to 2013 inclusive. It's notable that until 2009, HSC significantly generated more appeals year-by-year than any other faculty, but that its numbers of appeals submitted each year since 2010 has tended increasingly towards parity with the ratio of LSBU students enrolled on its books each year.

	2004 %	2005 %	2006 %	2007 %	2008 %	2009 %	2010 %	2011 %	2012 %	2013 %
AHS	15	20	17	19	25	23	29	27	29	28
BUS	19	18	19	22	13	23	20	18	18	18
CH	8	4	7	5	--	--	--	--	--	--
ESBE	11	12	10	19	20	17	20	27	26	24
HSC	47	45	47	34	42	37	31	31	27	30
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Fig.4

2 Outcomes of appeals

2.1 Outcome of appeals in 2013 - all faculties

Of this total of 774 appeals, 309 appeals were upheld, and 465 were not upheld:

% of appeals successful/ unsuccessful in 2012:	Number	%
Upheld	309	40%
Rejected	465	60%
Total	774	100%

Fig. 5

This means that the number of successful appeals is quite significantly on the rise again in 2013, after a significant decrease the year before in 2012. 2012's percentage of 32% of all appeals being upheld is the most significant dip below 50% since 2006. The annual success rate of appeals is illustrated in Figure 6 below, for the years 2004-13 inclusive.

Year	% appeals rejected	% appeals upheld
2013	60%	40%
2012	68%	32%
2011	47%	53%
2010	41%	59%
2009	43%	57%
2008	45%	55%
2007	51%	49%

2006	62%	38%
2005	73%	27%
2004	61%	39%

Fig. 6

2.2 Outcome of appeals by individual faculty in 2013

These trends are nevertheless not entirely uniform among the individual faculties. Figure 7 below illustrates the success rates of appeals by individual faculty in 2013. The variation in outcome, as measured between the faculty least likely to have its appeals upheld (BUS), and the faculty most likely to have its appeals upheld (AHS), is 17%, which does suggest quite significantly different outcomes for students at appeal level, depending upon their home faculty. This may arise primarily from differing local approaches to the processing of Extenuating Circumstances claims at faculty level, prior to appeals being submitted.

	Appeals submitted	Number of appeals not upheld	Number of appeals upheld	% of appeals not upheld	% of appeals upheld
AHS	213	114	99	54%	46%
BUS	143	101	42	71%	29%
ESBE	188	106	82	56%	44%
HSC	230	144	86	63%	37%

Fig.7

2.3 Outcome of appeals by gender in 2013

59% of appeals in 2013 were by female students, and 41% were from male students. This is in line with the proportion of female and male students currently enrolled at the University, at 57% and 43% respectively. Nevertheless, appeals by female students were more likely to be successful: 42% of all appeals by female students were upheld in 2013, whereas 37% of all appeals by male students were upheld in 2013, an overall variation between the genders of 5%. The widest variation seen in outcomes overall at a faculty level was between female appellants in AHS, who had 52% of their appeals upheld, and male appellants in BUS, who had only 27% of their appeals upheld. The widest variation seen inside a single faculty was in AHS, where 52% of female students had their appeals upheld, but only 38% of male appellants had theirs upheld, a variation of 14%. The respective success rates for appellants in each faculty are given below, in Figure 8.

	Total number of appeals in 2013	Total of appeals from women	Total of appeals from men in 2013	% of appeals from women upheld	% of appeals from women not upheld	% of appeals from men upheld	% of appeals from men not upheld
AHS	213	147	66	52%	48%	38%	62%
BUS	143	66	77	30%	70%	27%	73%
ESBE	188	50	138	50%	50%	41%	59%
HSC	230	193	37	36%	64%	41%	59%
Total %	774	456	318	42%	58%	37%	63%

Fig. 8

2.4 Outcome of appeals by tuition fees status in 2013

In 2013, 88% of all appeals submitted were from Home based students, 5% of appeals were from EU students, and 7% of appeals were from International/Overseas students. These figures are broadly in line with the proportions of Home based, EU and International/Overseas students enrolled at the University in 2012 at 91%, 3% and 6% respectively.

The success rates for the appeals of these 3 categories of students are set out below in Figure 9.

Tuition fee status	% appeals upheld	% appeals Not upheld
Home students	40%	60%
EU students	43%	57%
Overseas/Int'l students	30%	70%

Fig.9

2.5 Outcome of appeals by disability in 2013

27% of all students who appealed in 2013 were formally registered with University as having a disability. Figure 10 below gives the breakdown by faculty in 2013.

	% of appellants with a registered disability	% of appellants with no registered disability
AHS	25%	75%
BUS	16%	84%
ESBE	23%	77%
HSC	30%	70%

Fig.10

All appellants in 2013	appeals upheld	appeals not upheld	% appeals upheld	% appeals not upheld
Disabled	97	93	51%	49%
Non-Disabled	212	372	36%	64%

Fig.11

As Figure 11 illustrates above, 51% of all appellants with a registered disability had their appeals upheld in 2013 while 36% of all appellants without a registered disability had theirs upheld. This 15% variation in appeal outcomes between disabled and non-disabled students, in the former's favour, is quite striking. Nevertheless there is also wide variation between individual faculties in this respect, as illustrated in Figure 12 below.

Appeals	AHS		BUS		ESBE		HSC	
Registered disabled	34/53	64%	12/23	52%	25/44	56%	26/70	37%
No registered disability	68/160	43%	29/120	24%	56/144	39%	60/160	37.5%

Fig.12

Perhaps the most surprising result here is the experience of disabled appellants in HSC, who are marginally (albeit that the factor is only 0.5%) less likely to have their appeals upheld than non-disabled appellants in that faculty. In all the other faculties, disabled appellants are very significantly more likely to have their appeals upheld than non-disabled appellants.

2.6 Outcome of appeals by ethnicity in 2013

No detailed breakdown figures for enrolment by ethnicity across the student population in 2013 were available for this report. Some headline comparisons of the outcomes of appeals by ethnicity category have nevertheless been attempted in relation to the 3 largest general categories: Asian students; Black students; White students.

	Total number of appeals in 2013	Number of appeals upheld	% of appeals upheld	Number of appeals not upheld	% of appeals not upheld
Asian students	85	25	29%	60	71%
Black students	370	152	41%	218	59%

White students	170	68	40%	102	60%
Other students	149	64	43%	85	57%

Fig.13

2.7 Outcome of appeals by level of study

In 2013, 86% of all appeals were submitted by undergraduate students and 14% of all appeals were submitted by postgraduate students. This compares with a student population comprising 76% undergraduates and 24% postgraduates. 40% of all undergraduate appeals were successful, while 41% of all postgraduate appeals were successful, indicating no significant differences in success rates at these different levels of study.

3 Seasonal peaks and troughs in 2013 – all appeals by faculty

The overwhelming majority of appeals each year are submitted over the summer months, July to October, which is easily explained by annual sittings of the summer (June/July) and September resit award and progression examination boards. Most appeals received outside this July to October timeframe are appeals from HSC, which have award and progression examination boards sitting at different times of year. Figure 14 below illustrates the numbers of appeals submitted in each Faculty per month throughout 2013.

2013	AHS	BUS	ESBE	HSC	Monthly total – all faculties
January	0	0	1	7	8
February	2	1	4	15	22
March	2	2	5	21	30
April	0	2	4	9	15
May	7	2	0	11	20
June	4	2	1	1	8
July	52	44	55	16	167
August	44	2	32	55	157
September	34	31	36	61	162
October	54	27	42	20	143
November	8	3	6	7	24
December	6	3	2	7	18
Annual total per faculty	213	143	188	230	774

Fig.14

4 The Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIAHE)

88 complaints from exhausted appeals were newly submitted back to the University by the OIA in the calendar year 2013, for investigation. This compares with 94 such OIA cases submitted in 2012, and 33 received in 2011.

4.1 OIA complaints by faculty in 2013

	No. of OIA (appeal) complaints	% of all OIA (appeal) complaints
AHS	11	13%
BUS	16	18%
ESBE	14	16%
HSC	47	53%
Total	88	100%

Fig.15

At 53%, exhausted appeals from past or present students from The Faculty of Health and Social Care continue to constitute the highest number of OIA cases submitted among the four faculties; notwithstanding that only 30% of appeals submitted in 2013 were from past or present HSC students.

4.2 Outcomes of OIA complaints in 2013

To date (30 April 2014), 81 of these 88 complaints have been resolved, while 7 are still in progress. The outcomes of these 81 cases are shown in Figure 16.

Outcomes of OIA complaints	AHS	BUS	ESBE	HSC
Not justified	6	10	7	30
Partly justified	1	0	2	4
Fully justified	2	0	1	3
Settled	2	1	2	3
No case	0	3	0	4
Awaiting decision	0	2	2	3
Totals	11	16	14	47

Fig.16

	PAPER NO: EC.12(14)	
Board/Committee:	Educational Character Committee	
Date:	4 June 2013	
Paper title:	Educational Character Committee annual report	
Author:	James Stevenson, University Secretary and Clerk to the Board of Governors	
Board sponsor:	Douglas Denham St Pinnock, Chairman of the Educational Character Committee	
Recommendation:	That the Committee approve the report	
Aspect of the Corporate Plan to which this will help deliver?	Creating an environment in which excellence can thrive	
Matter previously considered by:	N/A	N/A
Further approval required?	Board (for noting)	8 July 2014
Communications – who should be made aware of the decision?		

Executive Summary

The Educational Character Committee receives reports on educational issues such as progression and retention and student satisfaction. It considers the sub-reports of the Academic Board annual report throughout the year and reports annually to the Board in parallel with the Academic Board annual report (which will be reported to the Board in July). This is its second annual report.

The committee is requested to note the report.

Introduction

1. The Educational Character Committee was established in 2011 in order to influence deliberations of the Board on academic strategy and educational character and allow independent governors to gain further insight into the academic life of the University.
2. Its duties include discussing educational issues such as student retention, progression and success rates; and reviewing student satisfaction.
3. The committee met three times during the academic year 2013/14. It consists of four independent governors and a student governor.
4. Douglas Denham St Pinnock was appointed Chairman of the committee during the year. Andrew Owen stepped down from the committee and Mee Ling Ng joined the committee.

Committee business

5. During the year the committee received reports which will form part of the Academic Board annual report to the Board. The committee has therefore discussed the key issues (set out in paragraphs 6-8 below) in this year's Academic Board annual report (which will be reported at the same time as this report to the Board on 8 July 2014). Oversight of academic quality and standards remains with the Academic Board who report this to the Board of Governors in their annual report.
6. In December 2013 the committee discussed:
 - Academic Key Performance Indicators
 - National Student Survey (NSS) results
 - Destination of Leavers of Higher Education (DLHE) survey results
 - Validations report
7. The Committee welcomed the improvement in the NSS results as well as the work being done by the Student Services and Employability Services teams to improve the DLHE survey results.
8. In February 2014 the committee discussed:
 - Undergraduate faculty monitoring reports
 - Annual report on external examiners
 - Report on Undergraduate Student Progression
 - Report on complaints and the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA)

9. The Committee noted the work being done on OIA cases and complaints.
10. The committee considered the role and purpose of the committee and its relationship with the Academic Board. The committee agreed that this matter should to be included in the Governance review commencing 2014.
11. In June 2014 the committee discussed:
 - HESA performance indicators
 - Postgraduate Student Progression
 - Postgraduate faculty monitoring reports
 - Report on appeals and academic misconduct

Faculty Visits

12. Before each meeting the committee visits a faculty in order to better understand the scope and nature of each faculty. During 2013/14 the committee visited the Faculty of Arts and Human Sciences (4 December 2013), Faculty of Business (12 February 2014) and the Students' Union (4 June 2014).
13. The committee has worked with the faculties to devise a briefing document for each faculty which includes the following information:
 - Key staff
 - Academic departments
 - Research centres
 - Course portfolio by department
 - KPIs including NSS results, DLHE results and level 4 progression
 - Faculty SWOT analysis
 - Faculty deliverables
 - Key risks
14. The faculty briefing documents are updated prior to the committee's visit to the faculty and form the basis of the presentation and discussion.

Approved by the Chair of the Educational Character Committee on * June 2014

	PAPER NO: EC.13(14)	
Board/Committee:	Educational Character Committee	
Date:	4 June 2013	
Paper title:	Educational Character Committee annual committee plan	
Author:	James Stevenson, University Secretary and Clerk to the Board of Governors	
Board sponsor:	Douglas Denham St Pinnock, Chairman of the Educational Character Committee	
Recommendation:	That the Committee approve the Annual committee plan	
Aspect of the Corporate Plan to which this will help deliver?		
Matter previously considered by:	N/A	N/A
Further approval required?		
Communications – who should be made aware of the decision?		

Executive Summary

The committee is requested to note the annual committee plan.

London South Bank

University

Educational Character Committee – recurring/standing items

	Dec	Feb	May/June
Statistical reports on student achievement, disability and demography/ enrolment statistics	X		
National Student Survey Report	X		
Destination of Leavers of Higher Education Survey Results	X		
Validations Report	X		
Academic KPIs Review	X		
Equality Act 2010 student data	X		
Annual Report on External Examiners		X	
Report on UG Student Progression		X	
UG Faculty Monitoring Reports		X	
Report on Complaints and OIA		X	
HESA Performance Indicators			X
Report on PG Student Progression			X
PG Faculty Monitoring Reports			X
Annual Reports on Academic Misconduct and Appeals			X
Faculty pro formas		X	
Business plan	X	X	X
Annual committee report to the Board			X