

Monday 28 January 2013  
Roscoe Room, Egerton Court

<b>Present:</b>	Mr T Aldus Mr L Appleton Ms M Box Dr I Bradshaw Professor S Davies Mr R Dawson Mr P Evans Ms J Guthrie Ms K Johnston Mr S Kenny	Professor P Lisboa Professor D Meehan Ms J Murphy Mr C Reid Professor P Vickerman Professor N Weatherill Professor R Webster Professor P Wheeler Ms K Wilkinson Professor A Young
<b>In Attendance:</b>	Ms J Hargreaves Mr M Power Ms S Spiers Ms V Stevenson	Miss L Sutcliffe (Minute Secretary) Mrs D Tipping (Committee Secretary) Ms M Ward
<b>Apologies:</b>	Mr P Abernethy Dr A Douglas Dr P Livsey	Dr M Meadows Mrs C Williams Dr L Wright

AB 13.01

**MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 November 2012 were approved as a correct record.

AB 13.02

**MATTERS ARISING NOT SHOWN ELSEWHERE ON THE AGENDA**

**AB 12.51 Review and update the Student Handbook as a matter of urgency**

That the review and update of the Student Handbook was underway following the review of the Module and Programme Handbooks (now known as Guides).

**AB 12.53 Academic Framework Review Group**

That the Academic Framework Review Group would report to the next meeting of Academic Board if the Education Committee had not met before that date.

**STUDENT POLICY AND REGULATION ANNUAL REPORT  
2011/12**

**RECEIVED  
PURPOSE**

The report of the Head of Student Policy and Regulation.  
To provide Academic Board with a summary of Student Policy and Regulation (SPR) activity for the academic year 2011/12.

**REPORTED**

That although the increased number of cases presented to Student Policy and Regulation were relatively small in comparison to the size of the student body they had a disproportionate impact on resources.

The increase in the number of cases was mirrored across the sector with the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) noting that it could not be attributed solely to the introduction of the new fee regime. Although, the new fee regime was likely to result in continued cases of a complex nature.

That the high number of academic appeals experienced during September were largely the result of changes to the Academic Framework Regulations and that it was anticipated that the University would experience similar figures during September 2013.

The team was looking to streamline the academic appeals procedure, which would require changes to the Academic Framework. In particular, the need for a three-tier appeal system was being explored.

The Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) was expected to release a Code of Practice by April 2013, which would emphasize that HEIs needed to provide advice and support to students progressing through the academic appeals process. Current practice was to sign post students to the LiverpoolSU, however, this may no longer be adequate given the limited resources within the LiverpoolSU.

Issues of student discipline had increased during 2011-12, which were focused particularly on anti-social behavior within Halls of Residence. Although, discipline in such instances was primarily a matter for the Halls Managers, LJMU were required to take action where such instances were likely to damage the University's reputation. Work was underway to encourage Halls Managers to take more responsibility when appropriate. The University would continue to work with its dedicated Police Officer and had also been approached by Liverpool City Council to foster a working relationship to tackle such issues.

SPR had identified that its recording systems were inadequate to meet both internal and external reporting requirements and a

new system was being explored. The increased number of requests for information received, such as those made under the Freedom of Information Act, would benefit from a more efficient recording system.

**COMMENTED**

Academic Board recognized the excellent support that staff across the University received from SPR.

There was an increasing trend of students seeking legal representation at an early stage, which had a training impact for staff dealing with hearings.

That the University needed to take more action to ensure that Halls Managers took responsibility for the discipline of students who were accused of anti-social behavior within Halls of Residence. A trend was developing whereby criminal incidents were being reported to LJMU rather than to the Police Service. Agreements in place with Hall Managers would be revisited to address such issues.

That the handling of students' complaints against staff had been modified and would be agreed with Human Resources (HR) and the Trade Unions. Previously, complaints would be handed to HR to investigate via the disciplinary procedure. This process had been updated so that complaints would be investigated by SPR who would recommend staff for disciplinary action as appropriate.

AB 13.04

**MINIMAL COMMITTEE STRUCTURE**

**RECEIVED**

The report of the Strategy Management Director.

**PURPOSE**

To present for information, proposals for the University's Minimal Committee Structure for immediate implementation and to seek Academic Board approval for those elements of the structure pertaining to the remit of the Board. In addition, to present the interim arrangements for the operation of the Academic Board as approved by the Board of Governors, pending the Governance Effectiveness Review.

**REPORTED**

That the University reviewed its committee structure in parallel to the review and drafting of the Strategic Framework 2012-2017. The purpose was to ensure that the University's governance and committee structures were aligned to the Strategic Framework to ensure efficient delivery of the plan.

**COMMENTED**

It was pleasing to see that staff and student forums had been included within the structure, likewise a separate Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee.

It would be useful and efficient to include academic representation for policy development purposes. This was addressed by the inclusion of the Chairs of the Faculty Teaching and Assessment Committees.

The Committees had been designed to ensure appropriate faculty representation.

Discussions and decisions of the Committees would need careful management. It was envisaged that specialist committees would discuss papers and proposals, which would then be reported to Academic Board for final approval.

AB 13.05

### **VICE-CHANCELLOR'S REPORT**

**RECEIVED**

The oral report of the Vice Chancellor and Chief Executive.

**REPORTED**

#### **Recruitment**

That as of 21 January 2013, recruitment figures were as follows:

Applications saw an increase of 8.28% from the previous year (2012/13).

Overall UCAS applications were up by 3.31% from the previous year.

Competitor applications saw a fall by 3.02% from the previous year.

The number of HEI applicants had risen by 9.47% and the number of UCAS applicants was up by 3.46%.

Thanks and appreciation was extended to all those who had helped to achieve such fantastic recruitment figures.

**REPORTED**

#### **Stonewall**

That for the 4<sup>th</sup> consecutive year, LJMU was featured within Stonewall's top 100 employers, which was not a sector specific listing. The University came second to Cambridge within the sector and was the top University in the North West. The University received the Networking Group of the Year award (cross sector) and would attend the presentation ceremony shortly.

**REPORTED**

#### **World of Work Bronze Statement**

That 71 modules had embedded the Bronze Statement, representing approximately 100 undergraduate programmes.

159 group session had been delivered with 5 left to take place and the number of statements submitted was currently 2,871 of a possible 3,364. The current average submission rate was 85%.

**REPORTED**

Graduation November 2012

That the graduation ceremony held on 26 November 2012 went extremely well and thanks were extended to all those who helped to make it such a memorable occasion. A graduation in November 2013 was planned and would possibly run over two days dependent on demand.

**REPORTED**

Inaugural Lecture Series

That an Inaugural Lecture Series had been advertised and all staff were encouraged to participate in such high profile and positive events for the University. The Lectures included both staff and external visitors and guests. It was appropriate for their work to be recognized in such a prestigious manner. The Lecture Series would be recorded for all to access via iTunes.

**REPORTED**

Chairman of the Board of Governors

That Sir Malcolm Thornton would step down as Chairman of the Board of Governors on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2013. Following a call for nominations, Mr Rod Hill was appointed Chairman Elect and would take up the role of Chairman on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2013. On behalf of Academic Board thanks were extended to Sir Malcolm and congratulations to Rod.

AB 13.06

**GRADUANDS REPORT 2012/13 – AUGUST TO SEPTEMBER 2012**

**RECEIVED**

The oral report of the Vice Chancellor.

**REPORTED**

That the Vice-Chancellor, in his capacity as the Chair of the Academic Board, had approved the Graduands Report 2012/13 – August to September 2012.

AB 13.07

**AMENDMENT TO RESEARCH DEGREE REGULATIONS – INTRODUCTION OF E-THESIS**

**RECEIVED**

The report of the Head of Research Programme Development.

**PURPOSE**

To amend the Research Degree Regulations to facilitate the introduction of submission of research degree theses in electronic format commencing September 2013.

**REPORTED** That the introduction of the submission of research degree theses in electronic format represented minor changes throughout the Research Degree Regulations, which had already been discussed and approved by the University Research & Scholarship Committee and the Research Degree Committee.

That the change applied to only MPhil and PhD theses, including PhD by Published Works.

**COMMENTED** That open access to theses would be available both internally and externally.

**APPROVED** That the recommendations to change the Research Degree Regulations were approved.

AB 13.08 **STUDENT HANDBOOK REVIEW – FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS**

**RECEIVED** The report of the Director, Academic Enhancement Unit presented by the Pro Vice Chancellor (Education).

**REPORTED** That the Student Handbook Evaluation Steering Group met for its final meeting on 8 January 2013 and recommended that:

- Programme and Module Handbooks should be rebranded as 'guides' rather than handbooks and would be available via Blackboard
- The Online Student Handbook should be reviewed at the same time as the generic institution level information for the programme guides
- Staff would be expected to use the Module Guide using the A4 Word template, which featured five headings. Staff would retain the flexibility of providing as much or as little information under each heading and would also be able to add headings
- Programme Guides would link to relevant sections of the website for institutional and programme level information. They would also contain a 'Frequently Asked Questions' section to answer any student-specific questions
- Programme or Subject Leaders would approve the Module Guides, with School Directors approving the Programme Guides. Approval of the Programme Guides was to be reported to Faculty Quality Committees

**COMMENTED** That the quality assurance process would meet QAA requirements of providing students with up to date, accurate information.

AB 13.09

**UPDATE ON QAA REVIEW CYCLE**

**RECEIVED**

The report of the Director, Academic Enhancement Unit presented by the Pro Vice Chancellor (Education).

**REPORTED**

That the University's mid-cycle review documentation had been submitted to the QAA. The purpose of the report was to provide the QAA with details of the actions taken in response to the institutional audit, key strategic and collaborative developments, and a list of all programme validations/reviews since the last audit.

That the Limited Confidence judgement in relation to collaborative provision during the last audit had been lifted.

The University was awaiting further details of the next Institutional Audit and would need to take a series of new QAA Code of Practice into consideration. The University should be prepared for the requirement to make changes to how it operates when the Codes of Practice are released.

**COMMENTED**

Thanks were extended to all those who contributed to the Limited Confidence judgement being lifted.

AB 13.10

**FACULTY AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICES LEARNING, TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES**

**RECEIVED**

The report of the Director, Academic Enhancement Unit presented by the Pro Vice Chancellor (Education).

**REPORTED**

That Faculty and Professional Service Plans were submitted annually and were aligned to the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy, which in turn was designed to facilitate the implementation of the University's Strategic Plan in relation to learning, teaching and scholarship.

The action plans were reported to the Academic Standards and Enhancement Committee (ASEC).

AB 13.11

**UPDATE ON THE ESTATES STRATEGY**

**RECEIVED**

The oral report of the Vice Chancellor on behalf of the Director of Finance and Estates and the Director of Estate Management.

**REPORTED**

The Estates Strategy was linked closely to the Strategic Framework which would in turn dictate the student experience. As such, the Estates Strategy would be reported to Academic Board regularly.

Wide consultation relating to the Estates Strategy had already taken place with staff being encouraged to put ideas forward. Some ideas already received had been presented to and discussed by the Board of Governors in December 2012 and would be further discussed at the Strategic Event during late January 2013. Discussions at Board level would emphasize the importance of the strategic imperative of an Estates Strategy.

Key issues included:

- Capital Development
- Maintenance
- Facilities Management
- Portfolio Management
- Environmental Management

Options for the Copperas Hill and I M Marsh sites would be discussed by the Board and a series of communications statements would be released to all staff following the Governor Strategic Event to ensure that all have the most up to date and accurate information.

It was important to note that not all development was within our control and that work with key partners was necessary.

**COMMENTED**

That there would be opportunities to work with other HEIs in the North West. The development of the Knowledge Quarter and the Science Park would be a particular focus and partnership working was necessary to realize our ambitions in these areas. Liverpool City Council had already demonstrated a desire to develop the Knowledge Quarter further.

AB 13.12

**REF2014 UPDATE**

**RECEIVED**

The report of the Director of Research and the Research Excellence Framework Manager, presented by the Director of Research.

**PURPOSE**

To update Academic Board on the progress towards the University submission to REF2014.

**REPORTED**

The University's submission to the Research Excellence Framework (REF) exercise would take place in November 2013.

The REF2014 is the peer review process by which the quality of research taking place in UK HEIs is assessed. The outcomes of the REF will be used by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) to determine the distribution of quality-related research funding to universities from 2015-16. The



results of the next assessment will be published in December 2014.

The REF2014 consists of three elements of research activity to be assessed:

1. Outputs – the quality of up to four research outputs per each member of staff submitted in terms of the ‘originality, significance and rigour’ (weighted at 65%)
2. Impact – the ‘reach and significance’ of impacts outside the HEI sector that were underpinned by excellent research (weighted 20%)
3. Environment – assessed in terms of its ‘vitality and sustainability’ making use of appropriate metrics such as postgraduate completions and grant income (weighted 15%)

The University will select those areas of research (units of assessment; UoAs) that are submitted to the exercise and the work submitted as evidence of research excellence. REF2014 primarily differs from previous research assessment exercise through its assessment of the broad impact of research on a non-academic audience. This area of assessment will prove challenging for some UoAs.

Each of the three elements will be scored using a five point scale and then combined to provide an overall profile.

The University’s strategy for REF2014 is focused on achieving a strong reputational outcome from the exercise. The University will not submit any research that it considers is poorly rated and as such, has set the minimum quality threshold for research submitted at 2.5\*. Some UoAs will decide to set the quality threshold at 3\* at the outset in order to maintain or improve on their standing in the sector.

The University will use the LJMU REF2014 Code of Practice, approved by HEFCE in 2012, to define how the REF2014 submissions will be managed institutionally. Each submission is to be robustly tested and will be assessed both internally and by external appointments chosen for their Research Assessment Exercise experience. Submissions will be discussed at the University Research and Scholarship Committee before recommendations are made to the Strategic Management Team (SMT).

Expert external review is a key part of the internal selection process and the feedback so far has reported positive results with a predicted rise in the quality of outputs since RAE2008 reflecting the efforts by staff across the institution since that exercise.

The University is aware of a misalignment in some UoAs between its REF intentions and the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) returns. This, which it was preparing fully for, would be taken forward with careful consideration to the likely use of such data.

The proportion of eligible academic staff submitted by each UOA and the University as a whole could be used as an indicator within League Tables. Whilst the proportion of staff submitted by LJMU may be greater than in RAE2008, it is likely that in REF2014 it will remain low when compared to research intensive universities.

**COMMENTED**

Consideration would be given as to whether to lower the quality threshold to increase the volume of staff submitted by the University to REF2014. However, the purpose of the University submitting research bids was to show that we are 'excellent' in the field of research.

AB 13.13

**ACADEMIC FRAMEWORK REVIEW – EXTERNAL EXAMINERS REPORTS**

**RECEIVED**

The report of the Head of Quality Support presented by the Pro Vice Chancellor (Education).

**PURPOSE**

To provide Academic Board with the overview of the 2011/12 External Examiners' reports and the process by which they were considered.

**REPORTED**

That two main themes had arisen from the reports in relation to assessment boards:

1. The implementation of the Student Information System (SIS) was raised as an institutional issue in a number of reports
2. Some concerns were raised regarding late notification of changes to the regulations affecting attendance at Assessment Boards

The reports also examined feedback in relation to the 15 day target. Examiners noted the variation in the quality of feedback and the balance that programme teams needed to consider to ensure quality feedback was given within 15 days.

The issues raised would be explored as part of the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy.

**COMMENTED**

That the comments surrounding the quality of feedback was mainly concerned with the electronic provision of feedback. However, it was noted that this was an interpretation of the

external examiners and that NSS results relating to feedback had improved quite considerably. There was a need for the University to now debate student expectations of feedback with staff, students and the LiverpoolSU, which would be conducted by the new Education Committee.

AB 13.14

**COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**Academic Standards and Enhancement Committee**

**RECEIVED**

Minutes of the meeting held on 12 December 2012.

**University Research & Scholarship Committee**

**RECEIVED**

Minutes of the meetings held on 21 November 2012 and 18 December 2012.

**REPORTED**

That the operation of the Committee had changed recently in that its meetings would now be held across the University with visiting presentations to ensure the sharing of best practice.

**Research Degrees Committee**

**RECEIVED**

Minutes of the meeting held on 25 October 2012.

**REPORTED**

That the website Find A PhD would be piloted for use as a recruitment tool.

**Research Ethics Committee**

**RECEIVED**

Minutes of the meeting held on 6 December 2012.

**REPORTED**

That the Research Ethics Committee would invite relevant areas to present to each meeting to share best practice.

AB 13.15

**ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

There were no items of any other business to report.

AB 13.16

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Monday 11 March 2013, 9.30am

**LIVERPOOL JOHN MOORES UNIVERSITY**

**ACADEMIC BOARD**

**Action Point Control Register – Status of Open Action Points as at 11 March 2013**

<b>Minute</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>By Whom</b>	<b>By When</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>AB 12.53</b>	Academic Framework Review Group to report to Academic Board if the Education Committee had not met beforehand.	<b>Director, Academic Enhancement Unit</b>	<b>11 March 2013</b>	<b>Active</b>