

**MINUTES
ACADEMIC BOARD**

**Monday 2 February 2015
Roscoe Room, Egerton Court**

Present:

Professor A Al-Shamma'a	Ms J Martin
Mr M Ashall	Dr R Murphy
Professor P Byers	Professor M Riley
Mr D Cole	Professor A Scott
Ms J Craddock	Ms L Sebastian-Francois
Professor S Davies	Professor H Sumnall
Ms S Davys	Ms P Uwamaliya
Mr R Dawson	Professor P Vickerman
Mr P Evans	Professor N Weatherill (Chair)
Professor S Gonzalez	Professor R Webster
Dr E Harcourt	Professor P Wheeler
Professor R Leatherbarrow	

In Attendance:

Ms J Bertolini	Ms M Phillips (AB 14.54)
Ms J Gresham	Mr M Power
Ms J Hargreaves	Miss L Sutcliffe (Committee Secretary)
Dr D Leighton (AB 15.09)	Ms H Thrift
Dr C Milsom (AB 15.10)	

Apologies:

Professor H Al Nageim	Mrs J Murphy
Mr P Killen	Dr J Yates
M J McDowell	

SECRETARY'S NOTE

Following the resignation of the Director of Research & Innovation Services from Academic Board and the imminent retirement of the Strategy Management Director, the Chair sought Academic Board approval for the following appointments:

- Professor Phil Vickerman be appointed as ex-officio member, filling the vacancy created by the forthcoming departure of the Strategy Management Director.
- Dr Raphaela Kane be appointed to membership within the Management category, filling the vacancy created by Professor Vickerman's movement to ex-officio membership.

The remaining vacancies would remain unfilled until the next round of Academic Board elections.

APPROVED Academic Board approved the appointments as listed above.

AB 15.01

MINUTES (AB 15/01)

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 December 2014 were approved as a correct record.

AB 15.02

MATTERS ARISING NOT SHOWN ELSEWHERE ON THE AGENDA

Action Point AB 14.43 Vice Chancellor & Chief Executive Report

REPORTED

Academic Board members to consider how they would like to interact more with staff across the University and provide any suggestions to the Chair as and when appropriate.

No comments were received in response to the standing invitation to Academic Board members.

Action Point AB 14.54 Pro-Vice-Chancellor (External Engagement) Briefing

REPORTED

That the announcements from the International Student Experience Group and the Student Mobility & Study Abroad Working Group would be reported to Academic Board at a later date.

Action Point AB 14.55 Current Topical Briefings (The University's Website)

Please see item AB 15.05 below.

Action Point 14.57 Academic Board Effectiveness Review

Please see item AB 15.03 below.

Action Point 14.59 2013/14 Graduate Profile

Postgraduate degree figures to be reviewed and aligned to those in the postgraduate degrees report. To receive an oral update from the Registrar & Deputy Chief Executive.

SECRETARY'S NOTE

The following response was circulated to Academic Board following the meeting.

Following discussions between the Graduate School and Academic Planning and Information Services team the differences between the two figures can be fully explained and both areas agree on the numbers. The two reports do measure

activity across a different timescale and one also included Professional Doctorates.

Action Point 14.63 Committee Reports

The terms of reference for IT Committee and Social & Economic Engagement Committee would be reported to Academic Board on 23 March 2015.

AB 15.03

ACADEMIC BOARD EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

RECEIVED

The report of the Vice Chancellor & Chief Executive (AB 15/02).

REPORTED

The Board of Governors' governance effectiveness review commenced on 1st December 2014 at the Governor Workshop with feedback guiding further debate at the Governor Away Day on 29th January 2015. The format of the governance effectiveness review was devised using best practice from across the sector and was intended to challenge Governors as to their understanding of the effectiveness of governance and their role in the leadership of the University.

The Governors' effectiveness review had highlighted the importance of the Academic Board and the value placed on its responsibilities. Governors received Academic Board minutes and, in addition, could attend Academic Board as an observer. However, this invitation was yet to be taken up.

As part of the governance effectiveness review, the Academic Board would be asked to comment on how it felt it discharged its responsibilities. A report containing recommendations and actions from the Governor discussions and the Academic Board discussions would be reported to the Board of Governors at its meeting on 30 March 2015.

Academic Board members were invited to respond to a set of carefully selected questions using anonymous 'clicker' technology to rate their response. Although attendees did not participate with the clicker technology, they were invited to take part in the open discussion that followed each question.

Out of the twenty-two members eligible, twenty-one were able to vote using the technology, which was due to a technical error. One member left the meeting during questions 5, 6, 7 and 8.

Question 1 – How effective is the University at meeting the requirement that the Academic Board is collectively responsible for considering the development of the academic activities of the University and the resources needed to support them and for

advising the Vice Chancellor and the Board of Governors thereon?

Highly Effective	0
Effective	12
Needs Some Improvement	7
Ineffective	2
Highly Ineffective	0
Total	21

No further comments were received.

Question 2 – How effective is the University at meeting the requirement that the Academic Board has a genuine and shared commitment with the executive and the governing body to ensure effective governance?

Highly Effective	1
Effective	13
Needs Some Improvement	7
Ineffective	0
Highly Ineffective	0
Total	21

COMMENTED

That there was an expectation that some committees, such as Academic Planning Panel, should report to Academic Board but the terms of reference did not allow this.

Question 3 – How effective is the University at meeting the requirement that the existing roles, responsibilities and accountabilities of the Academic Board and its committees are clearly defined and are known by both members, the executive and the governing body?

Highly Effective	3
Effective	5
Needs Some Improvement	12
Ineffective	1
Highly Ineffective	0
Total	21

COMMENTED

Academic Board member awareness of the existing roles, responsibilities and accountabilities was dependent on the role each member played within the University. For example, those without management responsibilities may not be as clear on the role they play as those with management responsibilities or those who sit on other committees.

That elected members of Academic Board have relatively little knowledge of the University, and as such, of their role on Academic Board. Such difficulties could be addressed by providing a detailed explanation of the roles and responsibilities of its members during induction.

The term 'representative' in relation to elected members was conflicting. Elected members were elected from within their local area by their peers but did not represent the views of their local area.

That communication between the Board of Governors and Academic Board could be strengthened.

Question 4 – How effective is the University at meeting the requirement that the Academic Board is able to assure the effective operation of academic governance to the governing body – in order to maintain quality and ensure that the interests of students are at the heart of governance?

Highly Effective	1
Effective	10
Needs Some Improvement	9
Ineffective	1
Highly Ineffective	0
Total	21

COMMENTED

The majority of business received by Academic Board was for 'noting' or 'approval' only and provided no forum to consider the interests of students.

Governors looked to the Academic Board for the effective operation of academic governance and to challenge the Vice Chancellor for academic re-assurance.

Question 5 – How effective is the University at meeting the requirement that the Academic Board regularly reviews its own performance and demonstrates a commitment to continuous improvement in its own affairs?

Highly Effective	1
Effective	9
Needs Some Improvement	8
Ineffective	2
Highly Ineffective	0
Total	20 (one member left for this question)

COMMENTED

The Academic Board had not taken any steps to evaluate itself over the last two years, but this was possibly longer.

Question 6 – How effective is the University at meeting the requirement that the Academic Board’s decision making structure (including any sub-committees) is fit for purpose?

Highly Effective	3
Effective	8
Needs Some Improvement	8
Ineffective	1
Highly Ineffective	0
Total	20

(one member left for this question)

COMMENTED

The Academic Board’s decision making structure felt more like a tick-box exercise and received reports for approval only.

Question 7 – How effective is the University at meeting the requirement that the Academic Board has effective processes for meeting its responsibilities to the Board of Governors for determining the educational character of the University?

Highly Effective	2
Effective	9
Needs Some Improvement	6
Ineffective	3
Highly Ineffective	0
Total	20

(one member left for this question).

COMMENTED

That the ‘educational character’ of the University suggested a wider representation. This was ineffective within the current Academic Board evidenced by the lack of working papers being received by Academic Board.

That Academic Board members needed to be aware of the processes to be able to answer this question.

Question 8 – How effective is the University at meeting the requirement that the size, nature, experience, skills and diversity of the Academic Board membership are appropriate to meet its roles and responsibilities?

Highly Effective	2
Effective	3

Needs Some Improvement	11
Ineffective	4
Highly Ineffective	0
Total	20

(one member left for this question).

COMMENTED That the terms of reference required two members of teaching staff only to be quorate. This was particularly problematic given the considerably increased number of senior management required. Balancing this requirement would be a simple solution to ensure a more diverse Academic Board.

SECRETARY'S NOTE

That the quorum shall be one half of the members of the Academic Board of whom at least 50% must be members of the Senior Management. There is no requirement that two members of teaching staff are required for the Academic Board to be quorate. The current terms of reference and membership of the Academic Board includes six members of teaching staff plus four members of the Professoriate.

Question 9 – How effective is the University at meeting the requirement that the recruitment, succession planning, election processes of Academic Board are effective?

Highly Effective	2
Effective	4
Needs Some Improvement	12
Ineffective	3
Highly Ineffective	0
Total	21

COMMENTED That the Academic Board induction may be the issue rather than the processes around recruitment, succession planning and elections.

Question 10 – How effective is the University at meeting the requirement that effective support, induction and ongoing professional development exist for members, and are valued by them?

Highly Effective	1
Effective	3
Needs Some Improvement	9
Ineffective	8
Highly Ineffective	0
Total	21

COMMENTED

That if the issues around induction were resolved, most of the issues highlighted previously would in turn start to be resolved.

That being a member of Academic Board was like being a member of a team with shared responsibility for academic governance, and as such, needed professional development to pull its members together.

Question 11 – How effective is the University at meeting the requirement that Academic Board members are motivated, attend regularly, participate actively, and their skills and experience are used effectively?

Highly Effective	2
Effective	14
Needs Some Improvement	4
Ineffective	1
Highly Ineffective	0
Total	21

COMMENTED

Academic Board may wish to replicate the Board of Governors' practice of maintaining attendance records and publishing them for the membership to view. In addition, the internal auditors recently attended a Board of Governors' meeting to observe and provide feedback on the debate that took place.

Attendance by Academic Board members was good, however, reports received tended to be for 'noting' only, which was not the best use of the expertise of the Academic Board members.

Question 12 – How effective is the University at meeting the requirement that the Academic Board is responsible for safeguarding and enhancing academic standards through quality assurance processes?

Highly Effective	4
Effective	15
Needs Some Improvement	1
Ineffective	1
Highly Ineffective	0
Total	21

No further comments were received.

Question 13 – How effective is the University at meeting the requirement that the Academic Board has a broad oversight of the academic work and activities of the institution, including:

learning; teaching; research; scholarship; and other community-based activities?

Highly Effective	4
Effective	12
Needs Some Improvement	5
Ineffective	0
Highly Ineffective	0

Total 21

COMMENTED

That the impact of the relatively new Social and Economic Engagement Committee would impact positively in this area.

That the Pro-Vice-Chancellor Briefing Reports were very useful and provided Academic Board members with valuable information.

END OF INTERACTIVE SESSION

COMMENTED

That the results of the interactive session would be more useful with the removal of the 'Needs Some Improvement' category as this allowed respondents to 'sit on the fence'.

The effectiveness of the Academic Board was very dependent on the effectiveness of the Committees that fed into Academic Board. It was felt that it was difficult to intervene at such a late stage and that the role of the Academic Board appeared to be 'for approval' only. It was suggested that a Faculty Senate, whereby motions are raised and discussed at Faculty level, would allow Academic Board members not on other committees to have a voice in the decision-making process before items are reported to Academic Board for approval.

The viewpoint that Academic Board was a forum 'for approval' only was also applicable across the University and that in general staff members were not involved in the decision-making process. For example, the regular staff forums are formatted so that staff are 'talked at' rather than there being an open discussion in relation to decision-making.

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor Briefings could be used as the basis for reporting key messages from Academic Board to staff.

That the election statements suggested that elected members were not fully aware of what it meant to be an Academic Board member.

The Chairman thanked Academic Board for their contribution to the session and confirmed that the emerging themes would receive attention. All members had a responsibility to discharge the Academic Board responsibilities and that it should serve as

the 'test and challenge' where the educational character of the University is moulded and taken forward. The Academic Board should have a high profile, with an agenda that reflected the agenda of the University.

ACTION That a list of proposed actions would be reported to the next meeting of Academic Board to enable members to implement the changes that would improve on the effectiveness of the Academic Board.

AB 15.04

PRO-VICE-CHANCELLORS' BRIEFINGS

Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) (AB 15/03)

RECEIVED The report of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education).

PURPOSE To update Academic Board on recent activity within the portfolio of the PVC (Education).

REPORTED **LJMU Teaching & Learning Academy**

That the work of the LJMU Teaching & Learning Academy continued and communications via a 'soft launch' were underway. It was anticipated that the Academy would be formally launched during April 2015. The Academy had undergone a number of enhancement activities since its creation, in particular, the UK Engagement Survey (UKES), which had replaced the LJMU 'Mirror Survey'. LJMU had taken part in the pilot survey last year and had decided to run it again to enable benchmarking across the sector.

REPORTED **National Student Survey**

That the NSS was launched on 19 January 2015. On the basis of wide consultation, it was decided to include two institutional questions based upon the learning environment.

Programme teams were able to exercise judgement to push for a response to the survey in an attempt to pick up on the individual nature of programmes. The response rates to date are as follows:

Arts, Professional & Social Studies 24% (21% at same point last year).

Education, Health & Community 37% (57% at the same point last year)

Science 25% (23% at the same point last year)

Technology and Engineering 29% (34% at the same point last year)

To date, the institutional response rate is 28% as opposed to 32% at the same time compared to last year. However, the University was confident that it would receive a positive response rate overall.

REPORTED

Admissions Reports

The weekly admissions reports had been reviewed and revised into one report that would provide audience specific information. Consultation on the use of the reports was underway and it was hoped that they would provide fit-for-purpose information in an accessible manner.

Pro-Vice-Chancellor (External Engagement) (AB 15/04)

RECEIVED

The report of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (External Engagement).

PURPOSE

To update Academic Board on recent activity within the portfolio of the PVC (External Engagement).

REPORTED

Engagement

The University had formed an exploratory partnership with Elliott & Thompson, a privately owned publisher, to look at the development of a University imprint. Academic Board were asked to comment on how to develop such a partnership.

COMMENTED

It was suggested that, from a REF perspective, involvement in providing general works for publication would not be the best use of staff time. However, several staff members across the University were interested in published general works via such an avenue, and indeed, already published general works in addition to REF standard research. The development of a University imprint would link to the University's strategy in relation to research and scholarship and would demonstrate a clear commitment to public engagement.

REPORTED

International Activity

The University's dialogue with Southern Connecticut State University had progressed well. In addition to exploring opportunities for student and staff mobility, the University was examining the case for joint or dual awards at both undergraduate and postgraduate level. A delegation representing the four faculties would visit Southern during February for detailed discussions.

Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Scholarship, Research and Knowledge Transfer) (AB 15/05)

RECEIVED The report of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Scholarship, Research and Knowledge Transfer).

PURPOSE To provide the Academic Board with an update on recent activity within the portfolio of the PVC (Scholarship, Research and Knowledge Transfer).

REPORTED **REF2014 Results**

That the REF2014 results were published on 18 December 2014 and were well publicised. A series of events were held across the University with three separate very well attended Road Shows. There were a number of positive messages from REF2014, most notably:

- A 25 % increase in the number of staff submitted since RAE2008;
- The amount of world leading activity had doubled since 2008;
- The quality of the submissions had increased significantly;
- LJMU was up to 4th best North West University in terms of quality (out of 12);
- Sports Science had performed extremely well, coming 2nd in the country in quality.

COMMENTED That the REF2014 Road Shows were very effective as a feedback mechanism and were welcomed by those in attendance.

REPORTED **Sensor City Industry Event**

That an industry liaison event for Sensor City was held on 10 December 2014 with over 100 delegates in attendance. The purpose of the event was to maintain interest in Sensor City whilst preparations were ongoing.

AB 15.05 **CURRENT TOPICAL BRIEFINGS**

The University's Estate (AB 15/06)

RECEIVED The report of the Chair of the Estate Committee.

PURPOSE To provide the Academic Board with an update on the progress of the Estate Committee.

REPORTED

The University's Estate was evolving each month and plans had progressed as hoped. The planning and design stages for the Copperas Hill building had moved forward, in addition to the plans for the John Foster Building, the Aldham Roberts Building, the Byrom Street Social Space, and the University Enterprise Zones (Sensor City).

The University had purchased the Henry Cotton Building at the end of 2014, which was a very practical decision for the University.

I.T. (AB 15/07)

RECEIVED

The report of the Registrar & Deputy Chief Executive.

PURPOSE

To provide Academic Board with information on the current portfolio of IT projects and to provide a progress update.

REPORTED

The SMS Text Alert project would be closed down as an IT project, however a great deal of work would continue in relation to the information provided by students.

The SIS Phase III project would look to implement further enhancements to the Student Information System.

The CRM project was reaching a critical phase with a partner recently engaged.

That the SAN Hardware installation was successful with all data successfully migrated from the old to the new SAN over the holiday period. However, a recent major system outage had prompted the installation of new operating system software that would provide enhanced stability. It was re-assuring that the systems were fully operational the following day.

COMMENTED

That the recent major system outage caused particular concerns for students in relation to submissions of assessment. However, the LiverpoolSU congratulated and thanked IT Services for its rapid response to the outage.

The system outage highlighted the positive impact that social media had on communicating current issues to students and staff. Further information on the processes for the use of social media would be reported to the next meeting of Academic Board.

ACTION

To report the processes for the use of social media to Academic Board.

The University's Website

RECEIVED A demonstration of the new University Website by the Head of Corporate Business Change Initiatives.

REPORTED That progress to date was as follows:

- The University had received full technical implementation, by Sitecore;
- Templates have been delivered by Mando;
- The University was now collating content to populate the templates;
- Phase 1 of the University website would be launched on 23 March 2015 and would contain new content, including videos, pictures and text

Content would not be re-written but would utilise that what was already available on Symplectic, therefore staff would be sent a reminder to update individual entries to ensure accuracy.

COMMENTED That academic staff profile pages should list the faculty and programme title along with the contact details to ensure optimum results when searching for staff. Although inserting the programme title was to be considered, it would not be implemented for the launch of the first phase.

Staff photographs would be shared with individuals for final approval before being published to the website.

Students would be invited to test the pages before the website is launched.

That the implementation of the website was a dynamic process across a number of phases and it was vital that staff engage with the project to develop a new website.

AB 15.06

VICE CHANCELLOR & CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT

RECEIVED The oral report of the Vice Chancellor & Chief Executive.

REPORTED That the Board of Governors' Strategic Event Away Day was very positive and received a number of key updates from across the University.

REPORTED That an additional meeting of Academic Board would be called during April/May 2015 to discuss the recommendations of the Academic Framework Working Groups. The additional meeting would enable comments from Academic Board to be

incorporated into the Academic Framework for final approval at its meeting on Monday 29 June 2015.

ACTION To agree and circulate a date for an additional meeting of Academic Board during April/May 2015.

AB 15.07 **GRADUANDS REPORT: DECEMBER 2014-JANUARY 2015**

RECEIVED The oral report of the Vice Chancellor & Deputy Chief Executive.

REPORTED That the Vice-Chancellor & Chief Executive, in his capacity as the Chairman of the Academic Board, approved the Graduand Report for December 2014-January 2015.

AB 15.08 **ANALYSIS OF 2014/15 FULL TIME NEW UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS SEMESTER 1 WITHDRAWALS** (AB 15/08)

RECEIVED The report of the Registrar & Deputy Chief Executive.

PURPOSE To provide Academic Board with an analysis of the withdrawal rates for newly recruited full time undergraduate students at LJMU for Semester 1 of the 2014/15 academic year in order to provide a reference point for reviewing programme performance and for determining strategic objectives and policies for student retention.

RECOMMENDATION

- Academic Board note the rates of withdrawal at institutional, faculty, school and programme level;
- Academic Board use the data as a reference point when considering strategic objectives and policies for student retention;
- Academic Board and Faculties use the data in the assessment of programme performance.

COMMENTED That it would be useful to receive information which identified the stage that each withdrawing student had joined the application process, for example, identify the number of withdrawing students who had applied via clearing. In addition, it would be useful to receive information identifying the institutions that withdrawing students transferred to. However, it should be noted that, although the University had students who had transferred out of LJMU, it also gained students who transfer in from other institutions.

ACTION To provide an analysis for withdrawing students and at what point of the application process they applied to the LJMU.

To provide an analysis of the institutions that LJMU students transferred to.

AB 15.09

RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE (AB 15/09)

RECEIVED

The report of the Interim Chair of Research Ethics Committee.

PURPOSE

To present to Academic Board the Annual Report of the University's Research Ethics Committee 2013/14.

REPORTED

That there was a slight drop in the number of submissions for ethical review as compared with 2012/13. Applications from the Faculty of Education, Health & Community had fallen in absolute terms and could be attributed to some students on postgraduate taught programmes opting to complete literature-based projects. It also reflected a downward trend in the funding available for health-based research.

The Research Ethics Committee (REC) was notified of two studies where a breach of approved protocol had taken place; in both instances the REC was satisfied that the breach was unintentional. Currently the REC had no formal progress or monitoring compliance function in place, however, failure to adhere to approved ethical procedures was classed as research misconduct.

The University REC had a governance role in relation to ethics panel's operating locally and local REC's were operating with good ethical standards but with differences in procedures which reflected the different ethical issues and risks across the different disciplines. Local REC's emerge from schools and to date there was no local committee within the Liverpool Business School despite undergraduate programmes involving human participants. The University would expect local programme leaders to look at the value of local ethical scrutiny and introduce formal procedures under the governance of the University REC.

Steps had been made to improve the membership and attendance of the REC, however, this had proven problematic for various reasons. Internal training provision had not been implemented but would be rolled forward to next year. A new 0.5FTE Research Governance Manager position would be advertised shortly which would include the role of Chair of the REC, with REC activity remaining with Research & Innovation Services.

COMMENTED

The attendance statistics, as listed in the report, raised questions around quoracy and the effectiveness of the REC. However, the Committee had been quorate in all of its meetings. Much activity was conducted outside of Committee business and some areas

included shared attendance. The Chairs of local panels were able to include attendance of local REC's in the workload allocation model, however, this was not the case for the University REC. There was no requirement for all faculties to be represented on the University REC and the lack of membership from the Faculty of Technology and Environment was being addressed by the Dean.

It would be useful to receive statistics on active involvement with proportionate review to provide a richer data set on the membership issues.

The Academic Board were responsible for assuring the Board of Governors' that there was sufficient scrutiny of all academic activity. As such, the work of the REC would be included within the Academic Board effectiveness review when it reports to the Board of Governors'.

ACTION

The Dean of the Faculty of Arts, Professional & Social Studies would make contact with members from APSS to improve their attendance record at REC meetings.

The next report to include statistics on active involvement with proportionate review in relation to the attendance statistics.

That the activities of the REC be included within the Academic Board Effectiveness Review and subsequent report.

AB 15.10

LEARNING, TEACHING & ASSESSMENT STRATEGY: PROGRESS REPORT 2013/14 AND REVISED FACULTY ACTION PLANS 2014/15 (AB 15/10)

RECEIVED

The report of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) and Director of the Teaching & Learning Academy.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Board note the 2013/14 Progress Report and the revised 2014/15 Faculty Action Plans.

REPORTED

The Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy was underpinned by the Strategic Plan which was informed by four Faculty Action Plans written by the Associate Deans (Education). The report included a number of new initiatives implemented throughout the year. The Education Committee had approved an Academic Framework Project Board from which five working groups were established and would inform the Learning, Teaching & Assessment Strategy for successive years.

COMMENTED

Further analysis of the data for the number of staff who had a teaching related qualification and/or Higher Education Academy (HEA) accreditation and those who do not would be useful. The

HEA had a new framework whereby Fellows were upgrading to Senior Fellowship but were not being reflected against institutional targets. The target could be revised to reflect those staff members who were upgrading, which would also provide an incentive for continuing professional development.

During the last academic year there was a pilot for accredited mentors to work with academic staff to upgrade from descriptor two/three or to gain Fellowship via a series of assessed conversations that were verified by external advisers. Therefore, the requirement for lengthy applications were negated and was a more efficient way of working.

Although, the University had achieved just 27% of the targeted 80% of staff engagement with best practice sharing activity, this did not include the new initiatives that the University had embarked upon through the Teaching & Learning Academy during 2013/14.

That the technology used to enhance learning must be robust and reliable. Technical staff were available to provide assistance when required and there was a commitment to develop more technically secure academic staff. Evidence had shown that engaging with new technology, even in the event of failures, was a valuable learning experience. Blackboard had been key to embedding the use of technology by academic staff and steps had been taken to make Blackboard more stable.

ACTION

To include a further analysis of the data for the number of staff who had a teaching related qualification and/or HEA accreditation and those who do not.

AB 15.11

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Education Committee (AB 15/11)

RECEIVED

Minutes of the meeting held on 17 December 2015.

NOTED

Academic Board noted the contents of the minutes of the last meeting of EDC.

I.T. Committee (AB 15/12)

RECEIVED

Minutes of the meeting held on 20 November 2014.

NOTED

Academic Board noted the contents of the minutes of the last meeting of the IT Committee.

Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee (AB 15/13)

RECEIVED

Minutes of the meeting held on 16 December 2014.

NOTED

Academic Board noted the contents of the minutes of the last meeting of QAEC.

Research & Scholarship Committee (AB 15/14 & AB 15/15)

RECEIVED

Minutes of the meeting held on 13 November 2014 and 4 December 2014.

NOTED

Academic Board noted the contents of the minutes of the last two meetings of RSC.

AB 15.12

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

REPORTED

On behalf of Academic Board, the Chairman extended his thanks and best wishes to Mr Paul Evans who was retiring from the University at the end of February 2015. As an ex-officio member, Paul had been a long standing servant to the University and Academic Board and had been a major driver behind the development of the Strategic Framework.

AB 15.13

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Monday 23 March 2015, 9.30am

LIVERPOOL JOHN MOORES UNIVERSITY

ACADEMIC BOARD

Action Point Control Register – Status of Open Action Points as at 23 March 2015

Minute	Action	By Whom	By When	Status
AB 14.43	<u>Vice Chancellor & Chief Executive's Report</u> Academic Board members to consider how they would like to interact more with staff across the University and provide any suggestions to the Chair as and when appropriate.	Academic Board members	Ongoing	Open
AB 14.54	<u>Pro-Vice-Chancellor Briefing (AB 14/73)</u> Announcements from the International Student Experience Working Group and the Student Mobility & Study Abroad Working Group would be reported to Academic Board.	Pro-Vice-Chancellor (External Engagement)	2 February 2015	Active
AB 14.55	<u>Current Topical Briefings (The University's Website)</u> Academic Board to receive a demonstration of the new University website.	Head of Corporate Business Change Initiatives	2 February 2015	Discharged
AB 14.57 (i)	<u>Academic Board Effectiveness Review</u> Academic Board to discuss the outcomes of the Governor Strategic Event debate on Board effectiveness	Vice-Chancellor & Chief Executive	2 February 2015	Discharged
AB 14.57(ii)	<u>Academic Board Effectiveness Review</u> Academic Board to discuss the use of a one page template of key activities from Academic Board that could be used to provide a consistent approach when communicating Academic Board activities to staff.	Academic Board members	2 February 2015	Discharged

AB 14.59	<u>2013/14 Graduate Profile (AB 14/77)</u> Postgraduate degree figures to be reviewed and aligned to those in the postgraduate degrees report.	Registrar & Deputy Chief Executive	2 February 2015	Discharged
AB 14.63	<u>Committee Reports</u> That the terms of reference for the University's I.T. Committee would be reviewed and reported to Academic Board.	Registrar & Deputy Chief Executive	23 March 2015	Active
AB 14.63	<u>Committee Reports</u> That the terms of reference for the University's Social & Economic Engagement Committee would be reviewed and reported to Academic Board.	Pro-Vice-Chancellor (External Engagement)	23 March 2015	Active
AB 15.03	<u>Academic Board Effectiveness Review</u> A list of proposed actions would be reported to the next meeting of Academic Board to enable members to implement changes that would improve the effectiveness of the Academic Board.	Vice Chancellor & Chief Executive	23 March 2015	Active
AB 15.05	<u>Current Topical Briefing (IT) (AB15/07)</u> Report the processes for the use of social media to Academic Board following a recent IT outage.	Registrar & Deputy Chief Executive	23 March 2015	Active
AB 15.06	<u>Vice Chancellor & Chief Executive's Report</u> To agree and circulate an additional meeting of Academic Board during April/May 2015.	Academic Board Secretary	23 March 2015	Active
AB 15.08	<u>Analysis of 2014/15 Full Time New Undergraduate Students Semester 1 Withdrawals</u> To provide information identifying the stage in the application process that the withdrawing students had applied, for example, the number of students who withdrew and had applied via clearing.	Registrar & Deputy Chief Executive	23 March 2015	Active

AB 15.08	<u>Analysis of 2014/15 Full Time New Undergraduate Students Semester 1 Withdrawals</u> To provide information identifying which institutions transferring students transferred to.	Registrar & Deputy Chief Executive	23 March 2015	Active
AB 15.09	<u>Research Ethics Committee</u> An email to be sent to REC members encouraging attendance and engagement with the REC.	Dean, Faculty of Arts, Professional & Social Studies	Immediate	Active
AB 15.09	<u>Research Ethics Committee</u> To include statistical information on active involvement with proportionate reviews in relation to attendance statistics.	Chair, Research Ethics Committee	7 December 2015	Active
AB 15.09	<u>Research Ethics Committee</u> To include the activities of the Research Ethics Committee in the Academic Board Effectiveness Review and subsequent report.	Vice Chancellor & Chief Executive	23 March 2015	Active
AB 15.10	<u>Learning, Teaching & Assessment Strategy: Progress Report 2013/14 and Revised Faculty Action Plans 2014/15</u> To provide further analysis of the data for the number of staff with a teaching related qualification and/or HEA accreditation and those without.	Director of the Teaching & Learning Academy	23 March 2015	Active