



Academic Board

16 October 2019

MINUTES

1. Attendance and apologies

1.1. Attendance:

AC Grayling	Master (Chair)
Brian Ball	HoF for Philosophy and Head of Research
Rosalind Barrs	Registrar (Secretary)
Diana Bozhilova	HoF for Politics & IR
Catherine Brown	HoF for English
Dimitrios Kyriazis	HoF for Law
Susan Green	HoF for Art History
John Hahn	Student Representative
Sonia Jones	Minute Secretary
Lars Kjaer	HoF for History
Marianna Koli	Dean for Education in Business and Economics, HoF for Economics
Rebecca Morrison	Head of Quality Assurance
Martin Smith	Executive Dean

1.2. Apologies:

Naomi Goulder	Dean for Academic Affairs and Innovation
Indrajit Ray	External Representative
Martin Smith	Executive Dean

1.3. Notice of meeting:

- 1.3.1. Notice of this meeting had been given to all members.
- 1.3.2. No members declared any conflict or potential conflict of interest.
- 1.3.3. The meeting was quorate.

- 1.3.4. The Board welcomed John Hahn as the new student representative.
2. Minutes of the last meeting
 - 2.1. The Minutes of 17 September 2019 were **APPROVED**.
3. Matters arising
 - 3.1. Matters arising were **updated**.
 - 3.2. 3. Item 9.1 Turnitin: RB informed the Board by email on 11.10.2019 that the similarity score could not be turned off for students. Students are able to see the report. The Assistant Register will include information on how to interpret the report in the *Submitting summative assessments through Turnitin* guide, which is on Moodle under Student Guides. Before the first coursework assessments are due to be submitted this term, an email will be sent to students reminding them to read the guide and informing them that extra information has been added about the similarity score and report.
4. Chair's Actions
 - 4.1. Minor modifications to Quality Assurance and Enhancement Strategy were **NOTED**.
 - 4.2. It was **NOTED** that three students had been granted exemptions from the NCH Diploma: one mature student with an exemption from LAUNCH; one with an exemption from Core Curriculum and LAUNCH for this academic year, at least, on health grounds; one with a complete exemption from Core Curriculum and LAUNCH on health grounds.
5. Policies and statement:
 - 5.1. Support to Study Policy

This had been approved by TLEC on 17 September and further recommendations had been made by RB and the Quality Manager (QM).

It was agreed that #21. '... from a group of staff...' would read '...from a group of all staff...'

CB raised questions around a student's suspension, the timing taken for an appeal to be lodged and an appeal outcome, and missed learning should the appeal be upheld. The Board decided that the Student Support Panel would decide whether students would be allowed to attend College while appeals were being considered on a case-by-case basis, taking into account whether the student's attendance would have a negative impact on other students' learning, and whether it thought that it was in the student's own best interests not to attend. Guidelines with sample cases could be drawn up for the Panel, but it would not be an exhaustive list.

It was agreed that #34., the communication of outcomes, should be improved to include confidentiality and what can be divulged.

This policy, therefore, was **NOT APPROVED** and would come back to the Board on 11 December 2019.

ACTION: RB to work with RM and the QM on the clarifications required and bring back to the Board on 11 December.

5.2. Confidentiality Statement

This was **APPROVED**.

5.3. Student Welfare Policy

This was **APPROVED** with the following amendments:

- Deletion of 'themselves' from #7.1.
- #20.1.2 would be reworded to clarify that meetings with Programme Directors would be scheduled for new and continuing postgraduate students.

It was agreed that #7.3 would be re-written to direct students to the SAS email account, and Chair's Action would be taken to approve the wording.

ACTION: RB to work with the QM to reword #7.3 and to take to ACG for Chair's Action.

JH raised a query about the use of 'impartial' in 20.2.1. It was agreed that this would stay for now, but JH was advised to consult the NCHSU and report back to the Board. (It was recognised that the case JH had used as an illustration had been more of a complaints matter, but nonetheless it was advisable that the NCHSU be consulted about this policy.)

ACTION: JH to consult the NCHSU whether the SUWDO could offer impartial advice.

6. Undergraduate Philosophy External Examiner's Annual Report and Response.

6.1. The report was **NOTED** and the HoF's response was **APPROVED**.

ACTION: RM to send the response to the External Examiner and Solent University.

6.2. External Examiner (EE) comments about administration

6.2.1. In 2019/20, it was not anticipated that any printed copies would be sent to EEs. However, the title of the marks spreadsheet would be moved so that an appropriate copy could be sent to EEs in case they made copies themselves.

6.2.2. It was agreed that the 2019/20 coursework cover sheet would be revised so as to remind students to complete the Course Title, the Course Code, and Assessment Number.

ACTION: RB to circulate a revised coversheet for approval.

6.2.3. An additional box for the coursework question would be added to the coversheet.

6.2.4. Candidate numbers, in addition to the students' unique Turnitin ID numbers, would be added to the marks sheets before sending to the EEs.

7. Postgraduate Annual Programme Review 2018-19

7.1. MA Communicating Economic Policy

The review had not been made available to the Board in sufficient time for consideration.

ACTION: RB to circulate and ask the Board to provide feedback to RM.

7.2. MA Historical Research & Public History

This was **APPROVED**, and LK's thanks to Oliver Ayers, Programme Director, were **NOTED**.

7.3. MA Philosophy

This was **APPROVED**, and the doubling of student numbers and their satisfaction **NOTED**.

It was also **NOTED** that the External Examiner's full report had not been received at the time of the meeting. RM reported that Swansea's COAH Link Tutor was chasing this.

8. Annual Faculty Reviews

8.1. Art History

The draft review had been circulated.

8.2. Economics

The draft review had been circulated.

8.3. English

The draft review had been circulated. It was **NOTED** that the English review, with its reflective commentary, provided a good model.

8.4. History

The draft review had been circulated.

8.5. Law

DK reported that the Faculty required further time to complete the review.

8.6. Philosophy

The draft review had been circulated.

8.7. Politics & IR

The draft review had been circulated.

- 8.8. RB reported that the QM had not had the opportunity to meet with HoFs to discuss their drafts before circulation to the Board, and so further work, to varying degrees, was required. RM said that, in places, assumptions had crept in and more evidence is needed. Additionally, some of the actions still need to be SMARTer.

Reviews would be brought back to the Board in December for approval.

MK raised the question of SSLC Minutes being made available to HoFs and students. RM reported that the Quality Team and the Assistant Registrar were looking into making the minutes more digestible and easier for students to read. Once the format had been decided, 2019/20 minutes would be circulated.

ACTION: RB to brief Assistant Register to circulate SSLC Minutes to HoFs.

9. NCH Diploma Regulations: Attendance Requirements for LAUNCH

The Board **AGREED** that Regulation 112. 'For LAUNCH where a student fails to attend three timetables sessions without EC in the first or second academic years, they will lose a place on the Trinity projects of those years' would be removed.

It was also **AGREED** that the NCH Diploma Team should discuss the current 70% attendance requirement, and the suggestion that the attendance weighting of 30/30/30 each year could be possibly changed to 20/40/40. JH reported that having to attend evening Science Literacy lectures could impact on some students' overall attendance scores.

ACTION: MK to ask the Diploma Team Coordinator to add i) the 70% attendance requirement and weighting and ii) Science Literacy evening lectures to the next team meeting agenda.

10. Office for Students

Update on Access and Participation Plan 2019–20

RM reported that the College had supplied all requested information to the Office for Students for the Access and Participation Plan for 2020–2025. ACG reported on MS's behalf that we had expected to hear from the OfS within a couple of weeks of 20 September, but we were still waiting.

ACTION: RM to circulate the Widening Participation Officer's report on the 2019–2020 APP and to add it to the Board's December agenda.

11. Recruitment and Admissions: Interview Tasks

ACG reported on behalf of MS that, following the Admissions Manager's consultation with Admissions Tutors, it had been agreed that all Faculties would re-introduce set tasks and each would have their own policy on how the tasks would be implemented.

12. Research

12.1. Open access publishing in academic journals

BB noted that a case had come to the Research Committee (RC) in which two faculty members had opted to share the cost of open access publishing (£1K), which they had paid from their individual research allowances. This raised the question of how open access publishing might be funded in the future (especially if the College submits a REF return in the future). Two alternatives were suggested: an online repository such as the NCH working papers series or the Northeastern repository might allow compliance with REF requirements; and an internal College fund for open access publishing (not covered by grants) might be established. The Board advised that the RC should continue to consider/explore both options. CB argued strongly against the second option, considering this a waste of College funds in the interests of an unjust and exploitative system, which the College, not participating in REF, might be in a position to help lead the sector out of.

ACTION: BB to lead RC's consideration/exploration of the options which might address the costs of covering open access publishing.

12.2. Research Associate Procedure

The Research Committee's proposal for the procedure was **APPROVED** with the addition of sign-off to be sought from the Master and the relevant HoF.

Thus, i) the academic in question or a member of faculty at NCH should approach the Chair of the Research Committee requesting the status, submitting their CV; ii) the Chair will then seek the opinion of the Committee (e.g. by email) and the host HoF, before making a decision in accordance with the Committee's and the HoF's recommendations; iii) the decision to offer a Research Associateship will then be made by the Master, the Chair of the Research Committee and the HoF. Chair of the Research Committee will report to the Board.

Only those with a doctoral degree (or equivalent) should be considered for the status of Research Associate; and the status should be granted for a period of (up to) one year, with the possibility of renewal.

It was **NOTED** that Research Associates should be likely to contribute to the research culture at the College through collaboration on research themes of interest to faculty (and a 'host' faculty member within the NCH Faculty assigned); and they should be given the privileges of faculty as regards building access and library facilities.

13. Student Retention Strategy Annual Report 2018-19

This was **APPROVED**. The strategy will be kept under review.

ACTION: RB to schedule a meeting of the Board dedicated to student attendance.

14. Student Surveys

14.1. Student Super Survey Results Report 2018-19

The report was **NOTED**. The low response rate was discussed.

ACTION: RM to ask the Quality Manager to circulate a link to the mid-point and short course surveys with a reminder for faculty to promote and allow time in their classes for students to complete the surveys in Michaelmas weeks 10, 11 and 12.

14.2. NSS Report 2018-19

The report was **NOTED**. The response rate here was 90% with mainly extremely positive feedback. Students had again expressed low satisfaction with learning resources.

ACTION: RM to include Learning Resources on a TLEC agenda and ask students how this can be improved.

It was **NOTED** on page 6 that Philosophy's overall satisfaction difference would be revised from +9 to +12 and thus be judged to be outstanding; on page 7 that 'Philosophy' would be corrected to 'Politics'.

15. Redacted – restricted information.

16. AOB

DB asked about data from the previous DLHE surveys (now called Graduate Outcomes).

ACTION: RM to share the data though she cautioned that it is in its raw state and complex.