APPC17/04/01



Meeting APPC17/Special Meeting Confirmed

## ACADEMIC POLICY AND PRACTICE COMMITTEE

## Minutes of the special meeting held on 17 August 2017

PRESEN	Τ:	Dr N. Andrew, Professor A. Britton, Mr K.Campbell, Dr D Chalmers, Professor R. Clougherty, Dr M Ferguson (vice Mr I. Stewart), Professor T. Hilton, Mr S. Lopez, Ms J. Main, Mr V. McKay, Dr N. McLarnon, Dr S. Rate, Ms K. Roden, Mr R. Ruthven, Professor B. Steves, Professor V. Webster (Chair), Professor R. Whittaker, Mrs M. Wright
APOLOGIES:		Professor I. Cameron, Ms J. Fisher, Professor A. Morgan, Ms Y. Ogedengbe, Dr M. Sharp
BY INVITATION:		Mrs H. Brown (ALC Academic Lead), Ms D.Donnet (Governance)
IN ATTENDANCE:		Professor L. Kilbride (for item B1), Mr P. Woods (Secretary)
PREAM	BLE	
		embers that the meeting had been convened to consider the GCNYC Catalog and ducation items.
GLASGO	W CALEDONI	AN NEW YORK COLLEGE (GCNYC) CATALOG
17.001	Considered	The GCNYC Catalog and Lexicon of US Higher Education (APPC17/01/01).
17.002	Reported	By Professor Clougherty that the lexicon was presented for information on the differences between the US and UK Higher Education systems. The Catalog was the annual publication of major regulations and processes for students and details of programmes and courses to be offered in that academic year.
		The lexicon provided context for members in relation to terminology and accepted norms of HE in New York.
		The Catalog was a contract with the student in that the student accepts the catalog

· · · · ·		
		by registering and the institution must fulfil the commitment s of the catalog. GCNYC will establish an Academic Board which will be responsible for approving the Catalog. In the interim the Catalog was presented to APPC for consideration and endorsement, subject to any required changes. The GCNYC Academic Board would also have a reporting relationship with APPC and Senate at GCU.
		The requirement for autonomy of GCNYC to comply with NY State Department of Education Board of Regents means that the GCNYC Academic Board will function as Senate doe sin GCU.
		Where statutorily possible the Catalog adapted GCU Policies and Processes. The key exceptions to this were highlighted and explained at length.
		Academic Quality
		Quality control is asserted through the faculty member who is subject to a peer review process. Hence faculty members have a great deal of academic freedom in determining the content of their courses within the framework of the learning outcomes.
		Assessment Regulations
		The faculty member is also responsible for assessment and there are no assessment boards. Students cannot appeal academic judgement but can appeal where there has been a material error e.g. deviation from the syllabus or error in calculation.
		Code of Student Conduct
		Faculty members also set their own policies for plagiarism and cheating. Penalties are normally limited to the course where the offence originated but in extreme cases the faculty member can recommend further action.
17.003	Discussion	Members discussed the Catalog section by section:
		<b>Library</b> Professor Clougherty stated that there was a physical library on site and links to the GCU Library. A librarian was to be hired and the Metropolitan Library Council membership would allow students access to other libraries. The reading list for the modules to run in 2017-18 would be complete.
		Student Status definitions Professor Clougherty explained that "non-matriculated" students were a category of student who could be allowed to take individual courses subject to space availability.
		Full-time and part-time status was dependent on the number of credits undertaken per semester.
		"Auditing" meant attending classes without formally undertaking the module. This was not allowed by this Catalog.

Student Services
7.2 xi Professor Clougherty explained that, for example, this meant that a disciplinary hearing couldn't be held on a Friday for a Jewish student.
Code of Conduct
Aspects of this were included as required by law to be there. The Select Disciplinary Committee would have a student representative and they would no have the same support as GCU student representatives as yet as the cohort was too small. However a conversation with students would be undertaken as to ho best to support.
The similarity checking policy e.g. use of Turnitin, would not be prescribed in the Catalog as the faculty member was responsible for determining their approach to plagiarism detection. Turnitin was, however, available.
<b>Fees and Refund Policy</b> Professor Clougherty explained that this was a legal requirement of GCNYC. RPL fees \$500 - Professor Clougherty explained that this for an evaluation of RPI (PLA) which, if approved, saved the student on regular programme fees. RPL wa not used for admission but for course exemption. Also the cost reflected the need to manage expectation of the RPL evaluation process. He also asked members to note there was no fee for credit transfer.
Repeating plus fees: there are no resits as understood in UK. Students can take module again but must pay fees. There was an incomplete grade process where an extension may be granted by appeal to the Dean. Fees would not be applied where a student suffered serious illness and/or accident and were not able to complete a trimester.
The fee for replacement ID cards reflected the cost of a smart card (for building access etc) as well as deterrent to losing card.
There would not be any fees for Graduation.
Staff Development At the moment this was responsibility of the Dean i.e. faculty induction, mentoring.
Student Feedback Professor Clougherty stated that this would be at syllabus level (i.e. not in the Catalog content). Students would also have a handbook at syllabus level detailin expectations from faculty members. Illustrative that the US system moderates the person (faculty member) not the process, as in UK.
<b><u>Complaints Handling</u></b> There was no equivalent of the SPSO but students could, possibly complain to the State Education Department. However it would normally be an internal matter.

ith State
treme led class et up,
al
Report
action ed and
ALU of the C dents at ion of taff at library ning was

		"foundation" year and would be considered a core element of a student's programme. This did not entail an additional burden for GCU staff. Student Recruitment
		Projected student recruitment numbers had been scaled back. Mrs Brown stated that this was largely as a result of student funding situation. The residency requirement had been removed in response to queries from Mauritian students and other markets. The first Graduation ceremony will also provide a boost in marketing terms, particularly to Africa. One member queried the student cohort profile – i.e. that students were supposed to be sponsored, not fee paying. The Chair explained that the cohort was mixed and as well as African nationals scholarships there were fee paying students. It was felt a breakdown of the cohort profile would be useful.
17.008	Resolved	That the report be noted.
TRANSN	ATIONAL EDU	JCATION ACADEMIC CASE: CCBRT TANZANIA
17.009	Considered	An Academic Case: Delivery of Transnational education in collaboration with Comprehensive Community Based Rehabilitation [CCBRT) (NGO) in Tanzania (APPC17/02/01).
17.010	Reported	By Mr McKay that the proposal had been developed in partnership with SWBE and was based on a programme already running at GCU.
17.011	Discussion	The main drivers around the proposal were women's health/maternity health in Tanzania and providing solutions to the lack of suitably qualified healthcare professionals. The proposal was based on the existing suite of programmes (Professional Studies in Nursing) and could be contextualised for Tanzania. Recruitment would be from qualified nurses and healthcare professionals with
		potential expansion in the future to target non-qualified candidates and rehabilitation professionals in future.
		There is no academic partner in this proposal but there is a local clinical partner, Comprehensive Community Based Rehabilitation in Tanzania (CCBRT). All academic delivery will be by GCU and philanthropic funding will come from Kletjian Foundation and DSA Investments.
		Members noted the need for quality approval site visit and the need to factor in learning resources, particularly the vle and library support. In the context of rural Tanzania, assurance of academic delivery in a blended format was a priority. Professor Kilbride agreed that she would provide details to the Library.
17.012	Approved	<ul> <li>The Academic Case (APPC17/02/01) - Delivery of Transnational education in collaboration with Comprehensive Community Based Rehabilitation [CCBRT) (NGO) in Tanzania:</li> <li>BSc Professional Studies in Nursing</li> <li>A Graduate Certificate Professional Studies In Nursing</li> <li>A Graduate Certificate Professional Studies In Nursing</li> <li>(Ophthalmology Nursing)</li> <li>A programme of specified non-accredited short CPD</li> </ul>

· ·
-----

Ag/appc/August2017/minutes