



Meeting APC16/5
Confirmed

ACADEMIC POLICY AND PRACTICE COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 10 May 2017

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| PRESENT: | Dr N. Andrew, Mr C. Daisley, Mr S. Lopez, Ms J. Main, Mr V. McKay, Dr N. McLarnon, Ms L. Ramage, Dr S. Rate, Mr R. Ruthven, Dr M. Sharp, Mr I. Stewart, Professor V. Webster (Chair), Professor R. Whittaker, Mrs M. Wright | |
| APOLOGIES: | Professor I. Cameron, Professor R. Clougherty, Ms J. Fisher, Professor T. Hilton, Professor A. Morgan, Ms K. Roden, Professor B. Steves, | |
| BY INVITATION: | Ms D. Donnet (Governance) | |
| IN ATTENDANCE: | Mr P. Woods (Secretary), Ms C. Brannan (Registry) | |
| PREAMBLE | | |
| The Chair informed members that given the number of items being brought to the last meeting of each academic session, in future the last meeting would be scheduled with a morning start in order to ensure all business is dealt with within normal hours. | | |
| MINUTES | | |
| 16.211 | Considered | The minutes of the meeting held on 22 March 2017 (APC16/49/01). |
| 16.212 | Resolved | That the minutes be approved as a correct record subject to: An amendment at 16.208 to say that <i>"The total credits for the award would be 120 per year, years 1-4, with 80 credits per year delivered on campus and the remainder as work based education.</i> |
| MATTERS ARISING | | |
| Reported late changes to programme structures (Arising on 16.187) | | |
| 16.213 | Reported | By Dr Rate that the incidence in GSBS had been a staff error and had now been resolved. |

| | | |
|---|------------|---|
| 16.214 | Reported | Reported by Mr Stewart that similarly the case in SEBE had been an error and was now resolved. |
| STUDENT ATTENDANCE AND ENGAGEMENT MONITORING | | |
| 16.215 | Considered | A demonstration of a new software update to the <i>Student Attendance And Engagement Monitoring System</i> . |
| 16.216 | Reported | By Mr Lopez that the current monitoring process used a card swipe system which involved a degree of manual processing of data in order to provide reports to Schools. Since the introduction of individual student timetables there had been a review of the software provider with a view to enhancing the reporting process. The update being presented would be trialled in trimester A 2017-18 and then reviewed. |
| 16.217 | Reported | By Ms Brannan that the new system was web based and provided greater flexibility to deal with changes, better search ability overall and allowed easier export of module related data to reports. The system provided a view of who is expected via a class list and facilitated early warning flags on attendance. Students could also be contacted regarding their attendance via the system. Location capacity by room and individual student dashboards were other features. |
| 16.218 | Discussion | Members asked for clarification on use and sharing of data. Ms Brannan stated that the same staff as currently engaged in monitoring attendance would have access. Members were concerned that the student dashboard feature may have implications for data sharing and were concerned that appropriate restrictions were defined before introducing this feature. Mr Lopez informed members that the features could be limited to the necessary data required for applying the policy and access would be restricted. |
| 16.219 | Resolved | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the system is approved for further development 2. That there is a clear description of the access rights that will be permitted. (Action: Academic Registrar) |
| ASSESSMENT GRADING METHODOLOGY | | |
| 16.220 | Considered | A discussion item considering the University's approach to assessment grading. |
| 16.221 | Reported | By the Chair that this item was intended to elicit feedback from members on the potential introduction of grades to replace percentage aggregate marks. This method would put students' assessment outcomes in a band of marks rather than |

| | | |
|--|------------|--|
| | | define a specific overall aggregate percentage mark. The suggestion was in the context of a broader sectoral movement towards grading. |
| 16.222 | Discussion | <p>Advantages of grading were discussed such as potentially opening up a wider range marks (i.e. making use of the band above 70%) and it would make student exchange equivalence more consistent.</p> <p>The Chair reminded members that the discussion was not about GPA which was a separate matter. She also reminded members that there is already a form of banding in Honours classification.</p> <p>There was a range of opinion where some members were more in favour than others. This tended to reflect subject area concerns. Non-linear marking was mentioned.</p> |
| 16.223 | Resolved | That the discussion be noted as part of the wider dialogue. |
| ACADEMIC CALENDAR REVIEW | | |
| 16.224 | Considered | Proposals for changes to the Academic Calendar (APC16/50/1). |
| 16.225 | Reported | By Mr Lopez that there had been wide consultation on the proposals and the feedback received was to reintroduce a full week inter-trimester break and to reduce the international orientation week to a long weekend. |
| 16.226 | Resolved | That the proposals be approved. |
| ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS WORKING GROUP (ARWG) | | |
| 16.227 | Considered | Proposals from the ARWG (APC16/51/1). |
| 16.228 | Reported | By the Chair of ARWG that he indicated that he would discuss each proposal in turn. |
| Carrying of up to 40 credits (undergraduate assessment regulations) | | |
| 16.229 | Reported | <p>By the Chair of ARWG reported that the recommendation was that the regulation be retained with enhanced guidance for Assessment Boards, i.e.</p> <p><i>i) Due consideration is given to the additional assessment loading associated with carrying up to 40 credits</i></p> <p><i>ii) Students are required to engage with their School LDC</i></p> <p><i>iii) Carrying of up to 40 credits is based on the Academic Judgement of the Assessment Board.</i></p> |
| 16.230 | Resolved | That the retention of the regulation is approved and Academic Advisor be added to point ii of the guidance. (Action: Chair of ARWG) |
| Re-Introduction of threshold minimum marks | | |

| | | |
|---|------------|--|
| 16.231 | Reported | By The Chair of ARWG that ARWG supported the reintroduction of minimum marks in principle and supported the re-reintroduction on an incremental basis via programme approval and review. |
| 16.232 | Discussion | <p>There was concern that the incremental approach would take too long if using programme approval review i.e. up to six years. The number of exceptions to this regulation was already considerable and would be expected to grow in the interim between programme reviews. Therefore it was strongly recommended that a quicker process for reintroducing the minimum threshold should be considered, taking into account the existing module catalogue and the number of current exceptions.</p> <p>Members were also cautious about the potential prospect of running 2 module versions at the same time.</p> <p>There was a wider discussion surrounding multiple assessment elements in modules and module assessment design and it was asserted that the core of the assessment strategy should be mapped on to the learning outcomes. Members felt there was the danger of assessment weightings dictating engagement with elements of the module.</p> |
| 16.233 | Resolved | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the reintroduction of threshold minimum marks be supported. 2. That a process for facilitating the re-introduction more quickly than the programme review cycle be explored. <p>(Action: ARWG)</p> |
| Conflict – Assessment Regulations/Qualifications Framework (Merit/Distinction) | | |
| 16.234 | Reported | The issue was that for the award of an unclassified degree, the Qualifications Framework allowed for the award of an unclassified degree at 360 credits, with a minimum of 60 credits at SCQF Level 9. A programme constructed to align with this minimum credit structure would not meet the criteria outlined by the University’s Assessment Regulations for the consideration of Merit and Distinction classification and therefore mechanism was proposed where programme designs with a proposed minimum 60 credits at SQCF 9, would require approval by the University’s Exceptions Committee, in order to identify the progression requirements and associated merit/distinction calculations. |
| 16.235 | Discussion | It was noted that there were no programmes designed this way on the University portfolio and it was queried as to whether or not the variation was required in the Qualifications Framework. |
| 16.236 | Resolved | That the Qualifications Framework be updated to remove the minimum 60 credits at SQCF 9 unclassified degree award variation. (Action: ARWG) |
| Assessment loading guidance | | |
| 16.237 | Reported | By the Chair of ARWG that a review panel was convened to review assessment preparation Guidance for Academic Staff. Their recommendations were included in a revised policy attached as an appendix to the ARWG paper. At the moment |

| | | |
|--|------------|---|
| | | this guidance only applied to unseen examinations so the proposal is to standardise guidance across all forms of assessment. |
| 16.238 | Discussion | <p>Members noted a 10% penalty for exceeding word count but no penalty for being below word count. The rationale for this was that assessments will lose marks if content is lacking in any case.</p> <p>Members expressed concern that the marking exemplars were too generic and it was suggested that there should be different approach using actual rubrics from across the University.</p> <p>Some concern was raised about the assessment loading of examination time and word counts increasing. Student members stated that that it wasn't necessarily beneficial to students to increase examination time.</p> <p>ARWG members felt that the 70% examination was substantial piece of assessment and reducing the time was not advisable.</p> |
| 16.239 | Resolved | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the ARWG review the assessment loading (exam times and word count) 2. That a check of the word count on sample of modules is undertaken. (Action: ARWG/Chair of ARWG) |
| Nullification | | |
| 16.240 | Reported | <p>By the Chair of ARWG that it was proposed that the Assessment Regulations be updated with the text (in bold) added to regulation 13.3 as follows: <i>13.3 Nullification of the results of an assessment of a single module at SCQF levels 9 and 10 (and level 11 for Integrated Masters programmes).</i> <i>Nullification applies to all candidates undertaking the module in question. It is accepted that circumstances may arise, where a module is delivered across several campuses, which impact on the performance of a majority of candidates at a single campus only. In such instances, the Assessment Board may wish to consider nullification of the results of an assessment for candidates at that campus.</i></p> |
| 16.241 | Resolved | That the update be approved and recommended to Senate for implementation from September 2017. |
| To review implementation of the generic award regulations | | |
| 16.242 | Reported | <p>By The Chair of ARWG that was proposed that the Assessment Regulations on Generic Degrees be updated as follows: <i>(UG Regs 25.2, PG Regs 24.2)</i></p> <p><i>It will be at the discretion of the Assessment Board to determine the appropriateness of transferral to a School-based Generic Award, on a case by case basis, for any student with up to and including 40 credits outstanding from their programme of study. The Assessment Board shall have discretion to either:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) Transfer the student to an appropriate School-based Generic Award, where the student will undertake up to 40 credits and, on successful completion, become eligible for an exit award of the School-based Generic</i> |

| | | |
|---|------------|---|
| | | <p><i>Award¹, or;</i></p> <p><i>b) Require the student to exit from the University with such credit and awards as have been achieved on the student's original programme of study. Section 8.1 of the Assessment Regulations will apply and inform the Assessment Board's deliberations when considering this course of action.</i></p> <p><i>In all cases, the supporting rationale for the decision taken by the Assessment Board will be fully documented in the Assessment Board minutes.</i></p> <p><i>(UG Regs 25.3, PG Regs 24.3)</i></p> <p><i>Notwithstanding the provisions elsewhere in these assessment regulations, students who transfer to school-based generic awards and undertake replacement modules will be permitted the number of attempts specified in Section 14 of the Regulations for completion of replacement modules. Students who fail to complete a replacement module within the permitted number of attempts will not be permitted to undertake any further modules as a replacement for the module not completed and will be required to exit, as appropriate, with such credit and awards as have been achieved.</i></p> <p><small><i>1 The option of transferral to a School-based Generic Award is not available at Honours Degree level for students who have failed the Honours project/dissertation associated with their original programme of study.</i></small></p> |
| 16.243 | Resolved | That the proposal be approved and recommended to Senate for implementation from September 2017. |
| Project and Dissertation Supervision Guidelines | | |
| 16.244 | Discussion | The clarification of guidance was welcomed by members and was suggested that there should be additional guidance to students on what is expected from the supervision meetings added to the framework guidance in appendix E. |
| 16.245 | Resolved | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the updates be approved and recommended to Senate for implementation from September 2017. 2. That the proposed student guidance update be added. <p>(Action: Chair of ARWG)</p> |
| University wide policy and guidance with respect to student mobility | | |
| 16.246 | Reported | By the Chair of ARWG that the Group recommended that a set of guiding principles be adopted (Appendix G), pending the outcome of organisational restructure in this area. |
| 16.247 | Discussion | Members were concerned at the proposal to assessment-map per individual partner institution. Members felt this was unduly cumbersome and preferred a solution that would assessment –map by geographical location. |
| 16.248 | Resolved | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the guiding principles be approved. 2. That geographical mappings (similar to the US example) be developed. <p>(Action: ARWG)</p> |
| Associated Policy on moderation | | |
| 16.249 | Reported | By the Chair of ARWG that the proposal was intended to standardise practice of moderation. |

| | | |
|--|------------|--|
| 16.250 | Discussion | Members welcomed the clarification, particularly with regard to the role of external examiners. |
| 16.251 | Resolved | That the proposed policy (Appendix H) be approved and recommended to Senate for implementation from September 2017. |
| Suggested considerations for the Assessment Regulations Working Group, 2017/18. | | |
| 16.252 | Resolved | That the proposed workplan be noted. |
| STUDENT PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT | | |
| 16.253 | Considered | A new Partnership Agreement entitled GCU Community: Working Together in Partnership (APC16/53/1). |
| 16.254 | Reported | By Ms Main that the agreement replaced the <i>GCU Commitment</i> . The new agreement was more in line with the HE sector in general. Consultation had been wide-ranging, including during the student experience summit and the feedback had been to keep the agreement simple. The agreement was also aligned with the student experience action plan. The final version would be different from the version provided to the Committee. It would be web-based and with a less cluttered interface. |
| 16.255 | Discussion | Members welcomed the agreement and the codification of what is already happening. |
| 16.256 | Resolved | That the revised Partnership Agreement be approved and recommended to Senate and Court. |
| COMMON GOOD CURRICULUM UPDATE | | |
| 16.257 | Considered | An update on the Common Good Curriculum (APC16/55/1). |
| 16.258 | Reported | By Professor Whittaker that the paper provided detail of the Common Good award. There would be alignment with the transcript and HEAR document and digital badges would be awarded for 25 hours of engagement with common good activities. The intention was to have a strong link with employability and the process would be managed through the work experience hub. |
| 16.259 | Resolved | That progress with the Common Good Curriculum be noted and the pilot phase be endorsed. |
| DIGITAL LEARNING IMPLEMENTATION PLAN | | |
| 16.260 | Considered | A Digital Learning Implementation Plan addressing the findings of the Digital Capabilities survey and identifying key areas of digital learning to be taken forward (APC16/56/1). |
| 16.261 | Discussion | Members asked for completed actions to be flagged in the rolling version of the plan. Training and development needs were highlighted and the Chair informed members that there was already work ongoing to map where support was |

| | | |
|---|------------|---|
| | | required. |
| 16.262 | Resolved | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the Digital Learning Implementation Plan be approved. 2. That the completed actions be factored into the rolling plan. (Action: AQ&D) |
| E-ASSESSMENT POLICY | | |
| 16.263 | Considered | An Online Assessment Policy and Guide which aimed to ensure consistent and efficient approaches to online assessment, marking and feedback (APC16/57/01) . |
| 16.264 | Reported | By Professor Whittaker that the paper presented a significant piece of work. |
| 16.265 | Discussion | Members were confused by the distinction between the guidance and the policy. It was also noted that there was further potential for confusion as to where assessments may or may not be submitted online. |
| 16.266 | Resolved | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That there is additional text to clarify what assessments are not covered by the policy (e.g. posters, OSCEs, group work). • It is noted that exceptions should be where the exception is agreed by the member of staff with their line manager. • That the proprietary name <i>Turnitin</i> is not used in the document. • That the guidance section is integrated to the policy statement and not presented as separate documents. (Action: AQ&D) |
| MONITORING OF ACADEMIC QUALITY AND STANDARDS (ACADEMIC PILLARS) AND ADVANCE NOTIFICATION OF ELIR 4 | | |
| 16.267 | Considered | Proposals for the ongoing monitoring of academic quality and standards in relation to the ELIR 4 outcome of 'Delivering a clear statement on baseline quality and academic standards' (APC16/54/1) . |
| 16.268 | Resolved | That the proposals be noted. |
| SHLS – PORTFOLIO REVIEW | | |
| 16.269 | Considered | A portfolio review of taught Postgraduate Programmes from the School of Health and Life Sciences (APC16/61/01) . |
| 16.270 | Reported | <p>By Mr McKay that the Equality Impact Assessment had now been added to the review paper on <i>Sharepoint</i>.</p> <p>There were 5 programmes to consider with very small numbers of students currently enrolled on the programmes listed, (10 heads/3.98FTEs in total across all programmes listed with a range of 1- 3students) and only 2 applications for any places.</p> <p>An appropriate teach out plan for each student would be implemented to ensure quality of provision is not diminished throughout the remainder of their respective programmes.</p> |

| | | |
|---|------------|---|
| | | He asked members to note that MSc Health and Social Care PT and FT were being replaced by MSc Advanced Practice (as confirmed at recent re-approval event). |
| 16.271 | Resolved | That the Portfolio review proposals be approved. |
| GSBS – PORTFOLIO REVIEW | | |
| 16.272 | Considered | A portfolio review of taught Postgraduate Programmes from the Glasgow School for Business and Society (APC16/66/01). |
| 16.273 | Reported | By Dr Rate that proposals reflected a review of viability and demand and included one proposed merger, where two withdrawn programmes would be replaced by one new programme. |
| 16.274 | Resolved | That the Portfolio review proposals be approved. |
| CROSS UNIVERSITY/ALC CONCEPT PAPER | | |
| 16.275 | Considered | A concept paper for the proposed Global Challenges programme (APC16/58/01). |
| 16.276 | Reported | By the Chair that the proposal was for a new programme in ALC featuring a combination of negotiated learning and core taught modules. It was being developed for delivery in ALC Mauritius but could be offered to Glasgow candidates. It was designated as a BSc programme as there would be a health/science basis. |
| 16.277 | Resolved | That the concept paper be approved. |
| GSBS –ACADEMIC CASE | | |
| 16.278 | Approved | An academic case for the proposed MSc International Tourism and Events Management (APC16/68/01). |
| GSBS – TNE COLLABORATIVE PROPOSAL | | |
| 16.279 | Considered | A collaborative proposal with Shenyang Normal University, China (APC16/67/01). |
| 16.280 | Reported | By Dr Rate that the model was similar to that of ALC and was anticipated to be a starting point for further opportunities in this region. The proposed programme MSc programme in International Banking, Finance and Risk Management would consist of 60 credits delivered at Shenyang and the remaining 120 at GCU. |
| 16.281 | Resolved | That the following points are clarified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That English language is compatible with GCU standards • That library arrangements are specified including an explanation the “GCU Connect facility”. • That the programme structure is clearly documented at approval to show that the students will conform to normal visa requirements. |

| | | |
|---|------------|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> That the arrangements for approval are discussed further with Academic Quality and Development. (Action: GSBS ADLTQ/Programme Development Team) |
| SHLS – TNE COLLABORATIVE PROPOSAL | | |
| 16.282 | Approved | Proposal for an International Partnership with the Ministry of Health, Botswana for Transnational Delivery of the PgC Medical Ultrasound (International) Programme (APC16/59/01) . |
| SHLS – TNE COLLABORATIVE PROPOSAL | | |
| 16.283 | Approved | A 5 year TNE opportunity with SEGi University in Malaysia for a (BSc Hons) Optometry Accreditation Degree (APC16/60/01) . |
| SHLS – TNE COLLABORATIVE ACADEMIC CASE | | |
| 16.284 | Approved | An Academic Case proposing the delivery of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> BSc Professional Studies in Nursing BA(Hons) International Supply Chain Management BSc Safety and Health Management - top up programmes with PSB Academy Singapore, commencing September 2017(APC16/62/01). |
| SHLS – ACADEMIC CASE PUBLIC HEALTH MASTERS | | |
| 16.285 | Approved | A concept paper for Public Health Masters Provision (APC16/63/01) . |
| SEBE – ADDITIONAL DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 16.286 | Approved | Additional delivery mode for MSc Advanced Internetwork Engineering programme (APC16/64/01) subject to clarification of the stated decline in student numbers referred to in the proposal. |
| SEBE – ACADEMIC CASE | | |
| 16.287 | Considered | A proposed Academic Case for the programme MSc Construction (APC16/65/01) . |
| 16.288 | Discussion | Members were unclear on whether the proposal was for a bespoke programme or open to other applicants. It was necessary to clarify if the proposal was intended to be a CPD framework or a bespoke programme for Clark Contracts. It was noted that the current module mix listed 15 and 20 credit modules. Although this would be rationalised in the future when the 20 credit modules are phased out, it remained an issue in this proposal. |
| 16.289 | Resolved | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That the Programme Development Team clarify the intention of the proposal i.e. a bespoke programme or a CPD framework. That the Programme Development Team explains how the variance in credit ratings for modules would be managed. That the Programme Development Team has further dialogue with Academic Quality & Development on the approval process for this programme. (Action: Programme Development Team) |
| SWBE - DEGREE AND GRADUATE LEVEL APPRENTICESHIPS | | |
| 16.290 | Considered | Proposed Principles for Designing and Delivering Degree and Graduate Level |

| | | |
|---|------------|---|
| | | Apprenticeships (APC16/69/01). |
| 16.291 | Reported | By Ms Wright that the cross University working group had convened to determine principles for designing and delivering Degree Apprenticeships and Graduate Level Apprenticeships. The paper outlined their proposals and defined who the students would be and how they were different to full-time and part-time cohorts. The intention was to provide a flexibility that can take into account of the needs of organisations, their employees and also specific subject and discipline requirements, including professional, statutory and regulatory bodies. |
| 16.292 | Discussion | It was felt that there need to be more clarity in the principles and the proposals should display a greater emphasis on work-based education. The model required to be consistent to allow for the development of a framework that could be accessed by multiple employers. |
| 16.293 | Resolved | That the principles are revisited to provide the clarity and emphasis described above. (Action: Short-life Working Group) |
| SCHOOL OF HEALTH AND LIFE SCIENCES FITNESS TO PRACTICE POLICY UPDATE | | |
| 16.292 | Considered | An update to the School of Health and Life Sciences Fitness to Practice Policy (APC16/70/1). |
| 16.293 | Reported | By Dr McLarnon that the addenda were for clarification on scope of the policy and the appeals process. There were no substantive changes to the policy. The appeals process would follow the model of the Senate Disciplinary appeals process and the Dean of the School of Health and Life Sciences would chair the appeals panels. |
| 16.294 | Resolved | That the update to the School of Health and Life Sciences Fitness to Practice Policy be approved. |