

**LANCASTER UNIVERSITY**

Academic Standards and Quality Committee  
minutes of a meeting held on 13 July 2015

**Present:** Professor A Chetwynd  
Dr A Collins  
Mr I Denny  
Dr C Edwards  
Mr Ben Harper  
Professor L Hendry  
Professor S Huttly (Chair)  
Professor C Rogers  
Professor S Skogly  
Mrs L Wareing  
Professor M Wright

**In attendance:** Ms J Anstee (Secretary)  
Mr C Cottam  
Mr S Cresswell  
Ms Sarah Dickinson (*for items 5.1 and 5.2*)  
Dr J Howard  
Professor Lucas Introna (*for item 8*)  
Dr Radka Newton (*for item 3.1*)  
Mr A Okey  
Ms J Ward

**Apologies:** Dr R Lauder  
Professor C Milligan  
Professor M Shackleton  
Ms R White

**SECTION A            INTRODUCTORY ITEMS**

ASQC/2015/45        Minutes

*Documents: SEC/2015/3/0465; SEC/2015/3/0297*

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 May 2015 were confirmed as an accurate record.

*Document: SEC/2015/3/0456*

46.1 LUMS 1+1 Master's partnership programmes: summer term (dissertation) delivery (Item 68)

*Document: SEC/2015/3/0486*

46.1.1 Dr Radka Newton attended for this item, providing an updated proposal for the Committee. This followed on from the Committee's initial consideration of the proposal at the May meeting (M.35.4 refers) and provided more detail on the quality assurance arrangements for delivery of the dissertation element of the Lancaster award, which would be delivered by selected partner institutions.

46.1.2 The following points were noted in discussion.

- (i) The arrangement would apply to the following selected partner institutions: NHH, Norway; Catolica Lisbon, Portugal; Catolica Porto, Portugal; Higher School of Economics, Moscow; and the Kozminski University, Poland. These institutions were accredited by the same global accreditation bodies as LUMS, with comparable quality and standards.
- (ii) The arrangement would apply to the dissertation element only.
- (iii) LUMS will undertake a review of each partner's quality and standards of dissertation delivery by reviewing their dissertation requirements and procedures, reviewing a sample of their dissertations and reviewing the CVs of dissertation supervisors. This evidence will be considered by the LUMS Teaching Committee in September 2015.
- (iv) Once the institutional comparability work was completed, the dissertations will be undertaken fully at the home institution and marked according to their procedures. Grades will be translated according to Lancaster's grade translation system.
- (v) A sample of the dissertations will be provided annually to the Lancaster external examiners according to Lancaster's standard external examiner procedures.

46.1.3 The Committee also noted that joint supervision between LUMS and the selected partner institutions had been undertaken previously and that this had provided an opportunity to compare marking standards.

46.1.4 The Committee **approved** the arrangements for the delivery of the dissertation element in the LUMS 1+1 Master's partnership programmes by selected partner institutions as detailed with effect from 2015/16, and **requested** that for the first year of the arrangement external examiners should be asked by LUMS to make specific comment on this in their reports.

**Action: LUMS PG ADT**

46.2 Other matters arising/outstanding actions were noted as detailed below. The Committee also noted that work would be undertaken over the summer to close off as many actions as possible prior to the start of the new academic year, and a report brought to the September meeting.

- *Item 7 – UGAR review:* This review would need to take account of national discussions/developments around the use of the Grade Point Average system for classification.
- *Item 9 – Provision of study skills support:* the final report and action plan of the Thematic Review on Learning Support was due to be published in early August. The Director of Student Based Services had convened a small working group to work on a detailed action plan arising out of the findings of the review and the Chair hoped to be able to circulate this to members over the summer.

**Action: PVCE**

- *Item 18 – PGR training and development:* An audit of current training provision had been completed. A small working group of Faculty reps and OED (Lucy Thorne) were working to progress the next stage.
- *Item 20 – Review of articulation arrangements:* It was **agreed** to defer this to 2015/16.
- *Item 39 – Student information on external examiner details, external examiner reports and departments' responses to the reports –* The Director of QAE requested that ADTs remind departments of their responsibility to ensure this information was made available to students.

**Action: ADTs**

*[Secretary's Note: this action was subsequently covered via an email from the Director of QAE to departments on the provision of information to students for the forthcoming year.]*

- *Item 42 – External examiner induction:* This matter would be addressed by the Director of QAE.
- *Item 46 – January examination period:* It was **agreed** to defer consideration of this to 2015/16 and that it would be useful to incorporate this into the work of the Part I Review Working Group.
- *Item 48 – Workload allocations for CAP:* The Chair reported on information received from the Director of OED on current University guidance on this. A guideline workload associated with the programme is provided by OED to departments.
- *Item 51 – Students' access to Turnitin reports:* The Chair reported on work being undertaken by the Library in developing Moodle resources to provide support to students for effective practice in referencing and avoiding plagiarism. It was planned to pilot the use of these materials, including student access to Turnitin reports, within several modules in the Michaelmas term with the aim of developing best practice before they were made more widely available.
- *Item 62 – Student satisfaction and experience surveys 2015:* members were reminded that the NSS 2015 results would be released in August. The Chair was discussing with the Planning Support Unit (PSU) the dissemination of these. A workshop to review the results was planned for September – to include departmental representatives, UG ADTs and TQSOs (date to be notified). The Chair would also be meeting with the Head of the PSU to discuss a timetable for the dissemination of the PRES and PTES results to departments and faculties once these had been released by the HEA.
- *Item 69 – External Examiner procedures – Overview Examiner role:* The Director of QAE reported that, following discussion with the relevant LUMS personnel, it had been concluded that an Overview External Examiner was not required as the current procedures already provided for necessary checks on the comparability of standards across partners and sites (the Committee was referred to the relevant section in the External Examiner Guidance document (agendum 15)). It was agreed that he should liaise with the relevant ITP staff over the implementation of these procedures.

**Action: Director QAE/Academic Registrar**

ASQC/2015/47      Schedule of Business: 2014/15

*Document: SEC/2015/3/0301*

The Committee received the updated schedule of business for the year.

**SECTION B                      ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

ASQC/2015/48      Quality assurance and enhancement procedures

48.1      Procedures to be followed for revisions to modules and programmes

*Document: SEC/2015/3/0482*

48.1.1      The Chair and Academic Registrar provided context to the proposed changes to the University's procedures for revisions to modules and programmes. All HE providers are obliged to ensure they provide students and applicants with accurate information about their programmes of study at the appropriate point in their studies/application and that this obligation is part of the legal contract between the provider and student. The proposed revisions were designed to ensure the University was able to meet this requirement.

48.1.2      The Committee had considered an earlier version of the revisions at its May meeting and the revised proposal was designed to make it clearer what groups of students could potentially be impacted by revisions, with more detail on the procedures to be followed for minor and major changes. The concept of "in-year" changes had been removed as this was ambiguous.

48.1.3      The Committee received a list of the examples of minor and major change definitions used by the faculties and the intention here was to provide one definitive list of examples which all faculties would follow and which would be contained in an appendix to the procedures. It was noted that work on the appendix would be carried out over the summer and that ASQ would consult with the ADTs and TQSOs on this prior to bringing a proposal to the September meeting of the Committee.

**Action: Academic Registrar/Assistant Registrar**

48.1.4 The Committee noted the potential, in the case of major changes, for a proposed revision to be blocked over several years if just one student objected in writing to the proposal each time it was made. However, it was noted that a major change could be applied to the next new intake of students who were due to commence the programme, so that whilst this lengthened the implementation period it did not prevent change *per se*.

48.1.5 The Committee queried whether it was appropriate to allow just one written student objection to prevent the application of a major change to current students as this could disadvantage the majority of students who were in agreement. It was **agreed** to refer this back to the University Secretary for further advice and for any resulting amendment to be made to the procedures.

**Action: Academic Registrar**

48.1.6 The Committee noted that in order to maintain PSRB accreditation, revisions affecting current student cohorts may need to be made irrespective of student views, and agreed that an amendment should be made to the procedures to take this into account.

**Action: Academic Registrar/Assistant Registrar**

48.1.7 The proposal also required revisions to be notified to applicants who had been made an offer. The Committee noted that the Head of Admissions had suggested that this should be widened to include all applicants and that the scope of the changes to be notified to applicants could perhaps be widened; for example the choice of option courses was often a factor in an applicant deciding between institutions which had a similar core curriculum offer.

**Action: Academic Registrar/Assistant Registrar**

48.1.8 The Committee agreed that, subject to the amendments noted above, the procedures for revisions to modules and programmes should be **approved** for incorporation into MARP 2015/16 and that the Chair should take Chair's Action on behalf of the Committee to approve the necessary amendments as noted in 48.1.5-7 above. The Committee also noted that it may be necessary to refine the procedures next year in the light of experience.

**Action: Academic Registrar/Assistant Registrar/PVCE**

48.2 Course approval: principles and processes

*Document: SEC/2015/3/0481*

- 48.2.1 The paper brought together a number of issues around principles and processes relating to course approval, following on from discussion of these at PSAG and in other fora.
- 48.2.2 The Committee noted the work being undertaken to update the programme information held in LUSI in order to produce more accurate programme specifications.
- 48.2.3 The Committee noted the need for the University to ensure that exit qualifications which may be awarded on completion of an intermediate point in a programme of studies had defined learning outcomes. This was in line with expectations set by the QAA in *The Framework for Higher Education Qualifications*. Discussion at PSAG had highlighted the need to ensure that Master's programmes with PGCert and PGDip exit qualifications had clearly defined learning outcomes for these. In the course of this discussion PSAG had agreed it would be preferable if all Master's programmes had named PGCert and PGDip exit qualifications and had recommended that, in future, this should be the default position when proposing new Master's programmes. Such a policy would need to be reflected in amendments to the relevant sections of MARP.
- 48.2.4 It was clarified that there was a requirement to define such exit qualifications for existing Master's programmes. However guidance on how to do this relatively easily would be provided by ASQ following the meeting. In many cases, differentiating between the PGDip and the Master's was essentially an exercise in separating out learning outcome(s) relating to the research element from the taught, whilst learning outcomes for the PGCert could be described as a aspects of those for the PGDip.
- 48.2.5 The Committee **approved** the proposal that the default position when designing and approving taught Master's programmes should be for the approval of named PGCert and PGDip exit qualifications and that these qualifications should have separately identified learning outcomes. Where a department/faculty deems such exit qualifications were not appropriate for a particular programme, a rationale to opt out of this default position must be

made as part of the programme proposal. It was **agreed** the policy should take effect from 2015/16 and that departments and faculties would need to undertake a programme of updating existing Master's programme specifications to accommodate these exit qualifications (ASQ to provide guidance on process following the meeting).

**Action: Assistant Registrar**

- 48.2.6 The Committee noted the number of cross-institutional discussions around the planning, design and approval of programmes of study which had been had in different fora, including the recent PGT provision review. These had raised a variety of questions and issues around the clarity and efficiency of the course design, development and approval process. It was felt to be both timely and necessary to undertake a review of this process and the underpinning principles and procedures. The Committee **agreed** that a working group should be set up to undertake this work, to commence in 2015/16. The Academic Registrar agreed to draft terms of reference for the group. It was noted that the group would need to articulate with the Working Group on PGT provision and also the UG Part I Review.

**Action: Academic Registrar**

- 48.3 PSRB procedures

*Document: SEC/2015/3/0466*

- 48.3.1 The Committee reviewed procedures for the reporting of PSRB engagement, through ATR reports upwards to the faculties and to ASQC. The Chair noted the importance of institutional oversight of this type of activity.
- 48.3.2 The Committee **approved** the PSRB procedures as set out, for inclusion in MARP 2015.
- 48.3.3 The Academic Registrar reported the PSRB register had been updated. This would be posted on the ASQ website. It was **agreed** it would be helpful to send this to ADTs for a final check prior to publication.

**Action: Academic Registrar/Assistant Registrar**

#### 48.4 ATR proforma

*Documents: SEC/2015/3/0489 and SEC/2015/3/0490*

48.4.1 The Committee reviewed a revised proforma for departments' ATR reports for 2014/15, proposed by the Director of QAE and the Academic Registrar. The Committee noted that no changes to the underlying principles were proposed; rather changes to the wording of existing questions had been made to make them clearer and to the running order of the questions to make the form more logical. The revisions had also been benchmarked to the QAA *Quality Code* chapter on Programme monitoring and review and to the new guidance from the Competition and Markets Authority (the latter with regard to changes to modules and programmes). A new feature of the proforma was the inclusion of a section on annual "specific issues", where a question or questions on specific topics for that year only would be asked – such topics would change from year to year.

48.4.2 A number of minor amendments were suggested by the Committee:

- it would be helpful to emphasise within the form in some way the external feedback element;
- in the list of sources of feedback make it clearer that not all would necessarily apply;
- add in a question about the effectiveness of the student representation system;
- delete the reference to the Lancaster Experience Survey data.
- 

48.4.3 Subject to the amendments detailed in 48.8.2, the Committee **approved** the revised UG ATR proforma for use in 2014/15 reviews. It was noted that the amendments would be made and the revised proforma posted onto the ASQ website for faculties to notify departments by the end of the week.

**Action: Academic Registrar**

48.4.4 It was noted that it would be helpful, at the end of the ATR process, to disseminate the reports to Careers so that they were informed of feedback relevant to them.

*Document: SEC/2015/3/0493*

- 49.1 The Committee reviewed a proposed policy and procedures on the Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL). This had been looked at by USAG and PSAG and a number of amendments made as a result.
- 49.2 A number of items which had been highlighted for the Committee's attention were dealt with as follows, and suggested amendments made:
- paragraph 1.4: direct entry – agreed as proposed;
  - paragraph 1.5: procedure for dealing with PGT RPL applicants – amend to reflect role of faculty PG admissions offices;
  - paragraph 2.2: level at which RPL should normally be allowed – agreed as proposed;
  - paragraph 3.3: composition of RPL Assessment Panel – agreed as proposed;
  - paragraph 3.4: ratification of RPL – agreed as proposed
  - paragraph 4.2: fee charges – agreed as proposed (PSAG amendment had been incorporated)
  - paragraph 4.5: approval procedure for cases of credit transfer – amend statement to reflect that the procedure should be decided on by the department
  - paragraph 4.8: treatment of marks gained elsewhere – agreed as proposed (PSAG amendment had been incorporated)
  - paragraph 4.12: underpinning assumptions regarding the programme fee to be charged – accepted. It was noted that any student coming into year 2 of the programme (which would normally be through 'direct entry') would automatically qualify for a reduction in fees by one year.
- 49.3 **Subject to** the minor amendments required in 49.2 above, the Committee **approved** the RPL policy and procedures, for incorporation into MARP 2015.

**Action: Assistant Registrar**

- 49.4 It was noted that the policy and procedures would need to be referred to on the Admissions website, with some guidance to applicants/students as to how to go about making an RPL application.

**Action: Assistant Registrar/Admissions**

*Document: SEC/2015/3/0470*

- 50.1 The Committee received a proposal from the Provost and Head of Student Registry on the introduction of a repeat first year, following a review of withdrawals statistics and progression between Part 1 and Part 2. The current system of external resits resulted in only a small number of students successfully redeeming their failure and it was considered that the opportunity to repeat the whole of the first year may better support some of those students who had failed.
- 50.2 The following points were noted.
- (i) As noted at USAG, the proposal was not for a further resit attempt but for a complete retake of the first year – the paper would need to be amended to reflect this.
  - (ii) Students who were offered the repeat first year would attend and retake all modules as if for the first time; including any modules which had previously been passed (there would be no opportunity to carry forward the credit for such modules). Students who had repeated the year would be entitled to resit attempts as if for the first time.
  - (iii) ADTs had been asked at USAG to canvass views from their faculties on the proposal. It was noted that FHM did not support the proposal; Biomedical and Life Sciences in particular felt that the current processes were adequate and appropriate. The other three Faculties were supportive in principle, subject to specific considerations.
  - (iv) The current regulations permitted a repeat of the first year only as part of the procedures for the Review Committee and a regulatory change would need to be made to the UG Assessment Regulations in order to introduce the option of a repeat first year as part of the standard procedures. The Academic Registrar advised that such a change would need to be approved by the Senate as it constituted a change in policy on assessment rather than a straightforward amendment to the regulations.
  - (v) The introduction of a repeat first year would require consideration of the advice and guidance to be provided to students who were repeating and also of any implications for academic probation procedures.

- (vi) PSRB requirements may not permit the opportunity for a repeat of the first year on accredited programmes and this would need to be taken into account in making revisions to the UGAR.
  - (vii) Reference to bursaries in the proposal document related to University bursaries only and not to the help provided to students under the National Scholarships Programme.
  - (viii) There was a question as to the timing and approval process for making such a change, including whether or not the opportunity for a repeat first year could be made available to those students who had failed resits in August this year.
- 50.3 The Students' Union welcomed the proposal as an alternative to external resits but noted the need to ensure students were not being simply provided with another opportunity to fail.
- 50.4 The Chair summarised the outcome of the discussion and the further work required.
- (i) There was a broad level of support for extending provision for a repeat first year to be part of standard procedures.
  - (ii) To make this provision as part of standard procedures, rather than only via the Review Committee, a revision of the UGAR would need to be proposed to Senate, via ASQC in September, and approved for implementation from 2015/16. The proposal paper would need to be revised to make it clear that this was a repeat year not another opportunity for resits. Account would also need to be taken of the implications for ITPs and RTPs.

**Action: Provost/Head of Student Registry**

- (iii) The extent to which current procedures could be used to provide a repeat year opportunity to those students who had failed resits in August this year should be explored outside the meeting and appropriate advice provided to the Chair of the Part I Review Committee.

**Action: Provost/Academic Registrar**

- (iv) The extension of this provision would require appropriate advice and guidance for students undertaking the repeat year. This would need to be provided by both the University and the Students' Union.

**Action: Provost/ Education and Support Manager, LUSU**

*Document: SEC/2015/3/467*

- 51.1 The Committee reviewed a proposal from LUMS for the introduction of a new doctoral award – the DMgt. The Chair noted this would need to be submitted to Senate for approval and that the Committee’s discussion should inform any amendments to the proposal document.
- 51.2 The Committee noted the following points.
- (i) Under the University’s regulations for doctoral awards, the proposal was for a Named Doctorate, which would be analogous to (for example) the Doctor of Medicine (MD) as this was a practice-oriented doctorate (not a PhD) aimed at senior practitioners working at a high level in their organisations. The five-year programme would be underpinned by structured residential modules and research outputs, culminating in the production of a DMgt thesis. This would be examined in the normal way for a doctoral programme, by viva, with an additional requirement for two external examiners one of whom would be a senior practitioner. It was reported by the faculty that the proposal had been benchmarked to a similar programme which had run successfully for 15 years by a university in Ohio.
  - (ii) The degree title would need to be regularised in the proposal document – reference to a ‘Doctorate of Management’ should be amended to ‘Doctor of Management’.
  - (iii) There were three exit points prior to submission of the DMgt thesis, for the following awards: PGCert in Management Practice; PGDip in Management Practice and a Master’s award. The faculty confirmed it was intended that the Master’s award would be a Master’s by Research. The Committee asked the faculty to check that the criteria for this type of award fitted the programme proposal and to amend the document to reflect the correct degree title for this Master’s award. (The Master’s award did not need to be approved by Senate as it already existed.)

- (iv) The faculty would need to ensure that its students would be working at the same level and with the same academic rigour as for a PhD, and that the level and rigour was demonstrable both internally and externally. Guidance to students and external examiners would need to be thought through carefully.

51.3 With regard to the award of credits for the programme, the Committee noted that the University did not currently provide for the award of credits at doctoral level. Whilst some institutions award such credits, if doctoral-level credits were required for the programme the matter would need to be considered more fully by the Committee at its September meeting (Academic Standards and Quality to provide advice to the department/faculty following the meeting and a revised proposal to be brought to the Committee).

**Action: Academic Registrar/LUMS**

ASQC/2015/52 Student programme-level evaluation

*Document: SEC/2015/3/0468*

52.1 The Committee had agreed at its May meeting that it would be useful to collect information on departmental practice in undergraduate student evaluation at programme level, with a view to developing a University programme-level survey of second year students (M.33.4 refers). Dr Alan Collins had co-ordinated the collation of this information, which had been considered by USAG and was now presented to the Committee.

52.2 The information showed there was diversity in practice, with use of programme evaluations typically driven by specific concerns and relatively few regular additional surveys undertaken at programme level.

52.3 Following on from this initial work, the Committee **agreed** to set up a small working group to investigate the development of a University programme-level survey and referred this on to USAG to take the matter forward as an agenda item for the July meeting.

**Action: PVCE**

ASQC/2015/53      New Plagiarism Framework: review of first year of operation

53.1      The Committee noted the report from the Director of QAE that a question on the operation of the new Plagiarism Framework had been incorporated into the revised ATR UG proforma as a “special issue” for consideration and comment on for the 2014/15 ATRs. Feedback would therefore come through to the Committee as part of the ATR reporting process.

53.2      The Students’ Union reported that there had been a number of occasions where departments had operated the old plagiarism procedures. The Committee agreed the Students’ Union should let the Director of QAE know about these cases.

**Action: Education and Support Manager, LUSU**

53.3      The feedback already received from the UG ADT for FHM should be forwarded to the Director of Quality Assurance and Enhancement for noting.

**Action: Assistant Registrar**

ASQC/2015/54      Regulations: revisions to MARP 2015/16

54.1      Undergraduate, Postgraduate Taught and General Assessment Regulations

*Document: SEC/2015/3/0488*

54.1.1      *Amendments to the UGAR, PGTAR and General Assessment Regulations - item (i)*

The Committee **approved** amendments to the UGAR, PGTAR and General Assessment Regulations as detailed under item (i) in the paper, relating to the following matters, for implementation 2015/16:

- form of resits (UGAR and PGTAR)
- resolution of disagreement between first and second markers (General Assessment Regulations).

54.1.2 *Criteria for the classification of Integrated Master's candidates who fall into the borderline category – item (ii)*

The Committee discussed the regulation for classification of Integrated Master's candidates who fall into the borderline category. This differs from the corresponding regulation for Bachelor's candidates which enables the final year average, where this is in the higher class, to be used as a criterion for applying the higher classification. It was **agreed** that the Bachelor's regulation on the classification of borderline candidates should also apply to Integrated Master's candidates; for implementation for final year candidates **with immediate effect** (this would be to the benefit of current students).

54.2 Proposal for additional award rules required by accreditation of School of Computing and Communications programmes

*Document: SEC/2015/3/0473*

54.2.1 The Committee **approved** the proposal for additional award rules for programmes in the School of Computing which were required as a condition of PSRB accreditation of the programmes (British Computer Society and The Institution of Engineering and Technology), as detailed in the paper and including the unaccredited exit qualifications; **to apply** to the 2014 intake (current Part I students) and the 2015 intake onwards.

*[Secretary's Note: following the meeting, a number of minor amendments were made to the wording of the proposal for purposes of clarification. These were approved on Chair's Action, including the definitive list of unaccredited qualifications for candidates who failed the requirements of the accredited programmes, as follows:*

- *BSc/MSci Computer Systems*
- *BSc/MSci Software Systems*
- *BSc/MSci Communications Systems and Digital Electronics.]*

54.2.2 The UG ADT for FST reported that a transition arrangement had been put in place for ensuring that those cohorts of students which were not covered by the introduction of the new degree titles for unaccredited qualifications would have their transcripts annotated to show whether they had been awarded an accredited or unaccredited degree.

ASQC/2015/55 Report on monitoring of coursework marking and return (Lent Term assessments)

*Document: SEC/2015/3/0485*

55.1 The Committee received a report from the Director of QAE on the data returned by departments on monitoring of coursework marking and return for Lent Term assessments. By every measure used, the performance was better for Lent 2015 assessments than Michaelmas 2014 assessments.

55.2 The Director also reported that departments had been asked, as part of the amendments to the ATR proforma, to comment explicitly on their adherence to the University's policy on this matter in their ATR reports.

ASQC/2015/56 Review of ASQC objectives, fulfilment of terms of reference and feedback on the operation of the Committee

*Document: SEC/2015/3/0471*

56.1 The Committee noted the current terms of reference and a report from the Chair of plans to introduce an Education Committee. This Committee would be introduced in the new calendar year and would impact on the work of ASQC. There would be a cross-check undertaken on the latter's terms of reference when drawing up those for the new committee.

56.2 In reviewing ASQC's terms of reference, it was noted that the Chair would be reviewing the systematic data inputs required to support the work of the Committee.

## **SECTION C ITEMS TO NOTE**

ASQC/2015/57 Update of Higher Education Academy (HEA) accreditation of provision

*Document: SEC/2015/3/0472*

57.1 The Committee received an update report from the Head of Professional Development on the HEA accreditation of the University's professional development programmes for staff, following the submission by OED to the HEA in April.

57.2 Some very positive accreditation panel feedback had been received in June, with a significant number of commendations. A number of amendments to the submission had been made to demonstrate how programme designs meet the conditions. A final confirmation of status was awaited.

ASQC/2015/58 External Examiner procedures

*Documents: SEC/2015/3/0487 and SEC/2015/3/0138*

The Committee received for information a summary of the amendments to external examiner procedures which had been agreed by the Committee over the course of the year, together with an updated version of the External Examiner Guidance document incorporating these changes.

ASQC/2015/59 Review of Postgraduate Taught provision: initial report of Working Group

*Document: SEC/2015/3/0475*

59.1 The Committee received for information the initial report of the review undertaken by the Working Group on Postgraduate Taught provision. The Chair **agreed** to clarify with the chair of the Working Group whether or not the report was now public so that PG ADTs could release this to the relevant staff in departments.

**Action: PVCE**

59.2 The Chair reported that another meeting of the Working Group would be arranged in order to determine how to take forward the recommendations and proposals in the report.

ASQC/2015/60 Associate College assessment procedures

*Documents: SEC/2015/3/0455 and SEC/2015/3/0360*

The Committee noted the approval by the Collaborative Provision Teaching Committee (CPTC) of Associate College assessment procedures, as detailed in the paper. These were reviewed on an annual basis by CPTC and any revisions to them were considered for approval by the Committee.

ASQC/2015/61

HER update

*Documents: SEC/2015/3/0449; SEC/2015/3/0350 and SEC/2015/3/0352*

The Committee received an update on HER as detailed in the papers.

ASQC/2015/62

Any other business

- 62.1 *Future quality assessment arrangements:* The Chair briefed the Committee on the HEFCE consultation on future quality assessment arrangements for the sector. The University's response would be made in September and interested parties would be invited to a meeting prior to this.
- 62.2 *External examiner nomination forms:* The Director of Quality Assurance and Enhancement requested ADTs to remind departments to use the current version of the external examiner nomination form.

ASQC/2015/63

Dates of meetings 2015/16

The dates of the Committee's meetings for the academic year 2015/16 were noted as listed below. All meetings would be held on a Thursday morning and take place in FASS Meeting Room 1.

24 September 2015  
26 November 2015  
21 January 2016  
10 March 2016  
5 May 2016  
7 July 2016