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**ACADEMIC COLLABORATION COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of the Sixty-third meeting (fourth of 2012-13 session) of the Academic Collaboration Committee, held on Friday 24 May 2013 at 2.30pm in Room QA75, Maritime Greenwich**

**12.4.1 PRESENT:** Will Calver (Access and Partnerships Manager)

Wendy Cealey Harrison (LQU)

Fiona Conlan (International Partnerships Manager)

Corine Delage (ADC)

Lorraine Gaskin (OSA)

Alasdair Grant (ENG)

Nick Hand (BUS)

Chris Harper (LQU) *(Secretary)*

Simon Jarvis (DVC – Academic Development) *(Chair)*

Maggie Leharne (ILS)

Mayur Patel (CMS)

Zoe Pettit (HSS)

Simon Walker (EDU)

**APOLOGIES:** Gordon Ade-Ojo (Education)

Richard Blackburn (SCI)

Dean Brander (SUUG)

Samer El-Daher (SCI)

Mamood Gousy (HSC)

Debi Hayes (Partnership Division)

Henry Hill (OSA)

**MINUTES OF LAST MEETING**

**12.4.2** The minutes of the previous meeting held on 27 March 2013 were confirmed as a true record. For clarification the following points were noted:

1. *Minute 12.3.4 Partner College AIRs*

Canterbury College and ALRA were no longer part of the Partner College Network with recruitment being discontinued in 2012/2013. However continuing students were still registered on University programmes for the rest of their study duration.

1. *Action arising out of Partner College AIRs*

Minute 12.3.5 (ii) - EDU, having assessed the wider application of good practice identified in Partner Colleges to report to the first meeting of Academic Quality and Standards Committee in September 2013.

**ACTION: EDU**

Minute 12.3.5 (iii) – Schools to provide a clear audit trail as to how Partner College AIR

Action Plans received consideration with a view to aiding implementation and identifying areas of mutual collaboration.

**ACTION: SDLQs**

**ACC ACTION CHECK-LIST FROM PREVIOUS MEETING**

**12.4.3** The list of actions arising from the March 2013 meeting of ACC was noted. Specific attention was drawn to the following:

1. *12.2.3(a) On-line Registration for international partners*

Feedback had been received from Schools and OSA representatives, reporting that the system was not being fully utilised by some partners. The International Partnerships Manager reported that an interim arrangement had been made with MSA who would fully utilise the system in September 2013. The School of Engineering reported that SEGi KD were not fully conversant with/utilising the system. CMS reported that some problems had been encountered in attaching students to Banner cohorts; the data that partners could view within the system and the authentication of student email addresses.

**ACTION:**

**International Partnerships Manager to raise the issue of utilisation during the visit to SEGi KD in June 2013**

**Mayur Patel to convene a meeting with Ashley Sargeant to discuss issues surrounding data capture and access.**

1. *12.3.4 Partner College AIRs –Organisational Links*

Will Calver reported that, given the resource implications identified by the Banner team in providing such access, Partner Colleges had been informed that on-line mark entry for their staff was not seen as a priority by the University. The recently developed website for Partner College staff would ensure that key information and institutional contacts (such as Link Tutors) were published and kept up-to-date.

1. *12.3.7 UK Quality Code – Managing HE Provision with others*

Chris Harper reported that Partner Scrutiny Panel, at its July 2013 meeting, would discuss the strengthening of the due diligence process in relation to partners. The Quality Assurance Handbook would be updated to include an appendix relating to ‘Discharging QA responsibilities in a Hostile/ Deteriorated Environment’. Discussion was ongoing with International Partnerships Office and Partnerships Division with regard to the maintenance of the Collaborative Register and meeting the requirements of UK Quality Code – Part C.

**ACTION: LQU/Partnership Division/International Partnerships Office**

**QAA TNE CHINA**

12.4.4 ACC received the following:

(a) QAA report on visit to Yunnan University of Finance

and Economics (YUFE) on 27 November 2012

(b) School of ADC response to the recommendations therein

(c) Conclusions of QAA overarching report

With regard to (a) above, the YUFE report had identified as positive features the clear and comprehensive written agreement between the parties, based on a form of model agreement devised by the University and the student handbooks produced by each partner that are informative and complement one another in their coverage as positive features. The report had recommended that the University take the following action:

* adopt a more systematic approach to the collection and evaluation of student feedback, and
* analyse the issues relating to student performance in the dissertation in an effort to understand the true nature of the underlying problem.

12.4.5 ACC received a paper from the School of ADC outlining the action taken to date in response to the above recommendations. It was reported that YUFE had introduced its own course evaluation system and that students were encouraged to participate in the Moodle on-line evaluation. Student feedback was also obtained via programme committees. The School had conducted its own analysis of student attainment in the dissertation over the last 4 years which, although illustrating a year on year improvement, showed that grades were bunched in the 50 to 60% range. ACC was of the opinion that the School response should be more fulsome in describing the School/University approach to the collection and evaluation of student feedback and how the process would be enhanced. In addition more information needed to be provided as to how the underlying problem in relation to the dissertation was being addressed.

**ACTION: ADC to re-submit its response to the DVC (Academic Development) by 9 July 2013.**

12.4.6 The overall conclusions of the QAA review of TNE in China were noted.

**QAA REVIEW FOR EDUCATIONAL OVERSIGHT (REO)**

12.4.7 ACC received and the following QAA reports:

(a) Blake Hall College –November 2012

(b) City of London College – May 2012

(c) East London College – September 2012

In each case the Colleges had received a judgement of confidence in the management

of their responsibilities relating to academic standards and quality of learning opportunities. The QAA had also considered that reliance can be placed on the accuracy and completeness of the information that the Colleges published about their provision.

12.4.8 The Schools of Business and CMS had provided responses in relation to how well the College Action Plans, arising from the REO, were being progressed. Full consideration of actions undertaken by City of London College had taken place at the February 2013 meeting of PSP when discussing its reinstatement as a partner. With regard to Blake Hall and East London College, both Schools reported clear evidence of progress made by the Colleges and ways in which the Schools had contributed e.g. staff development and training packages.

**ACTION: Business School and CMS Link Tutors to continue to monitor progress.**

**PARTNER PROGRESSION STATISTICS 208/2009 – 2011/12**

12.4.9 ACC received an analysis of partner progression statistics from LQU based on statistics issued by PAS. The analysis illustrated the number of registrations and the level of unsuccessful students at each partner for the period 2008/2009 to 2011/2012. Registration figures showed the continued increase in students studying at overseas partnerships, with a decline in numbers studying at Partner Colleges, UK centres and LLTE Networked Colleges.

12.4.10 In monitoring standards, a key indicator was student progression and achievement. ACC considered such analysis on an annual basis in order to identify partners which had not meet University KPI. The analysis identified a number of partners where poor student progression on individual programmes indicated that further investigation at Faculty/School level was warranted. These being:

1. *FPT Hanoi* - 50% of BA Business Management and 27% of BSc Computing students failed the year.
2. *FPT Ho Chi Minh* - 60% (71 or 121 original registrations) of students on the BSc Computing failed the year.
3. *International Leadership Institute* - the MA Transformational Leadership, has an unusual attrition rate of 46% (2009), 3% (2010) and 37% (2011) which merits continued investigation.
4. *Koley Fajar* - BSc Occupational Safety, Health and Environment is the only programme to be run at this partner. Its progression in 2011 showed 30 failed students from 77 initial registrations and its failure rate has been consistently high over the past three academic sessions.
5. *NACIT, Blantyre* - BSc Business Information Technology is the only programme run at this partner and 2011 showed 18 failed students from an initial registration of 71.
6. *PIBT* - BSc Computing, with 77 students registered initially, showed 26 (34%) failed at the end of session.
7. *SEGi College KD* - BSc Civil Engineering is run from this partner. 41 (48%) students of the initial 98 registered failed the year.
8. *SEGi College SJ* -BA Accounting and Finance and BSc Computing are run by this partner, the former accounting for the majority of students, with some 107 registrations. Of these 107, 28 (26.17%) failed.
9. *SEGi College KL* - whilst the figure of 17% is within University KPIs, this figure disguises some elements where failure is considerably higher than University KPIs; notably the BA Business Management, where 111 students of 414 registered on the Stage 3 Entry programme, failed the session. Progression for this programme also exhibits an unusual pattern of (overall) lack of student success, being 32% (2011), 5% (2010) and 74% (2009).
10. *University of New York Albania* - the BA Law programme saw 21 (50%) of students failed in 2011.

**ACTION: Schools to ensure, as part of the 2012/2013 monitoring process, that specific Programme Monitoring Reports analyse progression statistics and reflect on any improved/declining performance, together with commentary on measures that have been/will be implemented.**

**COLLABORATIVE PROVISION UPDATE**

12.4.11*Partner College Service Level Agreement*

Will Calver reported that discussions had taken place in identifying the demarcation of key responsibilities between University and College in its collaborative activities. Particular attention had been given to identifying the division of responsibilities in the case of College Directly-Funded students and the provision/access to learner resources. Whilst commending the progress made, ACC was of the opinion that in the table(s) of responsibilities it was difficult to discern the differences in the level of responsibilities for each category of student (University student numbers studying at partner/College directly funded students).

**ACTION: Will Calver to amalgamate tables in order to better illustrate responsibilities of individual parties and key differences in relation to category of student.**

12.4.12*Partner Scrutiny Panel*

The DVC (Academic Development) reported that within the new committee structure there was still a need for a sub-committee to scrutinise partners (approval and review) and to maintain distance between APC and its major business of authorising programmes and deliberation of business plans.

**ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

12.4.13 **The Chair noted that this was the last ever meeting of Academic Collaboration Committee. He wished to thank members of the committee (past and present) for their contribution to the policy and practices of the University since October 1995.**