



Academic Board

Learning Teaching and Student Experience Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 13th November 2019.

Membership:

Present: Jane Harrington (Chair), Suleiman Al-Sa'Di, David Barrett, Sara Bird, Evan Botwood, Jackie Chelin, Rachel Cowie, Stanley Egeonu, Delia Fairburn, Lisa Harrison, Rob Ingram, Saharla Ismail, Neidi Lemos, Jo Midgley, Heather Moyes, Jasmine Pow, Gerry Rice, Richard Strange, Jackie Rogers, Rebecca Smith (Officer), Iain Mossman (Secretary).

Apologies: Sarah Bateman, Elizabeth Cleaver, Chris English, Myra Evans, Nadine Fry, Vicky Nash, Jane Ojiako

In attendance: Nick Biggs (for item LTSEC19.11.11), Tracey Horton (for item LTSEC19.11.8), Katie Owen-Jones (for item LTSEC19.11.12), Mike Small (for item LTSEC19.11.14), Jenny Wills (for item LTSEC19.11.13), Sue Yilmaz (for item LTSEC19.11.6).

MINUTES OF THE MEETING	
LTSEC19.11.1	MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING
LTSEC19.11.1.1	Subject to a minor amendment to the wording from 'part time' to 'particular' modules in minute LTSEC19.09.12.2, members approved the minutes of the meeting held on 25 th September 2019.
LTSEC19.11.2	MATTERS ARISING
LTSEC19.11.2.1	LTSEC19.06.14.2 – Redaction of the Module Feedback Survey – The Director of Student and Academic Services confirmed that it would take approximately 125 hours of staff time to redact the surveys, and resourcing for this is being explored for the next round of surveys.
LTSEC19.11.2.2	LTSEC Enhancement Session (the attainment gap) – The Officer confirmed that a working group has been brought together and will be meeting regularly to organise the session.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING	
	STANDING AGENDA ITEMS
LTSEC19.11.3	Learning 2020 Programme
LTSEC19.11.3.1	<p>The Chair provided an overview of progress with the Learning 2020 programme:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Event capture – the University is continuing in the roll out of the pilot, with eight further rooms set up in Frenchay and Glenside. Audio is currently being trailed in a few lecture theatres at Glenside; initial feedback is that audio-only has been better received by students and staff, and the pilots will evaluate this further. Student representatives were thanked for their support during these pilots. 2. Learner Analytics – the my-engagement system has now been rolled out to all UG programmes. 3. Learning Gain – the pilot has been well received and the University will look to roll this out more widely. This will also help identify students who aren't gaining as much as they are predicted and targeted support can be put in place. 4. Future projects – further work is being explored in relation to online marking tools. 5. The Learning 2020 programme has begun the process of evaluating how successful it has been, and whether the projects have made a difference. Further updates on this will be brought to LTSEC.
LTSEC19.11.3.2	<p>During discussions, members noted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Learner Analytics and Learning Gain pilots have been really successful in terms of both staff engagement and tools which can really help students; 2. Part time students have fed back some issues in receiving non engagement communications from the 'my-engagement' tool; these students may not need to access BlackBoard on a daily basis. It was noted that the roll out of attendance monitoring will be a better tool to show overall engagement outside of BlackBoard.
LTSEC19.11.4	Teaching Enhancement Framework (TEF)
LTSEC19.11.4.1	<p>The Chair provided the following update:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There remains some political uncertainty over the future of subject level TEF, and when it may be implemented, however the University will continue to collate data and evidence in preparation. This facilitates the sharing of good practice and identifies subject areas where there are concerns, which will also feedback into Institutional level TEF; 2. The submission dates for the next round of Institutional level TEF will likely be in 2020, with publication of outcomes in 2021, subject to any changes after the general election;

MINUTES OF THE MEETING	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Subject leads and panel leads have been identified for subject level TEF, and teams have until the end of November to pull together evidence; 4. New data will be available in the new year for further reflection by subject teams, in order to develop submissions across 25 subjects; 5. A steering group will oversee development of the submissions providing feedback to subject teams, and each will share the themes arising across subject areas; 6. Further detail will be presented to LTSEC following the general election.
LTSEC19.11.5	Student Voice and Engagement
LTSEC19.11.5.1	Student Surveys – LTSEC members noted the plans and preparations for the next round of student surveys.
	ITEMS FOR APPROVAL OR ENDORSEMENT
LTSEC19.11.6	Assurance report for the development and approval of the taught portfolio – 2018/19
LTSEC19.11.6.1	<p>LTSEC welcomed paper LTSEC19.11.4, and the Head of Quality Enhancement provided the following overview:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The University Curriculum Panel (UCP) have rolled out a new programme closure and suspension process; 2. There has been an increase in collaborative working across Faculties and with external stakeholders; 3. There is evidence of the Enhancement Framework principles at a strategic level filtering down to the Faculty level; 4. There has been more engagement with the Academic Practice Directorate in terms of sand pit events and scoping meetings; 5. Good progress has been made on the implementation of the new Curriculum Management Tool, which replaces the old Curriculum Approval and Review SharePoint site; 6. One area for enhancement is to work with the UCP on market insight; 7. In terms of programme approval, enhancements were identified in ensuring paperwork was complete and signed off by the Faculty off before it progresses to the University Validation Panel (UVP) 8. It was noted that faculties have experienced some challenges between business needs in growing student numbers and the timescales for development, which has led to a bunching of business at the end of the year, and challenges in in sourcing Panel members; 9. Discussions are happening at Institutional level about the Programme Enhancement Review (PER) schedule;

MINUTES OF THE MEETING	
	<p>10. The Team are working with partner colleges developing degree apprenticeships to ensure they have processes in place and understand their role and responsibilities;</p> <p>11. There are no recommendations in the report this year, just areas for enhancement which the Quality Enhancement Team will work on over the next academic year.</p>
LTSEC19.11.6.2	Members acknowledged all of the work the Quality Enhancement Team have done over 2018-19, including the implementation of the new CMT. The report will be updated to include a statement of compliance and any complaints relating to the Competition and Markets Authority (CMA).
LTSEC19.11.7	Terms of Reference (TOR) for the new Inclusivity for Learning Specialist Interest Group
LTSEC19.11.7.1	The Chair confirmed that, although the TOR was not ready to come to the November meeting of LTSEC, it will need to be circulated to the committee in January 2020, ready for discussion and approval at the February 2020 meeting.
LTSEC19.11.8	Review of the future Academic Regulations
LTSEC19.11.8.1	<p>The Academic Regulations and Policy Manager introduced the proposed new framework within paper LTSEC19.11.6:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The current academic regulations are over 20 years old, and have become quite complex over the years. The main aim of the review is to simplify and make them easier to understand and fairer for all students; 2. The proposals have previously come to LTSEC in June 2019, and Academic Board in July, for initial discussion. The report is now asking LTSEC to endorse the proposed framework to Academic Board for approval at its December 2019 meeting; 3. The report has been divided into two sections, the proposals which Academic Board were happy to agree at the July meeting, and the proposals which they requested more detail. The Regulatory Framework Steering Group has subsequently agreed with this additional information and is happy for the proposals to come back for approval; 4. The report also includes some student scenarios which shows the differences between the current and future regulations. These also show how the future regulations will fit together; 5. In the intervening period between LTSEC and Academic Board, drop in's for Academic Board members will be held to explain the proposals and the journey of the review/proposals; 6. If the framework is approved by Academic Board, it will then move into planning for implementation stage, in which communications with students will be planned; 7. These proposals will not be brought in for September 2020, with many of them planned to fall in line with the

MINUTES OF THE MEETING	
	<p>implementation of the new student record system. There will also be a significant piece of work to review and plan all of the processes that underpin the regulations;</p> <p>8. The most controversial proposal, which Academic Board asked for more detail about is the proposal to remove capping at resit and retake. The project team spent a lot of time investigating this, comparing a model which has capping against one which wouldn't in the future:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Award Board reports from last year showed that 92% of students would be exactly where they are now, and 6% would be moved into our borderline criteria; b. Within the review it is proposed to remove borderline uplifts, as students would get marks which reflected their achievement, rather than capped marks. This will reflect a simpler and transparent process as students will receive a module mark for the work they have done; c. 87% of all PCs applications to uncap a resit within 2018-19 were accepted. The amount of applications received every year is very high, and can be burdensome for students and staff; d. Capping is UK wide, however overseas Higher Education sectors do not cap marks. e.
LTSEC19.11.8.2	<p>During extensive discussions, members noted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The scenarios in the report are really useful in seeing what differences the future regulations could have on the student experience; 2. The general view was that the proposals were in line with the principles set out for the review of the regulation, in particular that they were inclusive and simpler. 3. Students may not have access to specialist equipment and laboratories in the second sit period as they will be in an annual refurbishment phase, and that this would be a nudge to encourage students to use the first sit; 4. It will be key to ensure students understand that the first sit is the sit in which they should submit their work, unless there are good reasons to wait until the second sit. This will also fit alongside a very different mechanism of support for students in line with the personalisation model, focusing on support at the time they need it rather than dealing with issues after the event; 5. The threshold requirements for credits gained by certain points could be a barrier for placement students. Some scenarios to look at this in further detail will be useful during the implementation period.
LTSEC19.11.8.3	<p>Members acknowledged all of the work the Academic Regulations and Policy Manager and Project Team have done over the past 3 years to get to this stage, expressing that they considered the proposals to be</p>

MINUTES OF THE MEETING	
	sector leading. Members strongly ENDORSED the proposals to Academic Board for approval.
LTSEC19.11.9	Digital Education at UWE, Bristol
LTSEC19.11.9.1	The Chair confirmed that the proposal for a digital education vision would sit inside the Learning 2030 programme. This piece of work will therefore come back to LTSEC as part of this wider work.
LTSEC19.11.9.2	The Chair, Deputy Vice Chancellor (DVC) and Provost departed the meeting, and the Pro Vice Chancellor Student Experience took over as Chair. The DVC and Provost was thanked for all of the work she had done as Chair of the Committee, and wished well for the future in her new role.
	ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION
LTSEC19.11.10	Transforming Futures Learning Strategy
LTSEC19.11.10.1	<p>The Pro-Vice Chancellor for the Student Experience provided an overview of paper LTSEC19.11.8:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The paper provides early thinking on the strategy for 2030, following and building on the brilliant work which has taken place in the Learning 2020 programme; 2. At the core of the strategy is learning and teaching, capturing high level thinking about the values and purpose of the University as set out in the mission 'transforming futures'. This will include the performance of provision, outstanding learning and how students will need to be ready and able graduates; 3. The strategy will look at new ways of working and opening up new opportunities. The University will consider what is needed to develop personalisation, what students want to experience, articulating what they have achieved, and how they take this forward as graduates; 4. As discussed in LTSEC19.11.9.1, digital education will be a core strand in the L2030 strategy; 5. This focus will be facilitated by looking at programmes, the people that deliver them and personalising this to the student; 6. There are areas to focus on, including achieving positive student satisfaction in all programmes, being in the top 10 for graduate employability and narrowing attainment gaps; 7. A diagram will be crated reflecting the core themes of the new strategy; 8. Noted the developing branding around the phrases 'Don't get comfortable' and 'University done right' – that UWE will be a University that challenges and stretches student achievement, will develop change makers and create future leaders. The language of this will be reviewed to capture this sense of ambition;

MINUTES OF THE MEETING	
	<p>9. There will be further consultations with Faculties, Services and students on the strategy; what this means, how to take this forward and asking what students want from their learning experience;</p> <p>10. The paper is asking LTSEC to share views on this direction and to help shape the future strategy.</p>
LTSEC19.11.10.2	<p>During extensive discussions, members noted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How sustainability and the climate change agenda will be embedded in the strategy; there will be a sustainability plan and the University will ensure this aligns and is included in this strategy; 2. It will be key to ensure this applied to all students, including degree apprenticeships and other different kinds of learners; 3. The strategy focuses clearly on students; it will also be important to consider the staff side and how they interact; 4. The University strategy 2030 focuses on the 'civic' university, reflecting the dynamic and challenging side of UWE within the Bristol City region. The Transforming futures learning strategy could also have a stronger focus on this; 5. The language within the strategy could be more active rather than passive; 6. Digital education is being considered, however it will also be important to ensure the day to day interaction and engagement with students is included; 7. Wider inclusivity, including external communities, the city region and externality, will also be important to consider.
LTSEC19.11.10.3	<p>Further work will continue, taking the LTSEC feedback into consideration, as well as consultation throughout the University. The strategy will then be brought back to LTSEC for endorsement before it is taken to Academic Board and the Board of Governors for approval.</p>
LTSEC19.11.11	Assessment Offences report
LTSEC19.11.11.1	<p>The Senior Quality Officer introduced the LTSEC paper LTSEC19.11.9:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is the first report at a University level looking at Assessment Offences (AOs). It has been produced following a recommendation from the Learning 2020 Board to consider issues with assessments and groups of students who may be more likely to commit an assessment offence; 2. The first report has largely been a statistical exercise; the project team will be looking into how this data is captured and recorded for the future; 3. Plagiarism at level 3 was more common than at levels 1 and 2. The most common age of students who commit offences is 21-24, which is reflected across each of the Faculties; 4. There is a higher proportion of BAME students committing AOs; work will continue to understand this issue and look to put further support in place;

MINUTES OF THE MEETING	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. The team will consider how more information can be captured on coursework assignments as they can vary in size from a small assignment to a substantial part of their final project; 6. The level of assessment offences recorded by gender was mirrored in each Faculty, and no links were identified with disabilities indicating that support in this area is appropriate; 7. When comparing the data to the previous year, figures were very similar; 8. The Assessment Offences Advisers Group has been expanded to include the Academic Practice Directorate and Library Services to help identify any issues in terms of student support and training; 9. More data and qualitative information, especially in terms of assessments, will help identify more themes in the future and will facilitate designing out opportunities for assessment offences; 10. Library Services have created a project to help understand why students have committed an AO; in the future these outcomes will feed into this report; 11. The numbers of essay mills are expanding and companies are employing clever strategies to encourage students. This poses a challenge to the Higher Education sector. A Viva has been introduced as a form of assessment to test a student's knowledge of the subject if there is reason to believe they have used an essay mill (for example the language/writing style is different to work they have previously submitted).
LTSEC19.11.11.2	<p>During discussions, members noted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In FBL it has been really useful to see the breakdown of data, and the effect this can have on assessment offence advisers. The report has also been helpful in considering how assessment offences can be designed out; 2. FET have also looked at data for direct entry students and identified enhancements in supporting the development academic skills and understanding assessment offences; 3. Prevention is as important as detection; further information for students about assessments and academic integrity could have an impact in reducing AOs; 4. More information about collusion and the implications of sharing work which could be used in an assessment could be helpful to students; 5. Further data on assessment turnaround time and the impact on students' mental health will be useful, including whether this has an impact on complaints.
LTSEC19.11.11.3	The committee welcomed the report.
LTSEC19.11.12	Student Conduct and Behaviour Annual Report 2018/19

MINUTES OF THE MEETING	
LTSEC19.11.12.1	<p>Members welcomed paper LTSEC19.11.10, and the Student Casework Managed provided the following introduction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There has again been an increase in cases under all of the student policies, in particular under the fitness to study policy where cases have doubled; 2. As discussed last year, it is difficult to know whether there is an increase in cases or whether students are more willing to report cases. However, the more reports received facilitates better understanding; 3. Under the fitness to study policy, students have been identified at an earlier stage and support has been put in place to help the student stay at University rather than be suspended or withdraw. This will increase in the future with learner analytics and my-engagement tools; 4. Report and Support and the speak-up campaign have also increased publicity about routes to report concerns and challenging behaviours, and students have begun to use this tool more regularly. The University can be confident that cases have been dealt with and support put in place for students who use this; 5. Training and raising awareness with staff at Level 1 of the new policies will be developed so that student behaviour can be challenged at a lower level and cases can be dealt with quickly and effectively; reducing those progressing through more formal stages of the student conduct policy; 6. The areas pulled out to consider further are as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. There is a higher level of foundation year students involved in cases. This may be because they have come through clearing and have had less time to adapt to the HE environment. There may also be less cohort identity at foundation level; b. There is now a few years of data showing how students have progressed academically after going through the fitness to study policy which will be reviewed; c. It has also been identified that the nature of University programmes is changing, which poses a challenge in dealing with student policy cases and how they progress, for example if students are also in paid employment; 7. Changes to the reporting system has resulted in different data now being reported and recorded. It will also be interesting to see what impact the recent changes to the student policies has in the future.
LTSEC19.11.12.2	<p>During discussions, members noted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The numbers of cases reported is small compared to the number of students at UWE. Better reporting is resulting in more data, resulting in students being dealt with more effectively which is positive;

MINUTES OF THE MEETING	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. PAL leaders could help support foundation year students to develop understanding of what it means to learn at a University level; 3. It would be useful to see a breakdown of data at different modes of study i.e. part time, apprenticeship students. This could help understand behavioural issues with students in employment; 4. Any thoughts on what the committee would like to see in future reports can be fed back to the Student Casework Manager by the end of November. <p style="text-align: right;">Action: LTSEC members</p>
LTSEC19.11.13	Complaints and Appeals Annual Report 2018/19
LTSEC19.11.13.1	<p>LTSEC welcomed the paper LTSEC19.11.11, and the Head of Complaints and Appeals provided the following introduction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A number of teams had been identified where there had been a rise in the number of complaint cases, in particular the Student Money Service and with the SAT team, and the Complaints and Appeals Team would be working with these areas to identify learning and make changes to processes where appropriate. 2. One main area arising from the report will be strengthening stage 1 complaint management with the Complaints and Appeals team running more tailored training for Staff in responding to and recording outcomes from Stage 1 complaints; 3. The team will also work on capturing other data which exists in terms of complaints, and reviewing this; 4. One trend which has been common over the years is students with complex requirements and the difficulties in putting the right support in place for them at the beginning. The team will work with disability services to see if more can be done, including earlier conversations about what can be put in place and what is reasonable.
LTSEC19.11.13.2	<p>During discussions, LTSEC noted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A few years ago, issues were identified around support for dissertations. Additional information and guidance were provided, and since then no further issues have been reported; 2. If approved, it will be interesting to see how the new academic regulatory framework impacts on student complaints and appeals. Many of the current cases are around PC's and the application of the regulations; 3. In terms of students with complex needs, it can be very difficult to know exactly what these needs will be before the student arrives at University. In one instance the student received a diagnosis mid-way through their degree. Admissions are good at sending out information on disabilities, however the student also has to disclose if they have a disability. Any training provided to disability services should also include library services;

MINUTES OF THE MEETING	
	<p style="text-align: center;">Action: Head of Complaints and Appeals</p> <p>4. It will be important to identify expectations of employers and students on apprenticeships programmes, and who has responsibility to report any reasonable adjustments;</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Action: Director of Apprenticeships</p> <p>5. There have been similarities arising from this, the annual report for student conduct and behaviour and the assessment offences report. There are cross themes which could be picked up ahead of LTSEC in the future. A piece of work will be done next year to review all of the outcomes together to highlight any themes to LTSEC.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Action: Head of Student and Academic Policy Enhancement</p>
LTSEC19.11.14	Longitudinal Employment Outcomes (LEO) data 2018/19
LTSEC19.11.14.1	<p>The Deputy Head of Library Careers and Employability and Business Intelligence Analyst provided the follow overview of paper LTSEC19.11.12:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The report covers LEO 3, which is data collected 3 years after a graduate has left University. LEO is also a key metric in the TEF and covers percentage in sustained employment or further study, and their median earnings. The dataset matched a high number of graduates from 2012/13: 99.5%; 2. The new Graduate Outcomes Survey (GOS) which replaces the Destination of Leavers of HE (DHLE) will cover level of employment; 3. All Universities are looked at in the same way; there is no differentiation of where the University is located or number of hours graduates work; 4. At an Institutional level UWE has positive flags for above median earnings threshold or further study. The gap to address is the sustained employment or further study, particularly for part time students as identified in the split metrics. There has been a small dip in outcomes this year for UWE with the graduate level score moving to 68.5%, from 70% last year. Looking at future data it is expected that this should improve; 5. Faculty level data: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. ACE are doing well for students in employment or further study. One area to look at further is Education which is the lowest for the south west. It is difficult to know which programmes the data reflects as it does not go down to this level. The median earnings for education is in the top half, however History is 50th out of 95 Institutions and could be looked at further; b. FBL sustained employment figures are good across the faculty, however median earnings have brought the data down slightly. Economics is identified as an area for further investigation, although again it is difficult to know what these students are doing 3 years after leaving University;

MINUTES OF THE MEETING	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. FET again have good sustained employment, although Maths is slightly below in median earnings, especially between males and females; d. HAS have some real positives e.g. nursing is at the top for sustained employment and Biomedical Sciences is 85%. In terms of earnings however Nursing is 70th out of 73 institutions. As mentioned above, it is difficult to know how many hours these graduates are working, however more could be done to look at why nurses may not be moving up the pay scales and whether there are vacancies allowing them to move up. Philosophy could also be looked at which is 44th out of 64 institutions for earnings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6. When the GOS data is available it may help the University understand some of these outcomes. The South West is also one of the lowest paid regions, outside of Bristol. Most students who study at UWE stay in Bristol, however the data reflects that any graduates moving to any other region will generally earn more; 7. It is also worth noting that the data does not differentiate between the traditional and more vocational Institutions; 8. The report also provided data on automation, which will dramatically change the labour market in the future. Some sectors will be affected more than others, but it will impact on what the University teaches and how this is taught; 9. The University strategy will promote a more personalised approach in the future and follow a career development model which could have an impact on the data.
LTSEC19.11.14.2	<p>After extensive discussions, members noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is more favourable to Russell Group Institutions; there is nothing regarding the background of students and their future earnings; 2. One of the main things that helps students get employment is a meaningful practice experience, which continues to be a main aspect of Strategy 2030; 3. Graduates who move out of the region have likely been given more incentives to move and are therefore more likely to get a better salary; 4. Within the submission of Institutional level TEF, and subject level TEF if implemented, the University will be able to contextualise the data and the background of students.
	ITEMS FOR INFORMATION
LTSEC19.11.15	Enhanced Reading Lists Project
LTSEC19.11.15.1	LTSEC noted the report, which was a starred item on the Agenda.
LTSEC19.11.16	Human Tissue subcommittee Annual Report 2018/19

MINUTES OF THE MEETING	
LTSEC19.11.16.1	LTSEC noted the report, which was a starred item on the Agenda.
	ANY OTHER BUSINESS
LTSEC19.11.17	<p>Car Parking – The student representatives highlighted the issue in some students abusing car parking at Frenchay Campus. The restrictions are being ignored by some, and the University has seen an increase in student conduct cases related to parking issues this year. The Student Policy Team are working with faculties to tackle this. The increase in bus prices (which are more expensive than in London) could be a contributing factor. The Pro-Vice Chancellor Student Experience and the student representatives will be included in these discussions.</p> <p>Action: Head of Student and Academic Policy Enhancement</p>
LTSEC19.11.18	<p>Subway – The student representatives highlighted that there was no consultation with students as to the choice of catering companies coming onto campus. There is a need for more variety and inclusivity; buying food at subway is more expensive than the outlet that it replaced. As part of the strategy 2030 the University has been looking at how a 24/7 campus can be created reflecting what students need and want. Students will be a co-producer in this, especially in designing social spaces if the application to build more student accommodation is approved. This feedback will be taken back to Estates and Facilities.</p> <p>Action: Pro-Vice Chancellor Student Experience</p>
LTSEC19.11.19	<p>Additional LTSEC meeting – The Committee Secretary highlighted that there was a lot of business building up for the February meeting, of which only 30 minutes is reserved for normal business. Members were happy that an additional meeting be created to manage this business.</p> <p>Action: Committee Secretary and Officer</p>
LTSEC19.11.20	<p>Purbeck Court – The student representatives highlighted the controversy around the student accommodation in Purbeck court. The Pro-Vice Chancellor Student Experience explained the rationale for the introduction of an alternative type of accommodation as a pilot for this year. That the experience of living in Purbeck Court would be closely tracked with regular consultation with the residents. Improvement requests made by the residents had already been addressed. A rent review would also take place as part of price setting annual review for accommodation.</p>
LTSEC19.11.21	<p>DATE OF NEXT MEETING 05 February 2019</p>