

Board of Studies 18th Meeting

Minutes

Wednesday 10 May 2006, University of Manchester (London Office)

Present

Ann Morton (Chair), Nigel Beasley, Sue Beech, Mike Miller, Matthew McClelland
(Secretary), Alison Robinson, Joyce Tate

Apologies

Amanda Ashley, Terry Bransbury, Sandra Griffiths, Janet Flexney, Martin Hodkinson,
Hugh Jones, William Mortimer, Bob Westaway

01.18 Minutes

Confirmed: minutes of the previous meeting

02.18 Terms of reference and membership

Received:

- the terms of reference of the Board
- the current membership list

Reported:

Completion of Terms at 30 April 2006

- i) Mrs Cheryl Penna had completed her term as Chair, Board of Studies, and had resigned from the Board. Cheryl had been instrumental in developing the programme, and had also served as a member of the Board of Studies, Chair, Assessment Board, and a member of the Review Group. Members of the Board expressed their thanks to her.
- ii) Mr Bland Tomkinson had completed his second term as Assessor Representative, and had resigned from the Board. Members of the Board expressed their thanks to Bland for his contribution to the development of the programme.
- iii) Dr Nigel Beasley had completed his second term as Assessor Representative. As PDP Moderator, he remained *ex officio* a member of the Board.

Appointments from 1 May 2006

- iv) Dr Ann Morton, Aston University: Chair, Board of Studies.
- v) Mrs Amanda Ashley, Kingston University: Assessor Representative.
- vi) Mr Mike Miller, Consultant: Assessor Representative.
- vii) Ms Alison Robinson, who was leaving the Higher Education Academy at the end of May 2006, was co-opted to the Board.
- viii) Mr Bob Westaway, Goldsmiths College: PDC link.

Vacancies

- ix) Vice-Chair, Board of Studies: nominations were sought from members of the Board.
- x) Higher Education Academy Representative: nominations would be sought from Jane Pither, Higher Education Academy.

Resolved:

- xi) The constitution of the Board should be amended to stipulate that participant representatives cannot hold the position of Vice-Chair (Actioned: See appendix 2).

03.18 Institutional Review and Programme Revalidation**Received:**

- Draft report of the institutional review
- Draft report of the programme revalidation

Institutional Review**Reported:**

- i) The institutional review panel had recommended that AUA be re-approved as an accredited institution of the Open University for five years from September 2006, subject to two conditions:
 - a. the implementation of academic transcripts (see below, minute 10.18.2);
 - b. negotiating formal articulation and / or credit transfer arrangements to enable further study;and one recommendation:
 - c. the continued development of electronic technology and the website for mentor and participant support.
- ii) The panel had commended the strong ongoing commitment of AUA to the provision of CPD for administrative staff in UK higher education.

Noted:

- iii) Under a standard agreement with the Open University, graduates could transfer 60 credits towards Open University Masters programmes. Under a separate agreement, graduates could transfer 25 credits towards the University of Loughborough PGDip / MSc (HEA) programme, equivalent to exemptions from two modules. Preliminary discussions regarding formal credit transfer agreements had taken place with MA / DBA (HEM), University of Bath.

Resolved:

- iv) A formal credit transfer agreement with the Institute of Education MBA programme should be sought. A report on articulation agreements should be made to the next meeting of the Board.
Action: Secretary
- v) Graduate monitoring should be used to compile graduate destination data.
Action: Secretary
- vi) The appointment of the AUA IT Developer offered an excellent opportunity for the continued development of electronic and web-based resources. Such resources would be developed as enhancements to the programme, and there were no plans to move to e-learning or online delivery. The annual monitoring process should be used to assess participants' demands for additional learning technologies.
Action: Secretary
- vii) The final report of the institutional review panel should be circulated to members of the Board electronically.
Action: Secretary

Programme Revalidation**Reported**

- viii) The revalidation panel had recommended the re-approval of the programme for three years from September 2006, subject to two conditions:
 - a. the approval of the assessment strategy, the form and content of proposed assessment questions and of other assessments that count towards the award by the External Examiner. Future changes to the assessment strategy should

- also be agreed with the External Examiner prior to implementation;
- b. the recruitment of an external advisor to support the programme team with programme development. The person should be an academic with experience of developing or managing programmes with a similar structure or pedagogy, and be independent of AUA, the programme, and the home institution of the current External Examiner. This externality should be in addition to any Academic Reviewer support appointed by the Open University (see below, minute 06.18); and one recommendation:
 - c. AUA should closely monitor recruitment, admission, induction, and support for participants and report annually to OUVS on these areas.
 - ix) The panel had commended:
 - a. the professional approach of the programme team in making incremental improvements to move the programme forward;
 - b. the innovative nature of the programme which balances reflection and knowledge and enables students to design their own programme of study within a structured framework.

Resolved:

- x) The External Examiner's approval of the assessment strategy and assignment titles would be sought following the conclusion of the current assessment round.

Action: Secretary
- xi) The annual monitoring process would encompass the monitoring of recruitment, admissions and induction.

Action: Programme Management Team
- xii) The final report of the institutional review panel should be circulated to members of the Board electronically.

Action: Secretary

04.18 External Examiner's Report**Received:**

- The interim report of the external examiner.
- The Chair's response.

Reported:

- i) The external examiner found that the programme struck a good balance between the professional and the academic.
- ii) The external examiner was satisfied that the standards applied in reaching final decisions were in line with those at similar courses across a range of UK HEIs.
- iii) The assessment process had been amended to ensure that the external examiner received copies of all assignments graded unsatisfactory in the first instance.
- iv) On the recommendation of the external examiner, a brief note of guidance for each assignment title had been prepared for the revalidated programme. The Programme Management Team and Assessment Board had been tasked with producing similar guidance for the current programme.

Noted:

- v) A further recommendation concerning the number of resubmissions permitted would be considered under agenda 10.3 (see below).

Resolved:

- vi) It was essential to provide additional guidance on approaches to

major assignment titles as quickly as possible. This should initially be based on assessors' feedback to individual participants.

Action: Secretary / Alison Robinson

05.18 OUVS Response to QAA Audit

Received:

- A report summarising OUVS's response to QAA audit and its impact on the programme.

Reported:

- i) An audit of the Open University's arrangements for collaborative provision had resulted in a limited confidence outcome. Following a period of consultation with accredited institutions, OUVS had issued an Action Plan which had been accepted by the QAA.
- ii) The OUVS Action Plan aimed at greater oversight of accredited institutions and validated programmes through, *inter alia*: the appointment of an Academic Reviewer for each validated programme; changes to the collection of data; greater involvement of the Partnerships Manager at institutional level.
- iii) The impact of the Action Plan on the AUA and the programme could not yet be properly gauged, pending the publication of final details by OUVS. It was likely to include: increased cost of accreditation and validation resulting from more engagement; changes to the collection and storage of data, potentially impacting on the IT infrastructure; changes to the composition of programme and institutional committees.

Noted:

- iv) Changes to the composition of programme level committees would be considered under agenda item 7.
- v) The replication of roles between the Academic Reviewer, External Examiner, and Academic Advisor was a potential source of conflict. This was mitigated by the fact that the post-holders would be members of different committees.
- vi) The impact on IT infrastructure was likely to be limited, and could be managed by the Programme Manager and IT Developer.

Resolved:

- vii) The Secretary should monitor the proposals brought forward by OUVS, and report to the Board on any significant changes affecting the programme.

Action: Secretary

06.18 Appointment of Academic Advisor

Received:

- Draft role and person specification for the Academic Advisor

Tabled:

- Amended role and person specification following input from Dr Mike Green, Director Open University Business School and Chair, Revalidation Panel.

Noted:

- i) The appointment of the Academic Advisor would fulfil one of the conditions of revalidation.
- ii) Dr Green's recommendations moved the role of the Academic Advisor away from the academic content towards the pedagogy of the programme.
- iii) Dr Green recommended that AUA establish contact with the Learning Through Work (LTW) programme at the University of Derby which

- had a similar structure and pedagogy.
- iv) Dr Rajani Naidoo, Director of Studies, DBA (HEM), University of Bath had indicated her willingness to be considered for the role.

Resolved:

- v) The role of the Academic Advisor should provide advice on both the academic content and the pedagogy of the programme. The role would involve a time-commitment of around 5 days per annum, and should therefore attract an honorarium of around £1000 per annum. Full-time employment as an academic should not be a requirement, although the post holder should have experience of a postgraduate programme. The Academic Advisor's role and person specification was approved as amended, and is appended to these minutes (Appendix 1).
- vi) The Academic Advisor's post should be advertised as widely as possible.

Action: Secretary

07.18 Committee Structure**Received:**

- A report outlining proposed changes to:
 - a. Board of Studies: Terms of Reference and Composition
 - b. Programme Management Team: Terms of Reference and Composition.
 - c. Assessment Board: Composition

Tabled:

- Proposed changes to the composition of the Appeals Panel.

Reported:

- i) The Programme Manager had conducted a review of the terms of reference and composition of programme level committees in order to: comply with the conditions of revalidation; address issues arising from the OUVS response to the QAA audit; and, clarify the role and functions of the committees as a matter of good practice.
- ii) The proposals were not intended to amend or proscribe the powers of the committees.
- iii) Changes to the composition of the Appeals Panel were proposed to widen the pool of prospective members, following recent difficulties in convening the panel.

Resolved:

- iv) The role of the Board of Studies was to approve the processes for admission of participants and selection of mentors. The role of the Programme Management Team was to conduct these processes on the Board's behalf.
- v) Two members of the Appeals Panel should be appointed from amongst the members of the Professional Development Committee, Board of Studies, or Equality Advisory Group. Panel members must not have been involved in the process of assessing the appellant and may not themselves be participants on the programme.
- vi) With these amendments, the proposals were endorsed and recommended to the Professional Development Committee for approval. The endorsed proposals are appended to these minutes (Appendix 2).

08.18 Academic Infrastructure**Received:**

- Draft mapping of AUA policy and practice against the QAA Code of

Practice.

Reported:

- i) A mapping exercise had been first undertaken in December 2004, and submitted to the OUVS at their request.
- ii) The mapping exercise had been updated by the Programme Manager in January 2006. Outstanding actions from the previous mapping exercise had been carried over into the updated document.

Noted:

- iii) The anticipatory nature of disability legislation placed a duty on institutions to promote cultural change through the curriculum.

Resolved:

- iv) The Board aimed to promote awareness of the equality agenda through the programme. The Equality Advisory Group should be invited to review the curriculum and advise the Board on incremental changes to support the achievement of this objective. A report should be submitted to the next meeting of the Board.

Action: Secretary / Equality Advisory Group

- v) Advice on the legality of complaints and appeals procedures was not necessary as sufficient expertise existed amongst members of the Board. All programme regulations for 2006-07, including complaints and appeals procedures, would be reviewed by Mike Miller.

Action: Mike Miller

- vi) The Review Group should report to the Board on the process of institutional review and programme revalidation, and make recommendations for future major review exercises.

Action: Review Group

- vii) The Secretary should draw up an action plan to address the outstanding items, which should be submitted to the Professional Development Committee together with the mapping document.

Action: Secretary

09.18 Annual Monitoring
.1 Annual Monitoring 2004-05

Received:

- OUVS response to Annual Monitoring Report (AMR)
- Programme Manager's Response

Reported:

- i) OUVS had identified seven of items for commendation, consistent with the continuing initiatives of the Board and the Programme Management Team to enhance the programme.
- ii) OUVS had identified four actions requiring immediate action:
 - a. To ensure that recent and forthcoming enhancements to the programme were sufficient to result in M level attainment by students and a satisfactory External Examiner's report;
 - b. To prepare for the forthcoming institutional review and programme revalidation;
 - c. To begin to consider the institutional and administrative issues which will need to be addressed to introduce ethnicity / disability monitoring;
 - d. To produce a final programme specification.
- iii) OUVS had confirmed that the Programme Manager's response had addressed these concerns appropriately, as follows:
 - a. Enhancements would be monitored through cohort analysis, annual monitoring, and evaluation of training events;
 - b. The review and revalidation had been successfully completed in March 2006;

- c. Equal Opportunities and Disability Policy have been incorporated into the programme regulations, and monitoring will begin from 2006-07;
- d. Final programme specification approved as part of programme revalidation.

Resolved:

- iv) Where appropriate, further actions arising from the OUVS response to the 2004-05 AMR would be approved as part of the 2005-06 annual monitoring process.

Action: Board of Studies

.2 Annual Monitoring 2005-06**Received:**

- Draft annual monitoring forms for participants and mentors.

Reported:

- i) The forms remained substantially the same as in 2004-05 to enable year on year benchmarking. Minor changes to the forms had been made to enable the enhancements to the programme to be monitored in accordance with the response to the AMR. (See Minute 09.18.1 (iii) above.)
- ii) The forms would be distributed in June 2006. As in 2004-05, an incentive would be offered to respondents. The programme assistant would also follow up participants and mentors who had not returned their forms by the deadline to try and increase the number of responses.

Resolved:

- iii) The monitoring form for mentors should be amended to capture data on contact with participants and feedback about the mentor coordinator.
- iv) The monitoring form for participants should be amended to capture suggested enhancements to the available learning support.
- v) With these amendments, the annual monitoring forms were approved for distribution.

Action: Secretary

10.18 Assessment**.1 Reports****Received:**

- An oral report from the Assessor Representative

Reported:

- i) The Assessor Representative had marked 12 major assignments from 5 different knowledge areas in the last academic session. There had been no significant change in the quality of assignments, and there were no observable trends according to the knowledge area of assignments.
- ii) The Assessment Board had recently introduced supplementary guidance on the required standard of work, and new marking criteria for summative assessment would be introduced from October 2006.
- iii) The new External Examiner had initiated a constructive dialogue on the standards operated by the Board.
- iv) Differences in approaches to assignments perhaps reflected the lack of guidance specific to assignment titles.

Agreed:

- v) Recent enhancements to the programme should lead to an improvement in general standards. The Board would keep these

under review.

.2 Academic transcripts

Received:

- Draft academic transcripts

Noted:

- i) The implementation of academic transcripts would fulfil a requirement of the Institutional Review.
- ii) The draft transcripts had been developed using OUVS guidelines, and had been approved by Dr Stephen Cooksey, Deputy Director (Administration), OUVS, on 10 April 2006.

Resolved:

- iii) A note clarifying assessment requirements and the fact that Pass / Fail are the only possible outcomes of assessment should be printed on the transcripts.
- iv) The academic transcripts were approved for immediate implementation, and should be issued to all participants who had already completed the programme.

Action: Secretary

.3 Assessment arrangements

Received:

- A paper on proposed amendments to the assessment arrangements.

Resubmission of assignments

Reported:

- i) The external examiner had raised the question of whether participants should be permitted to resubmit items of summative assessment more than once, in order to address the lack of multiple opportunities for formative assessment.
- ii) Arrangements at UK institutions were varied, although the large majority permitted only one resubmission at Pg Level. AUA practice was not therefore out of line with practice across the UK.
- iii) One institution permitted multiple resubmissions for external students (i.e. distance / online learners) for the express reason that they did not receive the same degree of support as other students. This situation was comparable to the AUA programme.

Noted:

- iv) Although views amongst members of the Board were split, the majority did not support an extension to the number of resubmissions permitted. Members noted that current arrangements did not seem out of line with practice across UK higher education, and expressed concern that extending the number of resubmissions might damage the credibility of the programme.
- v) Allowing multiple resubmissions was one means of improving the support available to participants. The Board had already implemented a number of changes designed to improve the quality of output.
- vi) Any change to the number of resubmissions permitted could only be applied to cohorts in which no participant had completed. Because of the throughput of participants, a decision on this issue needed to be made immediately.

Resolved:

- vii) The Board rejected the proposal.

Decoupling summative assessment

Reported:

- viii) The Board was asked to consider permitting participants to submit elements of summative assessment separately. The item arose from participant feedback, which suggested that participants found it difficult to manage their workload because assessment was concentrated at the end of the programme. Decoupling the elements of final assessment could help to mitigate that difficulty and improve withdrawal and pass rates.
- ix) The revalidation proposals had already addressed this issue, and therefore any changes would apply to existing participants.

Noted:

- x) Three options were considered:
 - a. separate submission of the major assignment and portfolio;
 - b. separate submission of minor assignments from remainder of portfolio;
 - c. separate submission of minor assignments, remainder of portfolio, and major assignment.
- xi) There was support amongst mentors for allowing participants to complete some elements of assessment earlier.
- xii) The decoupling of assessment could lead to a distinction between the 'academic' and 'professional' elements which could be detrimental to the work-based ethos of the programme.
- xiii) The portfolio in its entirety constituted one element of summative assessment. The minor assignments were an integral part of the portfolio, and were linked to participants' professional practice and their reflections on its development.
- xiv) Assessing the minor assignments separately from the rest of the portfolio could undermine the assessors' ability to assess portfolios properly.
- xv) Any decoupling of assessment should provide clear benefits to participants through additional feedback and the attendant learning experience.

Resolved:

- xvi) Participants would be permitted to submit the major assignment and portfolio separately, subject to the following:
 - a. Where a participant chooses to submit the elements of summative assessment separately, the major assignment must be submitted first.
 - b. The major assignment may be submitted during the first twelve months of registration.
 - c. The portfolio may not be submitted during the first twelve months of registration.
 - d. Where a participant submits the major assignment first and is referred at the first attempt, (s)he may either:
 - resubmit the major assignment prior to submitting the portfolio;
 - or
 - resubmit the major assignment and submit the portfolio simultaneously.
 - e. Where a participant submits the major assignment first and is referred at the first attempt, an extension to his / her registration period may be approved to allow sufficient time for the major assignment and / or the portfolio to be revised with due care.
- xvii) The Secretary should write to all participants to explain the change in the regulations.

Action: Secretary

Recognising professional development**Reported:**

- xviii) The Board was asked to consider a means of recognising the professional development of participants who had not been successful at final assessment. The item arose from participant feedback.
- xix) Participants who failed one element of summative assessment had nonetheless completed a considerable amount of learning and professional development, which would currently be recognised by the Academic Transcript.
- xx) Although, there was no award intermediate to a Postgraduate Certificate on the FHEQ, with the approval of the Professional Development Committee, an AUA Professional Development Award could be awarded on successful completion of one element of summative assessment. This would not be credit-bearing, and would not be awarded by the Open University.

Noted:

- xxi) One participant had been awarded the AUA CPD Award, the forerunner of the Postgraduate Certificate programme. Due consideration should be given to whether the award of an AUA Professional Development Award would devalue his / her award.

Resolved:

- xxii) The proposal was endorsed and recommended to the Professional Development Committee for approval.

Action: Secretary / PDC**11. Training****Received:**

An oral report from Chair, Training Team

Reported:

- i) Feedback from Study Days in 2005-06 had, to date, been very positive.
- ii) The Training Team remained responsive to feedback from participants and mentors, and minor changes to the training material had been introduced.
- iii) Development days for participants had been scheduled in May, June, and July.
- iv) The Training Team intended to update the training material for 2006-07 to take account of changes to the structure of the programme.

Agreed:

- v) The Board would not need to re-approve the training material for 2006-07, as changes would not substantially affect the content.

12.18 Reports**.1 Branch Coordinator Representative**

No report

.2 Participant Representatives**Tabled:**

- Report from the Participant Representatives

Reported:

Participants had provided the following feedback:

- i) Recent guidelines sent to participants, including the Study Skills Guide and revised marking criteria, are very useful. Support and guidance available to participants has recently improved significantly.
- ii) The 2005-06 edition of the Resource Pack could be better organised.
- iii) Formative feedback was an opportunity for assessors to provide participants, who may have been out of education for a number of

years, with reassurance that their work conformed with academic conventions relating to writing and referencing.

- iv) Participants in Scotland found it difficult to travel to the scheduled development days. Local events in Scotland would be more accessible.

Noted:

- v) The Board had worked hard to introduce relevant supplementary guidance for participants, and it was pleasing to note that these were well-received. These enhancements would be kept under review and further guidance issued as appropriate.
- vi) The Board had sought to revise the Resource Pack for 2005-06, and it was disappointing to note that a participant was not satisfied. A new Programme Handbook would be available to participants registering from 2006-07 onwards. The supplementary guidance notes offered the best available way of issuing clarification to existing participants and mentors.
- vii) New formative feedback forms had been introduced in March 2006 which sought to identify the best features of assignments as well as areas where there was room for improvement. The new marking criteria also provided more comprehensive feedback.

Resolved:

- viii) A development day should be scheduled in Scotland in 2006-07.

Action: Secretary

.3 Mentor Representatives

No report

13.18 Fees

Reported:

- i) The Executive Committee had approved an increased fee of £1280 from 2006-07, inclusive of the Open University registration fee.
- ii) This substantial increase would cover the additional administrative and staffing costs associated with the revalidated programme.
- iii) The programme was still operated on a break-even basis.

14.18 Academic Calendar

Received:

- The Academic Calendar for 2006-07.

Noted:

- i) Running the existing and the revalidated programmes in parallel posed particular problems for timetabling the programme, in particular the scheduling of assessment.
- ii) Necessarily, the Academic Calendar covered dates in 2007-08 and 2008-09, and provisional approval for these was sought.
- iii) In order to mitigate these problems, there would be only two intakes of participants in 2006-07: London, 18 October 2006; Manchester, 6 March 2007. Up to 30 participants would be admitted in each cohort.
- iv) Particular care had been taken to try and minimise the overlap in assessment between the pre- and post- 2006/7 cohorts. Until the pre-2006/7 cohorts had completed the programme, the Assessment Board would continue to meet in January and May. Nonetheless, a significant increase in the assessment workload was projected, and plans to recruit additional assessors were being implemented.

Resolved:

- v) The Academic Calendar was approved for publication, and should be

posted on the AUA website and distributed as appropriate.

Action: Secretary

15.18 Registrations, Intermissions, and Withdrawals

Tabled:

- A statistical report for the period 31 January to 10 May 2006

Reported:

i) **Participant Registrations:**

Total: 9

Birmingham, 9 March 2006: 9

- *Enrolments for forthcoming inductions:*

London, 8 June 2006: 15

Edinburgh, 20 July 2006: 6

ii) **Mentor Registrations:**

Total: 4

Birmingham, 8 March 2006: 4

- *Enrolments for forthcoming inductions:*

London, 7 June 2006: 9

Edinburgh, 19 July 2006: 0

iii) **Withdrawals:**

Total: 32

2001-02: 10

2002-03: 18

2003-04: 3

2004-05: 2

2005-06: 0

Course not as envisaged: 1

Personal reasons: 4

Combination of two or more reasons: 1

Lapsed: 26

iv) **Intermissions:**

Total: 6

Noted:

- v) Because of an administrative error, some lapsed participants had not been recorded between August 2005 and February 2006. This had led to an abnormally high number of lapsed participants in the current period.

Resolved:

- vi) The administrative procedures should be amended to ensure this situation could not reoccur.

Action: Secretary

16.18 Other Business

Incentive scheme for mentors

Reported:

- i) The incentives available to mentors had been raised directly with the Programme Manager on several occasions. Mentors currently received one year's free membership of AUA once they had been allocated a participant to mentor.
- ii) The possibility of extending the free membership scheme had been raised with the Review Group. However, the increased cost to participants this would entail had not been found acceptable.
- iii) Mentors made a significant contribution to the delivery of the programme which ought to be recognised.

- iv) AUA was increasingly in competition for mentors' time with the numerous in-house mentoring schemes being rolled out across the sector.

Resolved:

- v) The Programme Manager should investigate the possibilities and report to the Board at the earliest opportunity.

Action: Secretary**17. Dates of next meetings**

- Thursday 14 September 2006, Manchester
- Wednesday 31 January 2007, London
- Thursday 31 May 2007, Manchester

Appendix 1: Academic Advisor Role Description

Purpose of role:

The purpose of the Academic Advisor is to advise the Programme Manager on:

- i) the monitoring, review, and enhancement of the programme
- ii) the academic content of the programme and its equivalence to other programmes in the discipline
- iii) the structure and processes involved in the teaching and learning aspects of the programme
- iv) the development of learning resources

Role description

The post-holder will:

- a) be *ex officio* a member of the Programme Management Team
- b) contribute actively to the annual and periodic major reviews of the programme
- c) review and offer guidance on the design of the programme
- d) conduct an annual review of the specified reading lists to ensure that they remain current and relevant
- e) provide advice on other academic matters that may arise

Person specification

The Academic Advisor will normally be a member of academic staff of a UK based higher education institution. (S)he will have demonstrable expertise in the discipline of higher education management and in the development of programmes based on individually negotiated learning outcomes.

Terms

The post-holder will be *ex officio* a member of the Programme Management Team, enabling her / him to play an important part in the review and enhancement of the programme. However, it is not envisaged that (s)he will need to be involved in all aspects of the programme management: the role is one of critical friendship, and the workload is not expected to exceed five days *per annum*.

An honorarium of £1000 pa will be payable subject to:

- attendance at meetings of the Programme Management Team, as appropriate
- timely discharge of the responsibilities defined above

Incidental expenses will be paid according to standard AUA policy.

Appointments will normally be made for three years in the first instance.

Appendix 2: Committee Terms of Reference and Composition

The Board of Studies endorsed amendments to:

1. Board of Studies: Terms of Reference and Composition
2. Programme Management Team: Terms of Reference and Composition
3. Assessment Board: Composition
4. Appeals Panel: Composition

which are recommended to the Professional Development Committee for approval.

1. Board of Studies

The Board of Studies is responsible for the operation and management of the programme within the appropriate frameworks determined by the Professional Development Committee.

Terms of reference:

- i) to assure and enhance academic quality and standards
- ii) to monitor, review, and enhance the operation of the programme
- iii) to approve minor changes to the programme to support its enhancement
- iv) to recommend to the Professional Development Committee major changes to the programme to support its enhancement
- v) to report annually through the Professional Development Committee to the Open University on the operation, monitoring, and enhancement of the programme
- vi) to advise the Professional Development Committee on the operation of the frameworks of the programme and its engagement with the Academic Infrastructure
- vii) to determine assessment and marking criteria so that moderators and assessors can fairly and objectively judge whether participants have satisfied the requirements of the award and reached the appropriate level of attainment
- viii) to approve the training programme for participants and mentors
- ix) to recommend the appointment of moderators, assessors, and external examiners to the Professional Development Committee, and approve arrangements for their training and induction
- x) to recommend the appointment of the Academic Advisor(s) to the Professional Development Committee, and approve arrangements for their training and induction
- xi) to approve and monitor the process for the admission of participants, in accordance with the admissions policy determined by the Professional Development Committee
- xii) to approve and monitor the process for the selection of mentors, in accordance with the selection policy determined by the Professional Development Committee
- xiii) to give full and proper consideration to any matters which may be referred to it by the Professional Development Committee

Composition

A: Nominated members

- two members of the AUA Professional Development Committee, one of whom will be the Chair of the Board.
- a Branch or Regional Coordinator
- a representative of the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education or of the Higher Education Academy
- a University Staff Development Officer
- two assessors
- a trainer
- a member with experience of acting as director for a postgraduate course of study

B: Elected members

- two mentor representatives
- two participant representatives

C: Ex officio members

- Chair, Assessment Board
- PDP Moderator
- Programme Leader
- OUVS Academic Reviewer

D: Co-opted members

- two members as appropriate

The Programme Manager will be secretary to the Board.

Members are appointed for a fixed term of three years, arranged in such a way that there is rotation in the membership of the Board. Members who have served two consecutive terms are normally required to retire from the Board for at least one year before becoming eligible for re-appointment.

A Vice-Chair is appointed from amongst members of the Board who are not currently participants on the programme.

2. Programme Management Team

The Programme Management Team is responsible to the Board of Studies for the leadership and executive management of the programme.

Terms of reference

- i) to conduct the annual and periodic major reviews of the programme on behalf of the Board of Studies
- ii) to recommend to the Board of Studies operational and pedagogical enhancements to the programme
- iii) to conduct the process for the admission of participants on behalf of the Board of Studies
- iv) to conduct the process for the selection of mentors on behalf of the Board of Studies
- v) to oversee the day-to-day administration and management of the programme
- vi) to advise and assist the Programme Leader in the intellectual leadership, executive management, and academic administration of the programme

Composition

- i) Programme Leader (Chair)
- ii) Chair, Board of Studies

- iii) an assessor
- iv) the Mentor-Coordinator
- v) the PDP Moderator
- vi) a trainer
- vii) the Academic Advisor
- viii) the Programme Manager

For periodic major reviews, the Programme Management Team may co-opt:

- i) a member of the Executive Committee or of the Professional Development Committee
- ii) a representative of another professional association which offers accredited or validated professional development
- iii) such other individuals as may be necessary to ensure that the programme is subjected to a proper degree of scrutiny

3. Assessment Board

Composition

The OUVS Partnerships Manager will be *ex officio* a member of the Board.

4. Appeals Panel

Composition

- Chair, Professional Development Committee, or his / her deputy (Chair of the Panel)
- Two members of the Professional Development Committee, Board of Studies, or Equality Advisory Group who have not been involved in the process of assessing the appellant and are not themselves participants on the programme.

The AUA Executive Secretary or his / her deputy will be the Secretary to the Panel.