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| Meeting: | **Academic Executive Committee Minutes** |
| Location: | **Chancellors Building Room 3.7** |
| Date & Time: | **Thursday 01st November 2018 at 1.15pm** |
|  |
| **Present:** |
| Stefan Garcia (Chair)  | Undergraduate Faculty Representative (Humanities and Social Sciences)  |
| Hollie Newing | Undergraduate Faculty Representative (Humanities and Social Sciences)  |
| Richard Hatfield | Doctoral Faculty Representative (Humanities and Social Sciences)  |
| Raj Haria | Undergraduate Faculty Representative (Engineering and Design)  |
| George Goodman | Undergraduate Faculty Representative (Engineering and Design) |
| Suruthi Gnanenthiran  | Undergraduate Faculty Representative (Science)  |
| Ella Rimmer | Undergraduate Faculty Representative (Science) |
| Akshar Nair | Doctoral Faculty Representative (Science) |
| Amy Staines | Undergraduate Faculty Representative (School of Management)  |
| Juni Oldensand  | Undergraduate Faculty Representative (School of Management) |
| Jelena Lagger | Doctoral Faculty Representative (School of Management) |
|  |
| **In attendance:** |
| Gregory Noakes | Governance & Executive Support Manager (acting Secretary) |
| Jack Kitchen | Education Officer |
| Jiani Zhou | Postgraduate Officer |
|  |
| Item |  |
|  | **Apologies** Morgan Roberts, Mohammed Saddighani, My Phan, Zixian Chen. |
|  | **Chair Elections** The committee were informed that they had received two nominations for the Chair position: Stefan GarciaRichard HatfieldBoth candidates were asked to give a brief statement of their background and why they wished to be Chair. Stefan Garcia gave an overview of their background, outlined their reasons for being Chair and what they hoped to achieve as Chair of the committee. Richard Hatfield withdrew from the election in favour of Stefan Garcia being elected Chair. Stefan Garcia was elected Chair of the committee.  |
|  | **Officer Updates*****(Raj Haria joined the meeting at this point)*** The Education Officer and Postgraduate Officer asked the committee if there were any questions about their updates. There were no questions. Richard Hatfield noted that the use of the website to distribute papers for meetings was not easily accessible. It was requested to distribute papers for meetings via email, and use calendar invites for meetings.  |
|  | **Academic Reps Conference** The Education Officer noted the Academics Reps Conference planned for 03/11/2018 and explained the purpose of this conference.  |
|  | **Future of Academic Exec: Taught and Doctoral Structures** The Education Officer reported on feedback that the previous Executive Committee members had given. They had noted that the Taught Academic Representatives and Doctoral Academic Representatives often had different issues that they wished to discuss because of the different students they represented. The Education Officer therefore suggested that to better facilitate discussion in meetings the Taught Academic Representatives and Doctoral Academic Representatives should have their own separate meetings to discuss issues relevant to them. A combined meeting of both representatives would still take place but on a less frequent basis and with the intention of discussing issues affecting both taught and Doctoral students. The committee discussed and agreed to try this new meeting structure. It was requested that minutes from the Taught Faculty Rep Meetings are circulated to the Doctoral Faculty Reps, and vice versa.  |
|  | **Faculty Rep Issues** **Tier four booking system** Akshar Nair reported that this system was unfairly treating international students who were having to pay to print of timesheets and Visas to submit to HR. It was noted that Visas were quite long documents and that timesheets had to be regularly printed off by international students who were working due to HR having a legal responsibility for monitoring their working hours. Akshar noted that HR did not reimburse these students for the cost of doing this. The committee discussed the issue. The Education Officer reported that both the Postgraduate Officer and Community Officer were planning to do some work on this issue. **Isolation on Placement** Juni Oldensand and Amy Staines jointly reported that they were receiving reports that students on placements were not getting support from the University during their time on placement. It was explained that while University was good at finding placements for students they were not good at providing advice and support for students who might encounter issues during their placement, particularly with regards to mental health and student wellbeing. It was noted that this had also been raised in the SU Student Voice Report.The committee members discussed and agreed that this was an issue reflected in all their own areas where students were going on placement:* Science: reps noted concern that the support was sometimes lacking. For students struggling to get a placement, particularly at late stages in the academic year (e.g. April), it was stressful and there was a lack of emotional support. For some students without a 1st or 2:1, students were encouraged not to apply as there are ‘enough applicants without extenuating circumstances’. Whilst on placement, there was only one visit, and one email which was focused on placement paperwork. It took an average of 4 working days to respond to these emails too.
* Akshar Nair noted that Professional Doctorates faced similar issues.
* *Confidential*: there was an issue in Chemistry, where the student was treated poorly by their company and were threatened with contract termination. All the placements team did was reprimand them, although the placement was inappropriate in the first place.
* HSS: Faculty Reps noted that University of Bath placements absorbed some students who struggled to get placements, or encouraged students to change to a 3-year course. This enabled them to advertise a 100% rate of students going on placement. It was also noted that HSS FDSC strongly recommended that staff did Mental Health First Aid training, although this was difficult to apply in practice.
* Reps questioned what the £1,800 placement fee entitled students to.

They discussed and suggested some ideas on how the University could respond to the issue: * Having staff who interact with students on placement trained in mental health first aid;
* Having two separate teams. One that finds placements for students and another providing support to students on placement.
 |
|  | **Any other business**The following item was raised for discussion:**Supervision**Doctoral Faculty Reps noted that students are unlikely to speak badly about their supervisors, and thought there should be a 6-monthly report which goes to the Head of Department or Director of Studies, not the supervisor, to allow for confidential feedback to be given.**Postgraduates who Teach pay discrepancies**It was noted that there were some discrepancies between the payments made to PGWTs between departments. This was due to some departments (not) paying for preparation time, and a varied approach to paying per hour, or paying per exam script marked.**10W Usage**Akshar Nair noted that there was a movie night in 2017/18, funded from the Doctoral Activities fund, although this year there were difficulties in re-using the space due to bureaucracy and undue requirements.**Virgil Building**The Chair reported that the Virgil Building had a learning space that student representatives could use and asked committee members to promote this to their own area representatives. They also noted that there was ongoing conversations around extending the opening hours of Virgil Buildings to allow for it to be used later at night. This would be trialled at the Virgil Building and pending its success may become permeant.  |
| **The meeting ended at 2pm.** |