

## UCEN Manchester Board

Minutes of the meeting held on 9 March 2023 via Teams

**Present:** Rachel Curry ( Principal), Justice Ellis, Philip Johnson, Malcolm Todd (Chair).

**In Attendance:** Rachel Curry Principal), Janet Faulkner (Director of Academic Standards), Mark Harris (Associate Dean), Ed Lack (Group Quality and Standards Director), Kate Mackenzie ( Deputy Company Secretary and Solicitor), Wendy Pennington (Director of Student Experience and Engagement), Debbie Sanderson (Divisional Finance Director College and Income Team), Michael Walsh (Vice Principal and HE Dean) and Lorna Lloyd-Williams (Company Secretary and General Counsel).

Molly Butcher ( Student Union President) for Minute Nos 01/23-04/23

*No declarations of interest were received.*

### Part A

01/23	<p><b>Part A minutes of the meeting of the UCEN Manchester Board held on 17 November 2022</b></p> <p>The Part A minutes of the meeting of the UCEN Manchester Board held on 17 November 2022, were received and approved as an accurate record to be signed by the Chair.</p>
02/23	<p><b>Applications Report</b></p> <p>The Board received an Applications Report which contained a comparison of applications to UCEN Manchester over the last 3-years, a January 2023 starts update, updates on curriculum developments, and an early indication on recruitment for 2023-24. The Board was cognisant of how critical the monitoring of the student application data was to achieving the budget and to the Estates Strategy and the overall UCEN Manchester Strategy.</p> <p>During the 2022 application cycle, which included the Clearing period, overall applications were significantly higher than in previous years and by 335 ( 17.5%) more than in 2021. This had translated into 732 new enrolments which had represented an increase of 67 (10%) by 1 November 2022.</p> <p>In relation to the 2023 application cycle, applications were 6% up on last year which represented a 26% increase on 2022 and 16% up on UCEN Manchester's 3-year average. This was despite the national application picture evidencing a drop of 2% on last year.</p>

	<p>Level 4 applications were 5% up on last year and 14% up on UCEN Manchester's 3-year average .Applications were up across all but one School and the majority of courses. Applications were particularly encouraging in: 3D Game Art &amp;VFX, Film Production, Art &amp; Design (Fashion), Music Production, Software Development and Acting. A decrease in applications was noted in Dance and Performance, Criminology, and Sport Coaching courses.</p> <p>The Board was presented with a comparison data table against prior years which was articulated to the meeting. The Board noted the 3- year positive trend. Due to the stage of the application lifecycle, it was noted that in the main these applications were via the UCAS process which was characteristically more prevalent within the Faculty of Creative Arts and Media Industries, where applications were up by 7%, including a significant increase of 36% in Manchester Film School and 14% for Arts. The opening of the City Campus Manchester was deemed to have positively impacted applications in these areas alongside a strategic shift from Foundation Degrees to 3-Year Degree provision which was detailed in table format .</p> <p>At this point in the cycle, it was flagged that overall, there was no difference in applications within the Faculty of Higher Technical and Professional Industries compared to the same point in prior year although this did represent an increase of 23% (63) as against 2021. It was articulated however that the application trend for this Faculty encompassed a more local profile of students who applied in the summer term.</p> <p>The Board reflected that a key target for UCEN Manchester last year was to increase internal progression from The Manchester College. It was noted that for 2022, internal applications from Level 3 in TMC to Level 4 in UCEN Manchester had increased by 10.6% (to 261) and internal enrolments had increased by 20.3% (to 148) which evidenced the positive impact that the team's focus on internal progression in 2021/22 had delivered. The intent to improve that position further for the current year was signalled. The Board received, in table format the detail on both internal and external applications received within the current cycle delineated by faculty/ School for scrutiny.</p> <p>The internal progression campaign activity was shared which included tutorials, tasters and workshop activity. The focus for the next 6-8 weeks on converting this activity into internal applications was noted . A member queried whether the financial incentives offered to transitioning students had positively impacted internal progression numbers (Minute No. 04/22 refers). Furthermore, the meeting probed the team's level of satisfaction with this initiative and perception of the return on investment of the work carried out.</p> <p>An increase in internal progression was evidenced this year which indicated that UCEN Manchester was on a positive trajectory. The team however confirmed that it was not completely satisfied with the progression rates and there was more work to do in this area. Currently internal progression was 3-4 % lower than for the same point last year. This was in part a timing issue, as the strategic intent had been to initially to focus on the UCAS cycle . On the financial incentive piece, based on a select number of courses analysed, this has not been particularly successful . The feedback received from students demonstrated that the change in curriculum offer and the city centre campus had influenced choice rather than financial considerations.</p>
--	--

	<p>The meeting probed the conversion activity relating to both internal <i>and</i> external applications. In particular the Board noted that the overall level of applications for Computing and Cybersecurity and Business and Law were low. Due to the modest numbers, it was deemed essential that a high level of conversation was secured. In light of this the Board requested clarity on the strategy to accelerate applications for both the current year and next.</p> <p>In relation to computing, the intent to continue to develop the curriculum in line with the GM skills gap was cited. The challenges aligned to a crowded and competitive market in the computing space was also alluded to with a significant number of students being attracted to university competitors. For UCEN Manchester the target areas were more aligned to conversions at Level 3. The impact of defining the offer and the approval received last week from a validating partner to revise the awarding title of the course to cybersecurity was anticipated to have a positive future impact on applications. The collaboration with industry partners, an example of which was the agreement by an industry brand to host their annual event on campus, was highlighted as one of the initiatives in this space and key to continued progress.</p> <p>The Board requested that a deep dive into computing be brought back to a future board meeting to include; the nature of the courses, challenges faced and strategies to increase market share.</p> <p><b>Action: Dean</b></p> <p>A member reflected on the decision to rename the schools in a prior meeting and in the context of computing it was noted that there had been some unease at first to the inclusion of the word 'cyber'. The meeting probed what the reaction had been from both staff and students to the name changes in general and in particular in computing. A consultation exercise had been carried out prior to the name change. It was deemed too early to gauge the impact of the brand perception in the market since the names only changed in September. Although no tangible evidence had been gleaned to date it was surmised that the new city centre campus had impacted positively, and this was demonstrated by positive comments from students during open days who had showed excitement and affinity with the new cyber school.</p> <p>Initial feedback from staff was the internal branding wasn't as strong as it could be so there was therefore some more work to do to increase the physical demarcation. A member agreed with this view based on their own experience of visiting the campus the previous day. The performing arts branding had been positively noted. It was deemed to be of importance that the discrete spaces were identified so people felt a sense of belonging and comfort in those areas. Historically a number of the areas had derived identity from their discrete campus locations. The Board requested that an update on brand identity by School be presented to the next meeting. Given the resource and energy associated with the brand changes it was deemed important that a method to quantify the impact on applications and conversions be developed. This would allow for analysis and testing.</p> <p><b>Action: Dean</b></p> <p>As with computing, the competitive landscape in relation to Business was similar. A number of competitors operated in this space with many applicants lost to one specific university. The curriculum offer needed to be more tailored and less rigid, for example incorporating business with finance or business with events. This area was one</p>
--	--

	<p>which needed to be reconsidered in terms of its offer for next year. The Board was reminded of the historical context of Business , in that last year discussion had ensured as to whether business courses should be continued at all. Since then, Business applications had increased in number so a refreshed business offer was proposed .</p> <p>In relation to the conversions piece, it was confirmed that Business did not have a level 6 top up . This therefore hampered the offer . Previously this had been offered and validated by Sheffield Hallam. UCEN Manchester currently did not satisfy the validation criteria as no staff held PhDs .</p> <p>Aligned to conversion, the Board was provided with a detailed timetable of keep warm activities. This included keep warm emails , open days , and digital marketing activities. Each School also had a list of different activities and was frequently looking at refreshing that conversion cycle. Last year a dedicated member of staff had been in place to focus on conversion activities supported by an outreach worker.</p> <p>It was confirmed that conversion activity was a collaborative piece between the team and the Group marketing department. The two distinct areas that UCEN Manchester operated in was highlighted. The Arden and creative areas aligned to a more national UCAS profile whereas the higher technical offer attracted a more local and mature student cohort. The latter students tended not to apply through UCAs and applied much later in the application cycle. This dual profile drove a differentiated approach to the marketing and the keep warm / conversion activities .</p> <p>A member queried what the target for conversation had been set at . It was confirmed to vary from course to course. The meeting received further information which illustrated what informed decision making. This chart showed conversion delineated by schools and courses and the difference of approach. It was confirmed that the current overarching conversion strategy was to achieve incremental improvement on 'offers to acceptance', there was no blanket target . The Board encouraged the team to give consideration to specific targets which would in turn support board focus and scrutiny .</p> <p><b>Action: Dean</b></p> <p>Having noted that Arden applications were static, a member queried why UCEN Manchester was not increasing market share in this area. This was attributed to the selective approach taken in the Arden. The provision had benefitted from the City Campus facilities, but class numbers were constrained by physical space and the numbers attracted were more or less at capacity. In order to tackle this issue complementary courses, for example, vocal courses were to be rolled out . The only area that was evidencing a decline was dance which was understood to be a Covid legacy.</p> <p>The increase in January enrolments was highlighted to the Board and the impact on September starts .</p> <p>As referenced earlier in the meeting, in line with the UCEN Manchester Strategy 6 new schools had been developed, making 8 in total which had necessitated the shift in the marketing strategy. The in-year recruitment campaign for 2023, focused on these 8 Schools, was reiterated which included an applicant day later on in the month.</p>
--	--

	<p>The Board received a summary of the launch of new programmes and curriculum offers in train in the Faculty of Higher Technical and Professional Industries which included the football industry course and revised cybersecurity courses referenced earlier. The intent to develop further offers for health in 2024 alongside a visual arts offer for the 2024 entry in the Faculty of Creative Arts and Media Industries was highlighted. The new provision was anticipated to impact in 2024.</p> <p>Having reflected on the full application discussion above, the meeting probed the overarching approach to forward planning, aligned to the data collected around applications. In particular, whether the team operated a forecasting approach to applications to aid the annual planning process rather than what appeared to be the current practice of using the data as an in- year measurement. It was confirmed that the data existed which evidenced for example, the different application routes and timeline, and year- on- year trends could be profiled and brought to the next Board meeting for scrutiny. A member cited that this would be important and prudent as it would enable the measurement of output of initiatives.</p> <p><b>Action: Dean</b></p>
03/23	<p><b>Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) 2022/23 Progress Report</b></p> <p>The Quality Enhancement Plan for 2022-23 (“QEP”) was received by the meeting in the interests of scrutiny. It was noted that the aim of the QEP was to drive continuous improvement across UCEN Manchester and had been developed by focusing on the areas for development identified in the UCEN Manchester SED. It was further understood that it had originated from the bottom-up approach applied to self-evaluation in UCEN Manchester whereby curriculum programmes and schools self-evaluated first in order to provide the basis for self-evaluation across the business. It was noted that as UCEN Manchester had recently restructured its curriculum into directorates and schools, the QEP-monitoring process had been undertaken in this new structure.</p> <p>An update following the school- level QEP monitoring point in December 2022 was also provided. The key message was the standard of the UCEN Manchester school-level QEPs was good, and the evidence base for progress made was convincing in the majority of cases. As most of the targets focused on quantifiable outcomes, the majority of action points were rated as ‘amber’ on the grounds that action had been taken to address the AfE, but that measurable data did not currently exist to suggest that the target had been fulfilled; in that event, it was not possible to record a ‘green’ rating. It was anticipated that many of the ‘amber’ ratings would change when the QEPs were monitored during the subsequent monitoring points in April and August 2023.</p> <p>A key focus for almost all curriculum school QEPs was student engagement generally and enhancements in NSS scores. Other areas of focus included progression and retention on a minority of programmes, industry engagement, data management, and student monitoring.</p> <p>The progress of the Business- Unit level QEP, in addressing the Areas for Enhancement (“AfEs”), identified by the SED, had been tracked to February 2022 which was the first review point in 2022/23 and the Board received a summary from that review point.</p>

	<p>Most of the action points in the QEP were RAG rated amber. It was understood that the next review point would take place in April 2023 with the final review in August 2023. In answer to a concern regarding an absence of any AfEs that were RAG rated green, it was articulated that that the QEP was only 6 weeks into the plan. The Board was assured that it was normal at this point for the indicators to be either red or amber. The meeting was satisfied with this.</p> <p>The key message was that good progress against all the AFIs identified in the SED had been demonstrated. It was noted that many of the QEP AFI targets were based around UCEN Manchester's strategic intent and in that regard, some of the targets were about enhancing the provision further rather than addressing elements of fundamental underperformance.</p> <p>The following two areas were highlighted to the meeting as needing to be addressed by the team going forward. For the assurance of the Board this was confirmed to have been evident in the QEP monitoring meeting that the team were alert to these issues and working towards addressing the AFIs:</p> <p><b>1.Data-</b> <i>UCEN Manchester's data must continue to evolve into a metric reporting structure recognisable in the HE sector</i></p> <p>It was confirmed that over the last 6 weeks significant work had been carried out to that end to look at the data through the lens of a HE provider. It had been a long-term ambition and it was just the start of the journey with much work still to do.</p> <p><b>2.AfE5-</b> <i>While the achievement rates of Black students have significantly risen, the gap between Black and White students has widened.</i></p> <p>It was confirmed that an analysis at curriculum and program level was in train to determine where the gaps were. The meeting tested whether there was any underlying issue that was impacting the ability to move forward in this area having noted that the issue of achievement gaps was a recurring theme. Whilst the team confirmed that there was no complacency in this area it was felt important that two discrete aspects were flagged to the Board. The first related to the reliability of data and the second, the nature of achievement gap fluctuations over the last few years.</p> <p>In relation to the data piece, it was articulated that from a quality team perspective there was some concern regarding the quality of data, which needed to be borne in mind when considering this issue further. The concern related to the reliability of data received upon which management decisions could be made. The Board sought and received clarity on the complexities of this, and the work in train to ameliorate the position. Within this context discussion then focused on the specific ongoing achievement gaps. As alluded to it was confirmed that achievement gaps overall fluctuated and in relation to this AfE the gap had closed last year but had widened again this year. It was flagged that it was not atypical to see a rise and fall in achievement gaps and for the first time this year social deprivation (AfE6- <i>The achievement rate gaps between most deprived male students and their peers are too wide</i>) had become evident which had never been seen before. Whilst AfE5 was being taken very seriously by the organisation it was felt important for the Board to also understand that achievement rates in UCEN Manchester had improved for both</p>
--	---



	<p>black and white students but what the data was evidencing was that the increase was quicker for white students which now needed to be looked into at pace.</p> <p>Assurance was also provided that from a regulatory perspective UCEN was not evidencing significant achievement gaps but from a team perspective these were still deemed too wide. The deep dive in train was drilling down into programme level to try and understand the picture as for example in the Arden there was a 100% achievement rate for black students so at this stage prima facie it appeared apparent that the issue was not a blanket one. The deep dive would continue to test whether the issue was one of ethnicity or for example curriculum design, model and assessment. The deep dive into curriculum areas and achievement gaps would be brought to the next meeting for meeting for scrutiny. A commitment was also given by the team that moving forward an in-year report be commissioned on attendance, retention and module performance to drive and inform management practice in year.</p> <p><b>Action: Dean</b></p> <p>It was noted that one of the actions in this area was to hold targeted student focus groups with students to determine the potential cause /touch points. The Board sought clarity and assurance on how this would be framed to ensure that this was sensitively handled and did not become divisive. Assurance was provided in terms of approach which would be mirrored for AfE6 too. As partly this was deemed to be due to curriculum performance in an area which had a large number of black students, the intent would be speak to all students in this area of study. The meeting derived some initial comfort from the potential position that the causal factor was curriculum wide.</p> <p>The following AfE's were also highlighted to the meeting :</p> <p><i>-AfE1 – Student achievement is too low on a small minority of programmes, particularly for low cohort sizes and resit groups</i></p> <p>A target of 80% achievement across all cohorts of less than 10 had been set. At the first monitoring point no mid- year assessment had taken place so an update on this could not be meaningfully provided.</p> <p><i>-AfE2- Some assessment methods on higher technical provision lack innovation and vocational relevance</i></p> <p>The work in train was to devise an assessment methodology for higher technical qualifications that was accessible to students and allowed them to develop and demonstrate vocationally relevant skills and knowledge. It was acknowledged that some assessment methods, for example in computing were too traditional and there was a need to ensure that assessments were relevant to the skills, knowledge and behaviours aligned to the workplace. Two Assessment Workshops had taken place (School of Sport, Health and Wellbeing) and (School of Computing) which had included a review of students' outcomes by assessment type, student feedback from programme committees and input from staff. The next stage was to extend this process working up to May 2023.</p> <p>A member reflected that both in relation to quality of data and quality of assessment there appeared to be a need and or ambition to do things differently. In light of this assurance was sought as to whether this was because UCEN was maturing or whether there was a root and branch review required, in that systems were not fit for current purpose and whether this was something that needed to be done as a priority The</p>
--	---

	<p>Board was assured that the former prevailed . In terms of data, it was more about operating in different sphere with the need to see data in a different way in the HE landscape which placed different requirements on the data team.</p> <p>In terms of student metrics, it was flagged that these had risen by 10% in last 3 years. The Board was further provided with comfort that the areas being highlighted for the Board's attention, in particular around assessment methodology, related to improvements and enhancements and sat within the context of strong quality provision which had demonstrated outstanding outcomes and embodied huge rigor of academic standards . The discussion and initiatives were therefore more a recognition that the organisation was doing very well with the intent to be compared to the best higher institutions .</p> <p><i>-AfE3: – Reportable data sets on student performance have improved significantly but remain under-developed</i></p> <p>The Board reflected on earlier discussion in- regards to data across the piece .</p> <p><b>-AfE 4</b> – The Higher Technical and Professional curriculum portfolio is under-developed to meet local skills needs and support growth in student numbers</p> <p>The intent was to develop and introduce an appropriate Higher Technical and Professional curriculum offer in line with the UCEN Manchester Strategy 2025. It was highlighted that this was an area that was underdeveloped nationally, and UCEN was engaged in the project work across Greater Manchester. The event with the DfE was alluded to again which was relevant to this issue.</p> <p><b>-AfE7-</b> Students have expressed low levels of satisfaction with the learning resources available to them It was understood that, for example the development of clear refresh plan for IT within UCEN did not sit solely with the business unit . Self-assessments had been reinstated across all business units and this action would also sit in the IT QEP.</p> <p><b>-AfE8-</b> <i>There are inconsistent approaches to sharing research and scholarship to inform and enhance teaching and learning.sharing research and scholarship</i></p> <p>It was noted that once again this related less to remedial action but more aligned to UCEN Manchester seeing to excel in the sector.</p> <p><i>Mark Harris left the meeting.</i></p>
04/23	<p><b>Future U</b></p> <p>A joint paper was presented by the Director of Student Experience and Engagement and the President of the Student Union. This covered an overview of the Student Experience and Engagement department and workstreams. The Board reflected that since 2022 the intent has been for staff supporting higher education students to become a dedicated resource to UCEN Manchester, having previously been a shared</p>



	<p>resource with The Manchester College, the model was still in transition and was anticipated to be complete by the summer of 2023.</p> <p>The Key issues , strands , themes, caseloads and actions to drive improvements in each of the following areas of the department were shared:</p> <p><b>-Recruitment, Outreach and Admissions</b> including the OfS Uni Connect project. The Recruitment and Outreach team was flagged as a new team, which was currently working on the Outreach Strategy. The Admissions team were currently professionalising the role of the Admissions Tutor to enhance the applicant experience.</p> <p><b>-Student Engagement:</b> including the Personal Tutorial system and Academic study skills support. It was confirmed that 130 students had been supported by the Student Engagement Officer since September 2022. Themes and concerns in the main had related to attendance, finance, and study skills. It was evident that the costs of living and welfare was impacting on attendance and student engagement. In particular this was evidenced by the workload in regard to the hardship fund ( detailed later in the meeting). The range of initiatives / projects that were underway to enhance this area were detailed.</p> <p><b>-Student Support:</b> including Safeguarding and Well-being, Disability Support and Careers and Employability. UCEN Manchester's Safeguarding Policy had approved at Academic Board. The purpose of this policy had been to outline UCEN Manchester's commitment to safeguarding adult students, based on six key principles which focused on students being primarily responsible for taking care of their own welfare - empowerment, prevention, risk assessment, proportionality, protection, and accountability.</p> <p>The dedicated safeguarding policy was welcomed by the Board, and it was deemed vital that students felt comfortable to raise matters and not just in a formal way. This was crucial as it impacted on wellbeing The Board tested how evident this was in on the ground . The Student Union President confirmed their view that the Future U team was perceived by students as friendly and approachable and they felt that a lot more students were expressing themselves now and raising matters of relevance to them.</p> <p>The update of the student hardship fund / offer was detailed with this having had to be increased due to student demand. £51K had been spent to date. The OfS, due to the cost-of-living crises, had awarded UCEN Manchester an additional £20K to be spent on hardship, plans are underway to distribute this.</p> <p><b>Student Voice and Student Union.</b></p> <p>The Student Union team had expanded for the first time beyond the three paid part time roles and the roles were detailed.</p> <p>Examples of the output of the U Make It Happen campaign, which brought student feedback to the forefront of practices, initiated by the student voice team, and working in partnership with the student union were shared. The first 'Food for Thought event' took place in February 2023 to gather student feedback on Future U matters in exchange for a warm free meal which aligned to the cost-of-living issue. This was</p>
--	---

	<p>considered a success with over two hundred student exchanges evident in the first hour and a continuous flow of students for the full two hours. Three other 'food for thought' events would be delivered.</p> <p>The key areas being worked on were shared including the Samaritans project and the mental health ambassador scheme.</p> <p>The Student Union President echoed the concerns highlighted above regarding the disturbing impact that the cost of living was having on students. The January winter warmer event had been in some way recognition and support around this. A lot of work was currently focused on identifying the areas in which students were struggling, providing support and tools to help them navigate the cost-of-living crisis, for example with work around budgeting.</p> <p>The Board was very concerned about the significant impact the cost-of-living crisis was having on students and the meeting sought to unpack this issue in great detail. The complexity of student lives, with many full-time students working a minimum of 15 hours per week was understood and validated by the Student Union President. The Board tested whether the team considered they had the support and funding available to deliver on the agenda. The Board sought clarity on how the organisation and as part of that the Board could engage more meaningfully with students and the mechanisms in place for the organisation to get closer to the facts.</p> <p>Discussion focused on the appropriate medium with which to reach out to students who due to the pressures of work may not always be on campus for long after classes have ended to engage in significant face to face interactions. The role of the personal tutor was deemed to be important in this context as social media was no substitute alone. It was noted that this was where Future U came into the equation as that enhancement. It was critical that students knew who to go to no matter what their age or personal circumstances.</p> <p>Further aligned to the cost-of-living crisis the Board was informed of the research published by the Sutton Trust which evidenced that 49% of HE students had missed classes to carry out paid work and 23% had missed deadlines. Whilst UCEN Manchester's attendance was only slightly down on last year it did highlight the impact. In light of this the Board probed what consideration had been given to curriculum design and delivery model to deal with the complexities of student life.</p> <p>A number of factors would need to be considered as this had multiple layers to work through. Following the pandemic there had been increased pressure from some students to return to face to face in certain areas whereas in others the pressure had been to continue via virtual means. This was a piece to be considered as part of curriculum planning which would include considerations such as; should there be a separate attendance policy for TMC and UCEN and what counted as attendance and input for example, if someone couldn't afford to travel to college could the resources be made available online? It was noted that OfS had a clear view on how public money should be spent and this did not relate to solely online but block teaching could be permissible to allow for students to for example, plan childcare. It was confirmed that block teaching had been developed in many areas however in the Arden this was not possible to achieve.</p>
--	---

	<p>The Board requested that for the November Board a paper analysing the art of the possible in relation to block teaching / intense teaching and curriculum model and how the curriculum might be adjusted in light of the current financial challenges being faced by students .</p> <p><b>Action: Dean</b></p> <p>The meeting thanked the Student Union President for their contribution which had been very insightful.</p> <p><i>Molly Butcher left the meeting</i></p>
05/23	<p><b>HE Tuition Fee Policy and HE Fees 2024/25</b></p> <p>The tuition fee rates and the tuition fee policy for 2024/25 were received by the Board, for review and approval, to meet the on-going Office for Students' registration requirements.</p> <p>The Board reflected that increased fees had been approved for students enrolling from September 2023 onwards ( Minute No. 30/22 refers). These had represented a not insignificant increase for many courses. Following these changes and based on the belief that UCEN Manchester fees were currently pitched at the right level it was confirmed to the Board that no proposed increases for 2024/ 25 were being recommended . The only proposed amendment to the HE fees policy was the removal of the direct debit facility. In response to a query around the rationale for this the Board was assured that an alternative mechanism for multiple payments was available to the few students who did not opt to student finance and therefore there was no negative impact on students aligned to the current financial pressures .</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b> that the HE tuition fees and the HE Fees Policy, as set out in the report, be approved for 2024/25.</p>
06/23	<p><b>Update from Academic Board – Minutes</b></p> <p>An update from the last Academic Board meeting, held on 4<sup>th</sup> November 2022, was provided to the meeting for information along with the draft minutes. It was noted that the Dean had taken on the position of Chair of the Academic Board following discussions with the new Principal .</p>
	<p><b>RESOLVED</b> that as the items to be considered were deemed commercially sensitive, the Board moved into confidential session.</p>
	<p>-----</p> <p><b>Chair</b></p> <p>-----</p> <p><b>Date</b></p>