Present:
Director of RUK Admissions – Ben Stride (BS) (Chair)
Admissions Officer, Computer Science - Dr Tristan Henderson
Admissions Officer, Modern Languages – Dr Emily Finer
International Marketing and Recruitment Manager, ELT – Deborah Brazendale
Pro Dean Curriculum Science – Dr Martin Campbell
Senior Administrator, International Admissions - Brenda Gardiner (Minutes)

Apologies:
Director of International Admissions – Beth Shotton (ES)
Director of Scottish Admissions and Access – Mike Johnson
Admissions Officer, Medicine – Mary Ainsworth
Pro Dean Advising, Arts – Dr Stephen Tyre
Pro Dean Advising, Science – Dr Iain Matthews
Assistant Registrar – Marie-Noel Earley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Action by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Updates on actions identified at the last meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As this was a small group, BS did not spend any time on the specific actions agreed at the last meeting other than to say that point 5 (about gathering information from Academic Schools) had been completed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Agenda items from last meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td><strong>How do we operationalise these policies and embed them into the Admissions processes?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The purpose of the Qualification Group was discussed and a number of questions remain unanswered. Has this to be a decision making group or has it been formed for information sharing purposes only? Who does the group report to?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It was agreed that someone from Publications should be brought into the group. BS with MNE to take this forward.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requests to change entry qualifications have been received from Schools – it is not clear who decides on this at the moment. It was agreed that the group should develop a pro forma for Schools to complete to ask for changes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BS/MNE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EF highlighted that there currently is no collective group of Admission Officers.

### 2.2 Communication on qualification policies to applicants

All present agreed that communication of our admission policies to applicants is poor and there is lack of consistency. There was discussion about how transparent we want to/can be. The communication policies of other institutions were highlighted and discussed in terms of entry qualifications and admission statistics e.g. RUK v. EU numbers.

It was agreed that there was a need for consistency and clarity and that this should be circulated. There should be a repository of information and a list of preferred subjects would be helpful.

TH advised that there are FAQs on the Computer Science website.

### 3.0 Entry qualification increases for 2016 prospectus

It was agreed that if the purpose of this group is to be decision making then members would need to send a deputy if they could not manage. This would ensure sufficient numbers to make up a quorum.

BS was in possession of the communications from Schools that had been passed to MNE and these were reviewed by all present to understand the types of requests that are coming through.

Prior to the next meeting all group members to consider what kind of pro forma is needed and what information would be required for the group to make a decision.

MC has a pro forma and he will send this through to BS for discussion at the next meeting.

It was agreed there would have to be a timeline of 1st September for requests to be approved to coincide with publications timeline.

### 4.0 External Foundation Programmes

DB explained that the language requirements for other foundation programmes such as Colleges or Private Pathways are lower than ours and the learning environment can be more school like than university. DB feels we are not doing enough to highlight the quality of what we do. We should be strong in rejecting other lesser foundation programmes. It was agreed that it should be the responsibility of this group to decide who we work with. Jane Magee has a lot of knowledge in this area. A list of good quality programmes would be helpful and DB to ask JM if she has one.

### 5.0 AOB

Ahead of future meetings group members should submit items for the agenda and circulate any agreed communications since the previous meeting.

**Date of Next Meeting**