

amounts to little more than abstract generalities about the need to be 'new' or 'innovative' without any elaboration.

7. The 'Proposal for Changes in Bioscience Courses' referral to a report by the Bioscience and Health Technology Database¹ is biased in terms of supporting the LSBU management's case. Their evidence neglected to state that the report gives equal if not greater weighting to the courses that have been closed.
8. The only arguments made against these courses were progression rates and National Student Survey. This adds to our case that the selected academic staff and not the management were to be held responsible or blamed for this data.

First the progression rate data for modules in the Proposal are inaccurate and selective. This supports our basic contention that LSBU is targeting the Bioscience teaching staff.

These progression rates include 'ghost students' and only refer to first exam sittings and do not include those who have passed their resits.

As far as the NSS data, this is aggregated data and as such you cannot make accurate deductions for the individual Bioscience courses.

9. On two occasions UCU have requested the relevant quality assurance documentation without response. These requests were made at the last meeting convened to discuss Proposal for Changes in Bioscience Courses on 9th October 2015, and then via email from UCU on the 19th October 2015.

The academic planning

The existing courses were officially closed in Feb 2015. A 'new course' (transitional course) began in September 2015. There is significant confusion about the nature of this new course and its modules. If this was done under the curriculum module modernisation program (ie move to 20Credits) then the validated courses were not closed, this implies that the existing staff should be involved in the modernisation process. The alternative explanation is a newly validated course. If this is the case, UCU requests the validation documents, times and dates.

10. There has been total exclusion of the proposed staff from involvement in the module modernization for the transitional course and the preparation for the new courses.

What about those lecturers who are currently involved in the new level 4 courses? How can management ask people to 'help out' with teaching on level 4 courses this year, but at the same time state in the revised redundancy documentation that staffing levels can be reduced by 1 person immediately?

¹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/bioscience-and-health-technology-database-annual-report-2013>