

## UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK

## ACADEMIC QUALITY AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE

## OPEN MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD 10:00, TUESDAY 23 NOVEMBER 2021 (ONLINE MEETING)

<b>Present</b>	Professor Andy Clark	AC	Co-Chair, Deputy Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education and Policy)
	Professor Will Curtis	WC	Co-Chair, Deputy Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education Quality and Standards)
	Professor Jo Angouri	JA	Academic Director (Education and Internationalisation) (for item 055)
	Professor Dan Branch	DB	Academic Director (Doctoral College)
	Professor Gill Cooke	GC	Co-opted member of academic staff in a quality assurance role
	Professor David Davies	DD	Chair of the Faculty Education Committee (Science, Engineering and Medicine)
	Dan Derricott	DDe	Director of Education Policy and Quality
	Professor Rebecca Freeman	RF	Dean of Students
	Lee Griffin	LG	Academic Director (Postgraduate Taught)
	Professor Jonathan Heron	HN	Representative of the Institute for Advanced Teaching and Learning
	Dr Jeff Jones	JJ	Co-opted member of academic staff in a quality assurance role
	Dr Helen Nolan	HN	Representative of the Faculty of Science, Engineering and Medicine
	Nathan Parsons	NP	Postgraduate Officer, Students' Union
	Professor Sarah Richardson	SR	Chair of the Faculty Education Committee (Arts)
	Professor Ross Ritchie	RR	Representative of the Faculty of Social Sciences
	Dr Chris Rogers	CR	Representative of the Faculty of Social Sciences
	Professor Dmitriy Rumynin	DR	Representative of the Faculty of Science, Engineering and Medicine
	Charlton Sayer	CS	Welfare and Campaigns Officer, Students' Union
Professor Pat Tissington	PT	Academic Director (Employability and Skills)	
Professor Gwen van der Velden	GvdV	Deputy Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education)	
Dr Tim White	TW	Representative of the Board of Faculty of Arts	
<b>Attending</b>	Sam Brook	SB	International Partnerships Officer (for item 055)
	Geraldine Connelly	GCon	Assistant Registrar (Assessment) (Assistant Secretary)
	Phil Griffiths	PG	Education Projects and Academic Governance Officer (Minutes)
	Dr Zhiyan Guo	ZG	Observing
	Dr Sam Hardy	SH	Director of Flexible and Online Learning (for item 054)
	Louise Hasler	LH	Senior Assistant Registrar (Education Policy and Quality) (Secretary)
Rachel Millichap	RM	Senior Compliance Officer (Student Immigration) (for item 053)	
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Item</b>		
<b>040</b>	<p><b>Chair's welcome and introduction</b></p> <p>The Chair welcomed all members and attendees, noting that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Charlton Sayer (Welfare and Campaigns Sabbatical Officer, Students' Union) would attend AQSC meetings in place of the SU's Education Sabbatical Officer until further notice.</li> <li>Dr Zhiyan Guo attended part of the meeting as a participant of the shadowing and development scheme for academics.</li> </ul> <p>It was also reported that this would be the last meeting of AQSC for Geraldine Connelly, who would shortly be leaving the University; the committee's deep gratitude was extended to Geraldine for supporting the work of the AQSC.</p>		

041	<p><b>Apologies for absence</b></p> <p>Apologies were received from Dr Jon Burrows, Professor Chris Hughes, Dr Naomi Waltham-Smith and Professor Phil Young.</p>
042	<p><b>Declarations of Interest</b></p> <p>No new declarations were made.</p>
043	<p><b>Minutes of meeting held on held on 21 October 2021</b></p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 21 October 2021 (043-AQSC231121) were <b>approved</b>.</p>
044	<p><b>Matters arising from meeting held on 14 September 2021</b></p> <p>A report (044-AQSC231121) was received and noted. An update to the following item was reported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Item 57 (2020/21)</b> – A satisfactory response had been received from Warwick Foundation Studies in relation to the 2019/20 Annual Report on Plagiarism Cases (057-AQSC241120, Restricted).</li> </ul>
<b>Substantive Items</b>	
025	<p><b>Chair's Business</b></p> <p>The following verbal reports were received:</p> <p><b>a) Course and Module Approval Update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A working group had been established to determine what could be changed in the current system to make the course approval experience easier for users;</li> <li>• Several improvements had been identified and the group was in the process of determining how long it would take to implement the changes. Users would be informed once a plan had been developed;</li> <li>• The working group had also started to consider the wider objectives of the project: what should be within and without of scope. It was likely that more than just course approval would be considered and that the project would evolve to consider various 'curriculum management' systems and processes;</li> <li>• The University was committed to implementing a lasting workable solution as soon as possible but needed to ensure it was the right one, meaning time and consideration were needed;</li> <li>• Key stakeholders would be consulted when appropriate, but comments/questions could be directed to LB (Assistant Registrar, Quality Assurance).</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION:</b> LB to prepare a report for the February 2022 meeting to update AQSC on the progress of the Course and Modules Approval Working Group.</p> <p><b>b) TEG Update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 2021-22 the University would return to the pre-pandemic TEG model by reinstating a greater focus on quality assurance, whilst not losing the openness of enhancement discussions held last year;</li> <li>• There would be two areas of thematic analysis: curriculum check-in (which would incorporate discussions around the future of blended learning) and inclusive education;</li> <li>• The Education Committee would be asked to approve the plan on 9 December 2021, after which EPQ would begin to liaise with departments;</li> <li>• Meetings would be held between February and March.</li> </ul>
046	<p><b>Students' Union Update</b></p> <p>A verbal update was received from the Students' Union Welfare and Campaigns Officer. The key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback received by the SU via SSLCs indicated that, whilst students broadly supported a return to in-person teaching, students were less in favour of in-person exams. Student concerns included: the choice of online vs in-person exams, assessment methods, costs for overseas students and time for January 2022 exams;</li> <li>• GvdV and DDe reported that the vast majority of assessment in January 2022 would continue to be online; new technology was being procured and conversations would continue, noting that standards and academic integrity needed to be maintained.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION:</b> DDe to continue further discussions with CS and the SU relating to online and in-person assessment.</p>

047	<p><b>Shape of the Academic Year</b></p> <p>The committee noted the report (012-AQSC140921) which had been prepared by Chris Luck (Senior Head of Strategic Change Planning) and the following key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An exploratory exercise was underway to understand the problems and challenges that stakeholders (students, academics, professional services) associated with the shape of our current academic year;</li> <li>• This exercise also involved co-designing options around what the University could do if it wanted to pursue changing its academic year model;</li> <li>• All stakeholders had been invited to engage in this activity throughout November, primarily through an online form and in-person workshops (<a href="https://warwick.ac.uk/services/aro/staffintranet/way/">https://warwick.ac.uk/services/aro/staffintranet/way/</a>);</li> <li>• In December, options would be narrowed and stakeholders would be asked again for views. A ‘do nothing’ option would be presented;</li> <li>• Senate would have ultimate decision making authority; the aim was to make an ‘in principle’ decision on whether to change the model and if so, to what, at the January meeting of the Senate;</li> <li>• Should change be agreed, a ‘discovery phase’ would commence in February to understand the system, curricula and process changes required before a formal decision on the ‘what’ and the ‘when’ at March Senate.</li> </ul> <p>Key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CR reported that PAIS had requested further data driven information and analysis to be made available, noting that the data provided as part of the current consultation exercise which related to other Universities use of semesterisation did not indicate how it may or may not have enabled better outcomes at those institutions;</li> <li>• Concerns relating to PGT and PGR impact needed to be taken into consideration and should not be driven solely by UG concerns.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION:</b> Committee members were encouraged to submit feedback to the consultation exercise by the end of November 2021.</p>
048	<p><b>UCB Regulatory Framework</b></p> <p>The Director of Education Policy and Quality presented the report (048-AQSC231121, Protected) including the following key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The report would also be considered by the Partnerships Committee on 23 November 2021, where UCB colleagues would be attendance for that item of business;</li> <li>• Work to align UCB regulations to Warwick’s arose from the UCB validation events’ action plan;</li> <li>• The UCB regulations ensured baseline Warwick standards and quality would be upheld; complete convergence was not required in a validation partnership;</li> <li>• In response to a query from CS, that there was no expectation or requirement that the Warwick Students’ Union would provide support to UCB students, noting that UCB students studying Warwick validated courses would not be enrolled at Warwick and would be members of UCB’s Guild of Students. The 2020-21 Warwick SU Sabbatical Team had met with sabbatical officers at the UCB Guild of Students and there may be opportunities for future collaboration between both, if wished.</li> </ul> <p><b>DECISION 1:</b> The regulatory framework for the academic partnership with University College Birmingham (UCB) as set out in appendix A of the report (048-AQSC231121, Protected) was <b>approved</b>, subject to approval by the Partnerships Committee.</p> <p><b>DECISION 2:</b> The amendment to Annexe A of the Recognition of Prior Learning Policy, to permit a standing exemption for UCB, as set out in appendix B of the report (048-AQSC231121, Protected), was <b>approved</b>, subject to approval by the Partnerships Committee.</p> <p><b>DECISION 3:</b> The regulatory framework would be maintained on an annual basis, with any amendments to be considered by July of each academic year by the AQSC and Partnerships Committee.</p> <p>[Partnerships Committee subsequently also approved decisions 1, 2 and 3 at its meeting on 23 November 2021].</p>

	<p><b>ACTION 1:</b> Further work would be required on the alignment of borderline cases and classification algorithms later in 2021/22, noting that UCB would be introducing these for PGT and UG.</p> <p><b>ACTION 2:</b> DDe to facilitate Warwick SU interaction with UCB and its Guild of Students through the Joint Advisory Board.</p>
049	<p><b>Course approval process for UCB validated provision</b></p> <p>The Director of Education Policy and Quality presented the report (048-AQSC231121, Protected) including the following key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The report would also be considered by the Partnerships Committee on 23 November 2021, where UCB colleagues would be attendance for that item of business;</li> <li>• Colleagues from Warwick would be involved in UCB's internal programme approval process for Warwick validated awards;</li> <li>• The Joint Advisory Board would then review and approve as a Warwick validated award;</li> <li>• The strategic outline phase would ensure programmes would be supported in principle early in the process;</li> <li>• Where there may be potential overlaps or conflict with provision at Warwick, stakeholders would be consulted ahead of full validation.</li> </ul> <p><b>DECISION:</b> The approval process for new and amended UCB validated courses was <b>approved</b>, subject to approval by the Partnerships Committee. [Partnerships Committee subsequently approved the report at its meeting on 23 November 2021].</p>
050	<p><b>Quality Assurance of Board of Examiners Decisions</b></p> <p>The Senior Assistant Registrar (Education Policy and Quality) presented the report (050-AQSC-231121). Key points and discussion were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The report had been considered by Faculty Education Committee Chairs;</li> <li>• AQSC had dis-established the June First Year Board of Examiners (FYBoE) and had previously discussed the dis-establishment of the September FYBoE (<a href="#">minute 056-AQSC241120 refers</a>);</li> <li>• SR and AC were concerned that there had been previous delays between approval of policy and operationalisation, including implementation of amendments to IT systems and support and training to staff. It would be helpful for timelines to be added to similar reports in future to demonstrate how new policy would be implemented;</li> <li>• LH clarified that External Examiners' involvement would relate to outcomes only. This could be done remotely and in light touch way. It would mean some change to External Examiners' remit.</li> </ul> <p><b>DECISION 1:</b> The Committee <b>recommended to the Senate</b> to approve the dissolution of the September First year Board of Examiners as set out in 050-AQSC-231121, noting that changes to reassessment methods would be approved by Faculty Education Committee Chairs.</p> <p><b>DECISION 2:</b> The remit of External Examiners would be extended to include first year students and modules, in tandem with further work on the remit of External Examiners and how departments should support and engage with them;</p> <p><b>DECISION 3:</b> The review of the University's Mitigating Circumstances Policy should consider the desirability and potential value of faculty-level oversight and capacity building;</p> <p><b>DECISION 4:</b> Training be provided annually for key colleagues involved in activities relating to Board of Examiners' decisions;</p> <p><b>DECISION 5:</b> The Committee <b>recommended to the Senate</b> that Regulation 9 be updated to remove the reference to the constitution of Boards of Examiners for First Degrees, as set out in the appendix of 050-AQSC231121.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> Education Policy and Quality would submit a report on the operationalisation of the dissolution of the September First year Board of Examiners to the AQSC meeting in February 2022.</p>
051	<p><b>Annual Report on Academic Misconduct Cases</b></p> <p>The Academic Director (Postgraduate Taught) presented the report (051-AQSC231121) with key points as follows:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With only two years of data provided, it was difficult to pick out any trends, but issues generally came under two categories: poor academic practice (e.g. poor referencing) and intentional efforts to deceive;</li> <li>• WMG currently use a form which markers completed, which was a very useful tool in the collection of data;</li> <li>• It was suggested that a question be added to External Examiner’s report relating to academic integrity.</li> <li>• Whilst systems and tools can assist in monitoring or picking up academic misconduct, and use of assessment methods can help to reduce it, greater thought needs to be given to how to proactively prevent this and consideration of why academic misconduct takes place is required;</li> <li>• The process for communicating outcomes was not yet the same for PGT and clarity regarding this would be useful for colleagues.</li> </ul> <p><b>DECISION:</b> The committee <b>approved</b> the proposed changes to academic misconduct reporting in principle although it was noted that the implications of making these changes in-year should first be considered.</p> <p><b>ACTION 1:</b> A question is to be added to the External Examiner’s report relating to academic integrity.</p> <p><b>ACTION 2:</b> AQSC secretariat to liaise with the Student Complaints and Academic Casework team to clarify the process for communicating outcomes, noting that this is not yet the same for PGT.</p>
052	<p><b>Annual Report on Timeliness of Feedback on Assessment</b></p> <p>The Senior Assistant Registrar (Education Policy and Quality) presented the report (052-AQSC231121).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is the first year where a narrative approach had been taken, rather than quantitative information having been supplied. The full responses were provided below the line for the committee’s information;</li> <li>• In some areas, departments had improved, despite impact of Covid-19. The main comment provided by departments was regarding the need for improvement of systems.</li> </ul>
053	<p><b>UKVI Amendments to Regulation 36</b></p> <p>The Senior Compliance Officer (Student Immigration) presented the report (051-AQSC231121), which set out amendments to Regulation 36 relating to UKVI policy to revoke sponsorship where engagement was not being made. The proposed amendments would enable the University to enact a process to withdraw students who did not meet UKVI timeframes on engagement.</p> <p><b>DECISION:</b> The Committee <b>recommended to the Senate</b> to approve the proposed amendments to Regulation 36, as set out in 053-AQSC231121</p>
054	<p><b>Collaborative Review of Degree Apprenticeships</b></p> <p>A report (015- AQSC140921) and verbal report were received from the Director of Flexible and Online Learning Delivery and discussion around the key points was as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All actions that arose from the collaborative review had been resolved, with the exception of one minor action which was being addressed;</li> <li>• From April 2021, the responsibility of Degree Apprenticeship provision at levels 6 &amp; 7 had been removed from the OfS and given to Ofsted. Every HEI offering this provision was expecting a new provider visit within 24 months of the start date in April, with notification only happening 24 hours in advance;</li> <li>• The University was currently preparing for a very different type of quality regime and a coordination group had been established, with key stakeholders involved;</li> <li>• The monitoring visit would look at safeguarding and Prevent, education quality and leadership and management. There would be serious consequences if an outcome of ‘insufficient progress’ was received, with potential for wider impact on the broader provision of the University;</li> <li>• 141 academic and support staff had undertaken safeguarding training and the central webpages would need to be improved;</li> <li>• An Institutional Self-Assessment Review (SAR) and QUIP would be produced;</li> <li>• The University was making good process and departments were responding well; we would be able to demonstrate improvement but there was further work to be done.</li> </ul>

	<p><b>ACTION:</b> Self-Assessment Review (SAR) and QUIP to come to AQSC in February.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> SH to share changes to Prevent website in report form.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> DDe to look in to where safeguarding may sit in terms of governance.</p>
055	<p><b>Review of Alliance Intensive Summer Programme Framework (AISP)</b></p> <p>The Academic Director (Education and Internationalisation) and International Partnerships Officer presented the report (055-AQSC231121). The following key points were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The team would like to expand AISP, adding in more modules and enabling students to carry credit year on, with an offer of co-curricula opportunities;</li> <li>• AQSC had not yet approved a credit bearing option for the framework and would be unable to approve it without seeing detail of the modules;</li> <li>• The framework appeared to be different and had evolved from what had initially been approved;</li> <li>• There were concerns raised regarding in-year changes, which had caused issues in some departments due to module selection taking place beforehand and there had been some unease regarding the carry forward of credit;</li> <li>• It was confirmed that in future any approval must happen in advance.</li> </ul> <p><b>DECISION:</b> The Committee were unable to approve the framework at the meeting.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> Chairs and JA to discuss the framework further and accurate documentation to be provided, for discussion at the Quality Discussion Group. Framework to be resubmitted to AQSC in February 2022.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> Discussion to take place at QDG in 2 weeks.</p>
056	<p><b>Undergraduate External Examiners' Report Analysis 2020/21</b></p> <p>The Deputy Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education and Policy) presented the report (056-AQSC231121). The following key points were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Areas of good practice were similar to those detected in previous years, which reflected the work that departments had put in to enhance feedback and moderation;</li> <li>• The institutional actions outlined were similar to those previously recommended, with new actions relating to resits in September and large workloads for some students;</li> <li>• Work relating to the structure of the academic year and the new 'End to end' assessment platform may help to address issues raised in the report;</li> <li>• The annual report from the Chief External Examiner had been added into this analysis, with positive comments received for both the Institutional Board of Examiners (IBE) and Senate Sub-group (SSG) processes;</li> <li>• A review of the Mitigating Circumstances policy and procedure was scheduled to take place in 2021/22. It will be important to ensure systems were developed as required by policy changes.</li> </ul> <p><b>DECISION:</b> The Committee <b>approved</b> the actions to be taken by the University.</p>
<b><i>Items below this line were for receipt and/or approval, without discussion</i></b>	
<b>For Information</b>	
<b>Approved by Chair's Action</b>	
057	<p><b>Faculty Reports on Academic Misconduct 2020/21</b></p> <p>The Committee noted the report (057-AQSC231121)</p>
058	<p><b>Faculty Reports on Compliance with Timeliness of Feedback Policy 2020/21</b></p> <p>The Committee noted the report (058-AQSC231121)</p>