

UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK

ACADEMIC QUALITY AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE

OPEN MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD 10:00, TUESDAY 22 FEBRUARY 2022 (ONLINE MEETING)

Ref	Item		
Present	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 081)
	Isabelle Atkins	IA	Education Officer, Students' Union (for item 069)
	Dr Jon Burrows	JB	Representative of the Board of Faculty of Arts
	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 (for item 070)
	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 (for item 075)
	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	
Professor Phil Young	PY	Representative of the Faculty of Science, Engineering and Medicine	
Attending	Jen Benger	JB	Senior Project Manager, Information and Digital Group (for item 072)
	Lauren Botham	LB	Assistant Registrar (Monitoring and Review), Education Policy and Quality (for item 072)
	Dr Nikola Chmel	NC	Chemistry (for item 074)
	Craig Franklin	CF	Assistant Registrar (Teaching and Learning), Education Policy and Quality (for items 076 and 077)
	Dr Zhiyan Guo	ZG	SMLC (Observer, shadowing Professor Will Curtis)
	Dr Sam Hardy	SH	Director of Flexible and Online Learning (for item 078)
	Louise Hasler	LH	Senior Assistant Registrar, Education Policy and Quality (Secretary) (for items 071, 079 and 082)
	Helen Hotten	HH	Clerical Officer, Education Policy and Quality (support)
	Kam Johal	KJ	Administrative Officer (Complaints Resolution), Student Complaints and Academic Casework (for item 080)
	Dr David Lees	DL	Attending in lieu of Professor Beccy Freeman, Dean of Students
	Nilpa Modhvadia	NM	Project Manager, Information and Digital Group (for item 072)
	Dom Sheehy	DS	Academic Partnerships Officer, Education Policy and Quality (Observer)
	Mahfia Watkinson	MW	Assistant Registrar (Teaching and Learning), Education Policy and Quality (for item 078)

064	<p>Chair's welcome and introduction</p> <p>The Chair welcomed all members and attendees, noting that: Dom Sheehy (Academic Partnerships Officer, EPQ) and Dr Zhiyan Guo (SMLC) were attending the meeting for development reasons and that Dr David Lees was attending <i>in lieu</i> of Beccy Freeman, the Dean of Students.</p>
065	<p>Apologies for absence</p> <p>Apologies were received from Professor Dan Branch, Professor Beccy Freeman, Professor Chris Hughes and Dr Naomi Waltham-Smith. It was noted that Professor David Davies needed to leave at 11.00am.</p>
066	<p>Declarations of Interest</p> <p>No new declarations were made.</p>
067	<p>Minutes of meeting held on held on 23 November 2021</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 23 November 2021 (067-AQSC220222) were approved.</p>
Substantive Items	
068	<p>Chair's Business</p> <p>It was reported that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senate had approved the regulatory framework for the academic partnership with University College Birmingham (UCB), further academic regulations would be brought to the committee in the summer (minute 48); • LH had submitted a request for a question on academic integrity to be included in the external examiners' report (minute 051); • The AISP quality framework would be dealt with under agendum 81 (minute 054); • Senate had approved the dis-establishment of the First Year Board of Examiners (to be taken under agendum 072); • Senate had considered recommendations in respect of the shape of the academic year: it had been agreed that change was required to address problems but that further work was needed on the proposed model; • An application to the Register of Apprenticeship Training Providers (ROATP) had been submitted (papers included below the line for information); • A number of Chair's actions had been taken on behalf of the Committee, these were included in a paper below the line for audit and information purposes; • DL is leading a review of our Mitigating Circumstances Policy, any comments could be sent directly to DL or LH; • Progress had been made with identifying a new online assessment system, 'the Warwick assessment system', and that a small number of departments would be involved in a pilot.
069	<p>Students' Union Update</p> <p>A verbal update was received from the Students' Union Education Officer. The key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SU was searching for a new CEO; it was likely that an interim appointment would be made for the summer term; • A proposed new policy on lecture capture was in train, which would set out an approach to online recordings of teaching; • The elections for sabbatical officers were underway and the new sabbatical team should be known in a few days.
070	<p>ITLR – Introducing the 2023 Review</p> <p>The Director of Education Policy and Quality presented the report (070-AQSC220222) with key points and discussions as below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the challenging timescale a more evolved paper taking into account feedback from Faculty Education Committees and SLEEC would be circulated to Education Committee later that day; • Senate had already approved a concept including the benefits it was hoped the next iteration of the ITLR would bring, crucially that there will be cross institutional conversations prior to the conclusion of review meetings; • As well as institutional themes there would be flexibility for departments to propose their own themes to ensure that agendas were specific to the context of each department;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An evaluation framework was being developed and in due course the committee would be asked to identify what should constitute the areas for evaluation; • Advice was sought on a possible rating system plus identification of any risk. • Some reluctance to use a rating was expressed, with a strong preference for a broad rating system; one view was that a rating was unnecessary unless it was to be used as a mechanism for comparing departments. • Clarity was also sought in respect of how any rating would relate to the self-evaluation process.
071	<p>Report on dis-establishment of FYBoE</p> <p>The Senior Assistant Registrar of Education Policy and Quality presented the report (071-AQSC220222) with key points and discussions as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the paper tried to offer clarity on expectations of external examiners in respect of first year Boards of Examiners and that a communication to external examiners was planned; • That an indicative list of training topics had been included and that it was proposed to mandate the training. • It was agreed that the approach to mandating training should be more ambitious than proposed; • Communications to departments were felt to be overdue and that this could now be actioned following the meeting of the committee. As part of this, the advertised key dates should be updated to reflect the new arrangements; • An opportunity to feedback on training after meetings of Boards of Examiners would help shape the training. <p>ACTION 1: The training should mandate the attendance of the Chair of each Board of Examiners plus one other member of the Board (such as the academic acting as secretariat); that feedback on the training should be sought and that refresher training should also be mandated.</p> <p>ACTION 2: To ensure SAS now updated their web page of 'key dates'.</p>
072	<p>Update on Curriculum Management Project</p> <p>The Project Managers and Assistant Registrar from Education Policy and Quality presented the report (072-AQSC220222) with key points and discussions as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhancements to the current system would be prioritised and checked by the technical team; • The Working Group had recommended that a Commercial Off-the-Shelf (COTS) solution was procured as a permanent solution to the current system; • As only urgent enhancements were being made, departments should be advised not to delay submitting courses for approval or minor amendments; • Due to the ground work needed to properly identify requirements no timeline for the new solution could currently be provided; • Finding a technical solution to a harmonised module catalogue was some way off: a module selection tool would first be implemented following the curriculum management project.
073	<p>IDG Update on projects relevant to AQSC ToR</p> <p>This item was unfortunately deferred due to lack of capacity.</p>
074	<p>Request for addition to the alternative arrangements to the requirements for PGT Awards (Chemistry)</p> <p>NC presented the report (074-AQSC220222) with key points and discussions as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PGT courses in Chemistry were bound to have a large amount of practical content (PSRB determined). • Students generally performed better in the practical elements and the department only wished to reward exceptional performance across both practical and written elements of courses; • Current PGT conventions allow departments to request additional modules to be passed for the award of merit and distinction but Chemistry proposes that the threshold for merit and distinction must be met across all 150 credits; • The interplay between the borderline criteria and the department's expectation that students should achieve 70% in certain modules has the potential to allow a student with a lower overall mark than another student to be promoted to a higher class of degree; • One view was that the high practical content of Chemistry PGT courses was not particularly distinctive and that the request was contrary to the University's wish to harmonise and simplify regulations; • Alternatively, it was felt that the combination of the current course regulations and Rules for Award had the potential to create perverse outcomes;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was acknowledged that the same situation might arise in other departments and an appreciation of this was needed before a view could be formed; <p>ACTION: To establish if the same complexity arises for PGT courses taught in other departments and to bring back to the Committee for further discussion.</p>
075	<p>Request to cap reassessment at component level (WMG) JJ presented the report (075-AQSC220222) with key points and discussions as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the purposes of professional accreditation learning outcomes were mapped against those required by PSRBs; WMG's PSRB expects all relevant module components to be passed if they have a 30% or higher weighting but the module approval system is binary in approach therefore it is not possible to remove assessments with a smaller weighting than this from the 'pass all' requirement; Students may fail an assessment component and therefore be disincentivised to achieve a good mark in subsequent assessment components as they appreciate that the module mark will be capped despite any improvement performance in other assessment components; It was requested that where a PSRB requires all learning outcomes to be met, it is the component rather than the module that is capped; The School of Engineering also finds problematic the binary approach of the module approval system to the requirement for components to be passed but consideration of this was something for the future; Under current arrangements a student could pass the progression requirement of the University but fail PSRB requirements: this could possibly be remedied by making an assessment pass/fail but not changing the module mark. <p>ACTION: To create a rule that describes the very specific PSRB driven situation in which it would be permitted for reassessed module components to be capped at the pass mark rather than the entire module, noting that AQSC Chair's action would be permitted.</p>
076 and 077	<p>OfS consultation on Regulating Student Outcomes and OfS consultation on the Teaching Excellence Framework Assistant Registrar Teaching and Learning (CF) presented the reports (076/77-AQSC220222) with key points and discussions as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The consultation on regulating student outcomes set out a risk-based approach to monitoring ongoing compliance with condition of registration B3, including the setting of 'numerical thresholds' for outcome data, and prioritisation of cases for intervention; The TEF consultation proposes that student outcomes are assessed in respect of educational gains and providers are asked to think how they would measure this; the Education Executive is looking in detail at implications for Warwick; It is proposed that HEIs will have access to subject level data each year, which provides an opportunity to think about how we could use this in our own processes to drive quality; The proposal in respect of condition B3 is that it relates to registered students only, which has potential for the same cohort to be included in two sets of data so clarification is being sought; Work is being undertaken to analyse data to make sure we are above the base line expectations for all groups (e.g. part-time students, where the sample size is smaller); OfS had offered reassurance there where there was internal transfer between courses (e.g. between BEng and MEng) this would be lead to a positive or neutral outcome at worse; <p>ACTION: To seek clarification of the proposed approach to transfer to exit awards and also from BEng to the School of Engineering's non-accredited BSc.</p>
078	<p>Self-Assessment Report (SAR) The Director of Flexible and On-line Learning and Assistant Registrar Teaching and Learning (MW) presented the report (078-AQSC220222) with key points and discussions as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As part of a future monitoring visit (and the inspection), Ofsted will invite the university to share its self-assessment of its effectiveness in delivering excellent apprenticeship training (SAR); <p>[Exempt information not included]</p>

	<p>DECISION: Approval of the draft SAR, agreement to its external validation and agreement for amendments to be approved by Chair's action.</p>
079	<p>Student Data Report 2020/21</p> <p>The Senior Assistant Registrar of Education Policy and Quality presented the report (079-AQSC220222) with key points and discussions as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That this annual data report sets out data relevant to quality and standards; • Whilst our proportion of first class degrees had increased in the last two years the rate of increase was slightly below the sector average; • There was a discernible drop in male attainment data; • Confirmation of which aspects of the report might be needed in future was requested. <p>ACTION: To make the next iteration of the report available to Faculty Education Committees (above the line) and to AQSC (below the line).</p>
080	<p>Termly report on Complaints and Appeals and Annual report on Complaints and Appeals</p> <p>The Administrative Officer (Student Complaints and Academic Casework Team) summarised the content of the reports (080a/080b-AQSC220222) for the benefit of the committee. It was noted that the most valuable information to the committee was any insights into complaints upheld by the University or the OIA that had implications for our educational policy or our delivery or teaching.</p> <p>DECISION: To require only annual reports ongoing but for any pertinent insights to be raised with the committee secretariat <i>ad hoc</i>.</p>
081	<p>AISP framework for approval</p> <p>The Academic Director (Education and Internationalisation) presented the report (081-AQSC220222) with key points and discussions as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The requested paper provided an overview of the core stages of the programme and the ways in which participating departments ensured the quality of the provision; • That under the arrangement to carry credit to the following year there was a requirement for marking and moderation (including Exam Board approval) to be completed by the end November to allow resits, presumably in the presence of an external examiner where the student was intermediate/finalist. It was noted that this would not need to be the same external examiner as seen in the intermediate year; • AISP was an attempt to diversify our provision but the cycle events used is still that of a 'traditional' degree. <p>ACTION: Academic Director (Education and Internationalisation) to check with departments whether the timing of marking/moderation etc. required in the case of the 'carry-credit' arrangement was feasible.</p>
082	<p>Rules for Award</p> <p>The Senior Assistant Registrar of Education Policy and Quality presented the report (082-AQSC220222) Setting out some proposed in-year changes to offer clarity, particularly around the need for AQSC approval where departments want to apply more stringent expectations for PGT degree classifications.</p> <p>DECISION: In principle agreement to the changes.</p> <p>ACTION: Secretariat to consider whether implementation could be delayed until the start of 2022/23.</p>

Items below this line were for receipt and/or approval, without discussion

For Information

Approved by Chair's Action

083	Chair's Actions The Committee noted the report (083-AQSC220222).
-----	--

084	ROATP documentation The Committee noted the report (084-AQSC220222).
-----	--