

<b>UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK</b>		
<b>ACADEMIC QUALITY AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE</b>		
<b>OPEN MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD 14:00, WEDNESDAY 15 MARCH 2023, MS TEAMS</b>		
<b>Present</b>	Professor Will Curtis	Co-Chair, Deputy Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education Quality and Standards) (Meeting Chair)
	Professor Andy Clark	Co-Chair, Deputy Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education and Policy)
	Professor David Davies	Chair of the Faculty Education Committee (Science, Engineering and Medicine)
	Dan Derricott	Director of Education Policy and Quality
	Lee Griffin	Academic Director (Postgraduate Taught)
	Dr Jeff Jones	Co-opted member of academic staff in a quality assurance role
	Professor Georgia Kremmyda	Co-opted member of academic staff in a quality assurance role
	Dr Helen Nolan	Representative of the Faculty of Science, Engineering & Medicine
	Professor Sarah Richardson	Chair of the Faculty Education Committee (Arts)
	Professor Ross Ritchie	Representative of the Faculty of Social Sciences
	Dr Elena Riva	Representative of the Institute for Advanced Teaching and Learning
	Dr Chris Rogers	Representative of the Faculty of Social Sciences
	Professor Dmitriy Rumynin	Representative of the Faculty of Science, Engineering & Medicine
	Professor Gwen van der Velden	Deputy Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education)
	Dr Naomi Waltham-Smith	Chair of the Faculty Education Committee (Social Sciences)
	Professor Philip Young	Representative of the Board of Social Sciences
<b>Attending</b>	Lauren Baker	Head of Education Quality and Partnerships, EPQ, Secretary
	Dr Lynne Bayley	Senior Policy Advisor (Assessment), EPQ, Acting Secretary
	Will Ellis	Project Manager, IDG
	Alison Greenhalgh	Senior Policy Advisor (Education), EPQ, (for item 052)
	Dr Sam Hardy	Director of Flexible and Online Learning (for item 053)
	David Lees	Associate Professor, SMLC
	Kim Robinson	Deputy Director and Head of Education Policy and Governance, EPQ
	Rob Stevens	Policy Advisor (Curriculum and Partnerships), EPQ, Assistant Secretary
Professor Leanne Williams	Chair of Inclusive Assessment Design Group (for item 052)	
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Item</b>	
045	<p><b>Welcome and Apologies for absence</b></p> <p>The Chair welcomed all members and attendees. Dr David Lees attended <i>in lieu</i> of Professor Rebecca Freeman. Kim Robinson attended as an observer.</p> <p>The Chair expressed his thanks to the Senior Policy Advisor (Assessment) for undertaking the role of Acting Secretary and welcomed the Head of Education Quality and Partnerships to the role of Secretary.</p> <p>Apologies were received from Professor Jo Angouri, Professor Dan Branch, Dr Rebecca Freeman, Professor Chris Hughes, Chih-Hsiang Lo, Hamza Rehman, Professor Patrick Tissington, Naomi Waltham Smith, Dr Jane Webb and Dr Tim White.</p>	

046	<p><b>Declarations of Interest</b></p> <p>No new declarations were made.</p>
047	<p><b>Minutes of last meeting on 22 November 2022</b></p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 22 November 2022 (047-AQSC150323, Public) were <b>approved</b>.</p>
048	<p><b>Matters arising from last meeting on 22 November 2022</b></p> <p>It was reported that:</p> <p>The Project Manager, IDG had looked at the correct processes for correcting IT actions, and guidance had now been provided for each of those actions. A meeting had also been arranged with the relevant colleagues to ensure that the requirements for External Examiners were supplied to IT with sufficient detail to provide the services as required.</p>
<b>Chair's Update</b>	
049	<p><b>Chair's Business and Actions</b></p> <p>The Committee received and noted a verbal update from the Chair.</p> <p>It was noted that 36 of the 38 ITLR reviews had commenced. The ITLR team had started to plan ahead in terms of reporting and wanted to filter review reports through the committee structure at the most appropriate way towards the end of the academic year.</p>
<b>Updates</b>	
050	<p><b>Students' Union Update</b></p> <p>No students were present at this meeting; therefore, the Committee did not receive any SU update.</p>
<b>Substantive Items</b>	
051	<p><b>Postgraduate Taught External Examiners' Report Analysis 2021-22</b></p> <p>The Committee received the report (051-AQSC150323, Public) from the Academic Director (Postgraduate Taught). The key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Areas of good practice identified in several departments included quality of feedback and moderation procedures and the use of diverse assessments.</li> <li>• University wide themes were generally positive, including the use of diverse assessments and the full scope of marking ranges.</li> <li>• Where suggestions for improvement had been put forward by External Examiners, departments had taken those on board and actioned the suggestions.</li> <li>• A positive report on the Institutional Board of Examiners was provided.</li> <li>• Several 'no comment' reports had been received from External Examiners.</li> </ul> <p>Discussions took place around the design of the report being restrictive leaving little room for individuality, and the Committee determined that this was a pattern in the sector.</p> <p><b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved</b> the report.</p>
052	<p><b>Inclusive Assessment Design Group</b></p>

The Committee received the report from the Chair of Inclusive Assessment Design Group and the Senior Policy Advisor (Education) (052-AQSC150323, Public) and key points and discussions were as follows:

The working group came up with 7 key recommendations:

- To carry out an assessment mapping activity to quickly identify areas for improvement in variation and optionality/timetabling and opportunity to remedy failure.
- To develop a new Moodle module and set up workshops which would aim to provide guidance on educational theory of assessment, how to carry out assessment mapping and how to design an assessment strategy.
- To provide improved disability/inclusivity awareness training, through a new Moodle training module. This training would guide attitudes and preconceptions regarding reasonable adjustments (RA) and assessment, to ensure that students meet learning outcomes in a positive way with minimum need for RA.
- To develop an institutional definition of 'inclusive assessment' and 'assessment strategy', to be highlighted in the module approval form to promote academics' understanding of holistic 'assessment strategy'.
- To enhance the definition of 'assessment hours' to include development of assessment and feedback literacy through a scaffolded and strategic approach across a module.
- To ultimately develop a comprehensive Warwick inclusive education policy that embeds at programme, module and individual assessment level.
- That all departments have a dedicated, dynamic, inclusive education and assessment strategy taskforce to establish and embed evidence-based impact evaluation processes in relation to assessment practices.

The Committee expressed concern about the human resource required to carry out these recommendations. The Chair of Inclusive Assessment Design Group confirmed that there were keen staff within the working group as well as a core group with a strategic overview, including staff from the Academic Development Centre and Education Policy and Quality.

The notion of optionality of assessment to promote inclusivity was discussed with the context that in ITLR 2017 Departments were advised to remove optionality. The University position on not permitting optionality of examination versus assessment on module level was reiterated, the sophistication required for equivalency where there is optionality was highlighted, and a steer towards diversification of assessment at the programme level was provided.

The Committee welcomed the report and discussion on inclusivity but felt recommendations did not align with other policies. It was felt that the report should be looked at holistically and included in the scope of curriculum review, considering the issue of staff capacity and working out timescales for implementation.

The discussions concluded that this report had invoked a lot of debate, was a good starting point, and there was a lot more work to be done outside of the Committee to take the recommendations forward.

**DECISION:** The Academic Quality and Standards Committee **approved** the report.

053

**Degree Apprenticeships: Ofsted New Provider Monitoring Visit Report**

The Committee received the report from the Director of Flexible and Online Learning (053-AQSC150323, Protected) and key points and discussions were as follows:

- On 30<sup>th</sup> November and 1<sup>st</sup> December 2022 Ofsted conducted its New Provider Monitoring Visit
- Broadly speaking, the visit went well and a rating of 'Reasonable Progress' was achieved

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A number of areas for development were identified including improving the availability of meaningful data and the feedback provided to employers.</li> <li>• Additional work needed to be conducted on starting points, particularly within English and Mathematics provision and DBS processes to be fit for purpose, ensuring sub-contractors have the same processes in place.</li> <li>• A full Ofsted inspection was due within the next 2 years.</li> </ul> <p>Discussions took place around defining what good quality within Degree Apprenticeships meant, and that the focus was currently on progress rather than achievement.</p>
054	<p><b>Rules for Award PGT Core Modules</b></p> <p>The Committee received the report presented by the Deputy Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education and Policy) (054-AQSC150323, Public) and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It had been noted that there was a significant omission from the Rules for Award, whereby the requirement for postgraduate taught students to pass core modules for Award was not specified.</li> <li>• This requirement was present in the previous degree conventions, and it was known that some course specifications had been developed in the belief that there was a requirement to pass core modules and that some student handbooks were written to refer to this principle.</li> <li>• There was no record that the requirement to pass core modules for postgraduate taught students was intentionally removed and it was believed that the removal was an accident caused by the restructure in the Rules for Award alongside the new definition of required core modules being specified for undergraduate modules only.</li> <li>• The eVision Course Approval system listed the core modules required to be passed, but for courses not recently approved, it was required to reinstate the requirement to pass core modules due to the reference to regulations.</li> </ul> <p><b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee recommended to Senate the <b>approval</b> of the revisions to the Rules for Award for introduction in 2023/24 and <b>endorsed</b> the proposal to update the good practice guide on providing information for students.</p>
055	<p><b>Mitigating Circumstances Policy Amendment and Economics Variation</b></p> <p>The Committee received the report presented by the Senior Policy Advisor (Assessment) (055-AQSC150323, Public) and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The mitigating circumstances policy was revised for introduction in the 2022/23 and elements relating to waivers were aligned with parts of policy L: Absence from a University Examination and Uncompleted Assessed Work.</li> <li>• The Department of Economics had historic approval to exempt them from applying the credit limits on waivers for students on their courses. The details of the standing exemption were not available, which resulted in the submission of this variation.</li> <li>• Undergraduate students who took specified courses with a significant number of modules from Economics, could be absent for more than 6 credits of assessment that could not be mitigated by methods other than waiver.</li> <li>• Discussions took place around the possibility of a universal 12 CATS exemption rather than 6 CATS, but there was strong opinion that allowing the exemption of 12 CATS was too great an amount, with it being equivalent to 10% of assessment. The working group had carefully considered the limit of 6 CATS, but the Committee felt uncomfortable to approve this variation, potentially leading to cross-departmental issues.</li> <li>• It was noted that there was already a mechanism for FEC Chairs to approve variations on a student-by-student basis, but that would involve a large number of students every year, the quantifiable impact being 110 out of 400 students a year.</li> </ul>

	<p>Confirmation was provided that the Committee was required to honour this variation for the current academic year, but require further discussions at the Committee with the Department of Economics present to consider the variation for future academic years.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> The Department of Economics to be invited to a future Academic Quality and Standards Committee to discuss the implementation of the variation for future academic years.</p> <p><b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved</b> the variation for the academic year 2022/23.</p>
056	<p><b>Mark Scale for UG FHEQ Level 7 Modules</b></p> <p>The Committee received the report presented by the Senior Policy Advisor (Assessment) (056-AQSC150323, Public) and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Senate approved a 50% pass mark for Undergraduate FHEQ Level 7 Modules for students first enrolling on their programme of study from 2020/21.</li> <li>• Undergraduate students who took Level 7 modules were primarily fourth year integrated masters students and 2023/24 was the first academic year where the marks management for FHEQ level 7 modules needed to account for the 50% pass mark.</li> <li>• Consequently, changes to the mark scheme required removal of the pass mark for grades with the range 40- 49, indicator grades between 0-39 now had a range of 0-49, with a new indicator grade being made available for manual selection by departments for students with an entry year prior to 2020/21.</li> </ul> <p><b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved</b> implementation of the proposed mark scheme for Undergraduate FHEQ level 7 modules.</p>
057	<p><b>Departmental Board of Examiner Recommendations for Subject Specific Exit Qualifications</b></p> <p>The Committee received the report presented by the Senior Policy Advisor (Assessment) (057-AQSC150323, Public) and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reports from the Institutional Board of Examiners in the first two years of introduction reinforced the desirability of enabling subject specific exit qualifications, however this had not yet been operationalised.</li> <li>• Regulation 8 enabled Boards of Examiners to recommend to Senate the award of an alternative qualification where a student had met the requirements of an approved course of study.</li> <li>• All courses that had been approved via the eVision course approval system had identified requirements and subject specific learning outcomes for the CertHE and DipHE qualifications.</li> <li>• Exit qualifications for courses not approved via eVision were difficult to validate due to data storage and retrieval issues.</li> <li>• It was proposed that the departments, where every UG course had been approved through the course approval system, could hold their own Board of Examiners to make recommendations to Senate Sub-Group.</li> </ul> <p>The Committee discussed whether there needed to be a validation check in-between the departmental boards and Senate Sub-Group, as there was an element of risk without an additional check in place.</p> <p>The Committee were reluctant to introduce this immediately for all departments, as many were used to the Institutional Board of Examiners system and felt that delaying full implementation would allow further</p>

	<p>consultation and discussion with departments. They felt a controlled trial taking place with the result to be discussed at a future meeting would be more appropriate.</p> <p><b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved</b> the recommendations to allow subject specific exit qualifications to be recommended to Senate Sub-Group by Boards of Examiners in approved Departments as a trial for the two departments who had all their Undergraduate Qualifications approved on the eVision Course Approval system.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> This item to be raised at an Academic Quality and Standards Committee in the academic year 2023/24 to allow discussion of the results of the trial.</p>
058	<p><b>Changes to Assessment Regulations and Policies for 2023/24</b></p> <p>The Committee received the report presented by the Deputy Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education and Policy) (058-AQSC150323, Public) and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <p>A number of assessment related policies were detailed that needed amendment in order to implement established principles and to align policies ahead of a project to reform academic regulations and policies. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amendments to the Credit and Module Framework, G: Marking for Degree Credit Policy, Mark Scale for Undergraduate Modules and Undergraduate Degree Conventions to align these policies and conventions with the 50% pass mark for FHEQ level 7 modules as agreed by Senate for students commencing their course in 2020/21.</li> <li>• Updates to appendix A in the Rules for Award to reflect that the total minimum credit for postgraduate award can include FHEQ level 6 modules, for which the pass mark is 40%.</li> <li>• Alignment of waiver limits in policy L, Absence from a University Examination and Uncompleted Assessed Work and the Mitigating Circumstances Policy.</li> <li>• Clarity that the Maximum Periods of Study Policy took precedent over the Mitigating Circumstances Policy.</li> <li>• Permission for a route for modules to be exempt from the right to remedy failure policy by Academic Quality and Standards Committee, to accommodate modules such as intercalated year modules that could not be reassessed in all circumstances and did not fit with existing exemptions.</li> <li>• Correction of errors (level of remaining credit for integrated masters, description of academic misconduct outcomes that were not eligible for right to remedy failure).</li> <li>• The header “Borderline Criteria” in Rules for Award section 2 moved to within the 10.5 to remove interpretation that 10.6 only applied to borderline cases.</li> <li>• Correction to phrasing in Policy in policy L, Absence from a University Examination to remove repeated phrase “less than”.</li> <li>• New item in Mitigating Circumstances Policy, section 1 to allow variations to the policy to be included in Appendix A. There was a request for AQSC to consider a variation to the waiver limit and the new statement would enable variations to be considered and published.</li> <li>• Description of the circumstances when a student had a right to remedy failure corrected by removing fail from “where the overall fail minimum pass mark”.</li> <li>• Clarification that the Maximum Periods of Study Policy took precedent over the Mitigating Circumstances Policy had been slightly reworded to include extensions as well as reassessments.</li> <li>• Section 2e and f removed from degree conventions for students entering in 20/21 as they referred to students entering in previous years of study.</li> <li>• Recently the availability of artificial intelligence (ChatGPT) for generating assessed work had garnered significant publicity. There was a wide range of activities across the institution to support and respond to concerns and one aspect that had been requested was an addition to the guidance on academic integrity in regulation 11 and the student facing guidance.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An additional line clarified that use of artificial intelligence was a type of <b>academic misconduct</b> has been added to the guidance on regulation 11, section GA3.3.1 and the student facing guidance. It was recommended that these changes to guidance were published and communicated immediately.</li> <li>Changes to guidance did not require Senate approval and it was not expected that the mid-year change would cause require Departments to change practice. The amendment has enabled Departments to carry out existing academic misconduct processes with greater confidence on how to respond to cases where use of artificial intelligence was suspected.</li> </ul> <p>There were strong discussions around the proposed amendments to Regulation 11 and whether students who committed academic integrity misconduct could not resubmit for a pass degree, and whether students who failed would be unfairly disadvantaged by this amendment.</p> <p><b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>recommended</b> to Senate the approval of the revisions to the regulations and policies for introduction in 2023/24 (Parts 1-9) and <b>approved</b> Part 10 (Guidance on Regulation 11 Academic Integrity).</p>
<b>Items below this line were for receipt and/or approval, without discussion</b>	
059	<p><b>Chair's Actions</b></p> <p>The Committee received and <b>noted</b> the report (059-AQSC150323, Public)</p>
060	<p><b>Modules Required in Range for Merit and Distinctions</b></p> <p>The Committee received and <b>approved</b> the report (060-AQSC150323, Public)</p>
<b>Other</b>	
	<p><b>Any other business</b></p> <p>There was no other business.</p>
<b>Next meeting: Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> April 2023, 10:00, Microsoft Teams</b>	

DECISIONS AND ACTIONS			
ITEM	DECISION/ACTION	LEAD AND DUE DATE	STATUS
[2022-2023]			
051 Postgraduate Taught External Examiners' Report Analysis 2021-22	<b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved</b> the report.		
052 Inclusive Assessment Design Group	<b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved</b> the report.		
054 Rules for Award PGT Core Modules	<b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee recommended to Senate the <b>approval</b> of the revisions to the Rules for Award for introduction in 2023/24 and <b>endorsed</b> the proposal to update the good practice guide on providing information for students.		

055 Mitigating Circumstances Policy Amendment and Economics Variation	<b>ACTION:</b> The Department of Economics invited to a future Academic Quality and Standards Committee to discuss the implementation of the variation for future academic years.	Secretariat April 2023	In Progress
055 Mitigating Circumstances Policy Amendment and Economics Variation	<b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved</b> the variation for the academic year 2022/23		
056 Mark Scale for UG FHEQ Level 7 Modules	<b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved</b> implementation of the proposed mark scheme for Undergraduate FHEQ level 7 modules.		
057 Departmental Board of Examiner Recommendations for Subject Specific Exit Qualifications	<b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved</b> the recommendations to allow subject specific exit qualifications to be recommended to Senate Sub-Group by Boards of Examiners in approved Departments as a trial for the two departments who had all their Undergraduate Qualifications approved on the eVision Course Approval system.		
057 Departmental Board of Examiner Recommendations for Subject Specific Exit Qualifications	<b>ACTION:</b> This item to be raised at an Academic Quality and Standards Committee in the academic year 2023/24 to allow discussion of the results of the trial.	Secretariat, September 2023	Not yet due
058 Changes to Assessment Regulations and Policies for 2023/24	<b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>recommended</b> to Senate the approval of the revisions to the regulations and policies for introduction in 2023/24 (Parts 1-9) and <b>approved</b> Part 10 (Guidance on Regulation 11 Academic Integrity).		
060 Modules Required in Range for Merit and Distinctions	<b>DECISION:</b> The Committee received and <b>approved</b> the report		