

UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK

**Academic Quality and Standards Committee**

Minutes of the meeting of the Academic Quality and Standards Committee  
held on 23 November 2017

Present: Professor C Hughes (Chair), Professor A Clark (Academic Director, Undergraduate Studies), Dr W Curtis (Academic Director, Partnerships), Dr D Davies (Representative of the Board of Faculty of Medicine), Ms E Dunford (Postgraduate Officer, Students' Union), Dr M Gifford (Representative of the Board of Faculty of Science), Professor L Gracia (Dean of Students), Dr L Hammond (Representative of the Faculty of Medicine), Mr L Jackson (Education Officer, Students' Union), Dr M Leeke (Representative of the Board of Faculty of Science), Professor C Sparrow (Academic Director, Graduate Studies) and Dr E Ushioda (Representative of the Board of Faculty of Social Sciences).

Apologies: Professor G Cooke (co-opted member of academic staff in quality assurance role), Professor C Jenainati (Representative of the Board of Faculty of Arts), Professor D Lamburn (Deputy Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education)), Professor N Monk (Director of IATL), Dr J Lee (co-opted member of academic staff in quality assurance role), Professor P Roberts (Representative of the Board of Faculty of Arts), Dr J Thornby (Representative of the Board of Faculty of Social Science) and Professor G van der Velden (Chair of the Student Learning Experience and Engagement Committee).

In Attendance: Ms C Gray (Secretary), Ms C Pearson (Assistant Secretary), Mrs H Green (Head of Client Services, Library) for item 3 (a), Mrs K Gray (Acting Deputy Academic Registrar) for item 11, Dr E Melia (Senior Assistant Registrar, Strategic Programme Delivery) for item 3 (a), Ms S Waldron (Administrative Officer, Complaints Resolution) for item 3 (b).

24/17-18 Minutes of the last meeting

CONSIDERED:

Minutes of the meeting of the Academic Quality and Standards Committee on 31 October 2017;

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Academic Quality and Standards Committee be approved, subject to the following amendments in minute 7 (e), the Students Union did not want to enter the top 10 Students Union in the UK, but rather that the Students Union had published top 11 priorities for 2017/18 which are available at:

<https://www.warwicksu.com/news/article/warwicksu/Sabbatical-Officer-teams-top-priorities-for-2017-18/>.

25/17-18 Conflicts of Interest

REPORTED:

That, should any members or attendees of the Academic Quality and Standards Committee have any conflicts of interest relating to agenda items for the meeting, they should be declared in accordance with the CUC Guide for Members of Higher Education Governing Bodies in the UK, available online from:

<http://www.universitychairs.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Code-Final.pdf>

RESOLVED

No conflicts of interests were reported.

26/17-18 Matters arising

(a) Reading Lists (minute AQSC.102/16-17 referred)

REPORTED:

That at its meeting on 12 June 2017, it was reported to the Committee (inter alia) that it was proposed that implementation of Talis Aspire for institution-wide use for publication of reading lists be phased for launch in 2018/19 and that a programme had been developed by IT Services to move reading lists currently held in multiple formats to Talis Aspire, which should accommodate 80% of those available;

That at its meeting on 12 June 2017, the Committee considered a paper from the Head of Client Services (Library) on a proposed approach to improve the visibility of Reading Lists (paper AQSC.30/16-17) and resolved:

- That the Library be mandated to take forward the implementation of Talis Aspire for 2018/19;
- That the project would need to be appropriately supported and clearly communicated to departments;
- That regular reports on the take-up of Talis Aspire be provided to the Committee.

RECEIVED:

An update report on the take up of Talis Aspire (AQSC.03/17-18), noting in particular:

- (i) That there had been a significant increase (nearly 300%) in publishing reading list by Faculties using Talis Aspire over the summer 2017 in comparison with the previous year;
- (ii) That a policy around archiving of reading lists was required to ensure correct timing of reading lists being taken down;

- (iii) That it was possible to have two reading lists published at the same time for different student cohorts, e.g. for PGT cohorts which span across years or students who are taking re-sits without residence the following May;
- (iv) That the normal roll over of reading lists would happen in July;

(By Dr D Davies, representative of the Board of Faculty of Medicine):

- (v) That in the academic year 2016/17 there had been an occasion in the Faculty of Medicine when teaching took place in June and the assessment was due in September and the reading lists had been taken down on Moodle by the time the assessment was due;

RESOLVED:

- (vi) That the incident in Medicine had been noted and that this would not happen again;
- (vii) That further investigations needed to happen as to how far back reading list should be made available;
- (viii) That some programmes had flexible start dates and consideration needed to be given by the Talis Aspire team and the relevant departments as to when reading lists should be published for these programmes.

(b) ~~Termly Report on Complaints and Appeals~~ (minutes QAWG.32 and 33/16-17 refer)

REPORTED:

- (i) That at its meeting on 18 May 2017, the Quality Assurance Working Group considered the termly report on student complaints and appeals (paper QAWG.24/16-17) and resolved (*inter alia*) that future reports further clarify the nature of Chair's action taken in relation to ongoing appeals, such as those referenced in section 4.3;
- (ii) That at its meeting on 18 May 2017, it was reported to the Working Group (*inter alia*) that an analysis of the OIA outcomes and trends would be addressed in the next termly report on Academic Complaints and Appeals, alongside the outcomes of the University of Warwick for the same period;
- (iii) That at its meeting on 31 October 2017, it was reported to the Committee that the termly and annual report on Academic Complaints and Appeals would be brought forward to the next meeting of the Committee;

CONSIDERED:

- (iv) The annual and termly report on Academic Complaints and Appeals (paper AQSC.04/17-18);

REPORTED:

- (v) That the number of stage 2 complaints (73) in the academic year 2016/17 had stayed fairly steady in comparison with the academic year 2015/16 and that almost half the number of complaints related to Warwick Accommodation;
- (vi) That about 20% (15) of these complaints had progressed to Stage 3;
- (vii) That the number of academic appeals received in the academic year 2016/17 (112) also remained fairly similar to the number received in the previous year;
- (viii) That the band median of OIA complaints from the University of Warwick (19 in 2016) was slightly higher than for comparable institutions (14 in 2016);
- (ix) That since the start of the academic year 2017/18, the University had introduced a single appeals regulation, Regulation 42 and all new appeals would be processed in line with this new Regulation;
- (x) That the new process for appeals administration also included the requirement to log all appeals centrally which is expected to help with the accuracy of appeals data reported in the future to the Academic Quality and Standards Committee;

(By Professor C Hughes (PVC Education)):

- (xi) That the number of postgraduate appeals had declined from 45 in 2015/16 to 27 in 2016/17;

RESOLVED:

- (xii) That the Administrative Officer, Complaints Resolution, would look into this issue and report back about any possible reasons for the decline in postgraduate appeals.

(c) Good Practice Guide on Monitoring Student Attendance and Progress (minute AQSC.84/16-17 referred)

REPORTED:

- (i) That at its meeting on 12 June 2017, the Committee considered a paper setting out proposed amendments to the Good Practice Guide on Monitoring Student Attendance and Progress (Paper AQSC.24/16-17) and it was reported (inter alia) that the fee for the intercalated year could be reconsidered if the level of monitoring required were reduced for non-Tier 4 students, noting that students who took a voluntary year out to work were not required to pay a fee.
- (ii) That at this meeting, the Committee resolved that the Secretariat explore the rationale for the current level of fees for the intercalated year;

- (iii) That the matter has been referred to the Fees Working Group of the Academic Resourcing Committee;
- (d) Compliance with Consumer Protection Legislation (Competition and Markets Authority) (minute AQSC.12/17-18 referred)

REPORTED:

- (i) That at its meeting on 31 October 2017, the Committee received a report from the Acting Academic Registrar on work undertaken to comply with requirements of Consumer Protection Law at the University of Warwick to date and invited the Committee to consider how it will secure responsibility for oversight and institutional compliance with Consumer Protection Law (paper AQSC.10/17-18) in future;
  - (ii) That the Committee resolved that the item needed further in-depth consideration and that the item be brought forward to the next meeting of the Committee;
  - (iii) That it had not been possible to progress work on the item for this meeting of the Committee and as such it would be deferred to a future meeting of the Committee in the Spring Term.
- (e) Outstanding ITLR responses (minutes AQSC.91/16-17 and 5(a) refer)

REPORTED:

- (i) That at its meeting on 31 October 2017, it was reported to the Committee that:
  - (A) The Committee had considered responses to ITLR reports from departments at its meeting on 12 June 2017 and resolved that the response to the ITLR report by Warwick Mathematics Institute not be approved, noting that responses to recommendations made in the ITLR report were still outstanding (minute 91/16/17 2 (a) (iii) (A) and (v));
  - (B) That responses to the ITLR report for Mathematics were in the process of being submitted to AQSC for consideration;
- (ii) That the Chair had taken action to approve the response to the ITLR report for the Warwick Mathematics Institute, subsequent to receiving satisfactory details in response to queries raised as set out in paper AQSC.24/17-18;
- (iii) That the two remaining responses to ITLR reports for the Admissions Office and WMG were still outstanding at the time of the meeting, it is envisaged that they would be

approved at a future meeting of the Academic Quality and Standards Committee.

27/17-18 Chair's Business

REPORTED:

- (a) That Professor David Lamburn (Deputy PVC Education) was currently away from the University and was expected to return in January 2018; the Chair wished him a speedy recovery;
- (b) That the draft Education Strategy was currently debated in a number of Committees and would be considered by the Academic Quality and Standard Committee in spring 2018 with a view to have it approved by Senate in spring/summer 2018.

28/17-18 Students' Union Update

RECEIVED:

An oral report from the Education and Postgraduate Officers of the Students' Union.

REPORTED:

- (a) That the Students' Union had published its top 11 priorities and members of the Committee were encouraged to look at these at:

<https://www.warwicksu.com/news/article/warwicksu/Sabbatical-Officer-teams-top-priorities-for-2017-18/>.

- (b) That the Students' Union was currently preparing a response to the consultations on the QAA Quality Code and the Office for Students regulatory framework for higher education; in general the Students Union would emphasise its opposition to the marketization of higher education and perceived loss of partnership between students and HE institutions apparent in both consultations;
- (c) That the Students' Union had passed a policy last week to lift the NSS boycott for 2017/18, although the Students' Union remained concerned about the NSS being a measure of satisfaction believing that there existed better mechanisms to gather student feedback and perceiving the NSS as a further means to marketize higher education;
- (d) That the Students' Union had embarked on an academic transformation project employing consultants and focusing on SSLC structures and processes, the wider University would be involved in due course and an final report with actions would be published in spring 2018;

- (e) That 400 course representatives had been trained so far in the current academic year with training dates already in the diary for next academic year hoping to achieve a 100% take up of training by all eligible course representatives;
- (f) That work on the inclusive and liberated curriculum was carrying on with an initiative called “discover my module”.

29/17-18

Student Learning Experience and Engagement Committee

RECEIVED:

An oral update from the Chairs of the Student Learning Experience and Engagement Committee.

REPORTED:

- (a) That at the first meeting of the Student Learning Experience and Engagement Committee, a student communication strategy was discussed with the emphasis on working towards a partnership between students and the University;
- (b) That a strategic approach to all the surveys conducted was considered with the aim to achieve better follow up actions and feedback mechanisms, a proposal would be considered by the University Education Committee in December 2017;
- (c) That proposals on how to improve and enhance module evaluation were being worked including technical and academic work streams;
- (d) That the SSLC co-ordinators had been renamed as the Student Experience Co-ordinators;
- (e) That action planning on the recent PTES/PRES surveys had started.

30/17-18

Recommendations from the Institutional Teaching and Learning Review 2017

REPORTED:

- (a) That at its final meeting, the ITLR Steering Group approved a process for monitoring progress against recommendations made as part of the ITLR 2017;
- (b) That recommendations made in relation to specific departments are being monitored by Faculty Education Committees and the Student Success Programme Board;
- (c) Recommendations made to the University have been categorised thematically and allocated an ‘owner’ deemed best placed to address or respond to the recommendation;

- (d) That the process for monitoring progress on these recommendations will operate on a termly basis (from Spring term 2018), with summary reports due to be submitted to University Education Committee at its meeting on 26 February 2018;

RECEIVED:

- (e) The process flowchart for monitoring progress against recommendations made as part of the ITLR 2017, as approved by the ITLR Steering Group and set out in paper AQSC 25.17-18);
- (f) A paper listing University-level recommendations with the Academic Quality and Standards Committee as 'owner' as set out in paper AQSC 26. 17-18)

REPORTED:

(By Professor C Hughes, Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education)):

- (g) That the ITLR 2017 had been a useful exercise in highlighting various improvements needed in the area of teaching and learning as well as identification of areas of good practice across the University;
- (h) That the recommendations arising from the ITLR 2017 now needed to be followed up to ensure joined up thinking and actions and that departments had a crucial role in ensuring follow up actions were taken;
- (i) That recommendations and actions would in due course be reported to the University Education Committee and Senate;
- (j) That departments had been formally asked to provide feedback on actions required by the 18<sup>th</sup> December 2017 to the Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education);
- (k) That extra investment had been provided for Teaching Quality and a new Assistant Registrar post had been created with a focus on monitoring and review which included oversight of ITLR 2017 recommendations and follow up;

(By Mr L Jackson, Education Officer):

- (l) That this action plan was welcomed by the Students' Union, stressing the importance of any feedback to students on progress of ITLR 2017 recommendations and actions and querying how Staff Student Liaison Committees would get involved in action plans;

(By Dr W Curtis, Academic Director, Partnerships):

- (m) That it was important not to forget any recommendations in relation to collaborative arrangements and how these were recorded or colour coded in the recommendations;

RESOLVED:

- (n) That further guidance should be sought on the colour coding of the actions to understand if one colour merely groups together the same theme or of the colours stood for something different than themes;
- (o) That it was also imperative to highlight any collaborative recommendations in the ITLR 2017 recommendations/actions;
- (p) That the guidance will need to be amended to include any student feedback on actions/recommendations;
- (q) That recommendations and actions arising from ITLR 2017 needed to be communicated effectively to staff and students and the involvement of the Student Learning Experience and Engagement Committee was crucial;

31/17-18

Consultation on the UK Quality Code for Higher Education

CONSIDERED:

A discussion paper on a draft response to the QAA consultation on a revised UK Quality Code (paper AQSC.27/17-18)

REPORTED:

- (a) That in light of the recent changes in the HE landscape, the QAA was currently consulting on the review of the QAA Quality Code which had been introduced in 2012, with the view to revise the Code to ensure it remained fit for purpose, agile, clear and current;
- (b) That the consultation would close on 13 December 2017 and a draft response would be considered by the Steering Committee on the 4 December 2017;
- (c) That two members of the Teaching Quality staff would be attending national consultation sessions ahead of the consultation deadline to feed into the consultation;
- (d) That the 19 Expectations had been reduced to 4 Expectations on Quality and Standards underpinned by core practices and supplementary practices driving enhancement and yet to be defined and guidance and advice also yet to be written;
- (e) That the consultation document focused on outcomes and not processes;

RESOLVED:

- (f) That members of the Committee welcomed the move to simplify the Quality Code; yet it lacked detail on how to achieve appropriate quality and standards in teaching provision;

- (g) That the relationship with students in the draft Quality Code was not a partnership anymore, but was based on a transactional model which was not welcome and regressive;
- (h) That there was no evidence of externality within the draft Quality Code at present in the baseline requirements, e.g. involvement of external examiners, engagement with employers and any monitoring and review practices;
- (i) That a concise and user friendly practitioners' handbook was needed which might focus on the student lifecycle rather than themes as a meaningful guide;
- (j) That the Students' Union would be making a separate response to the consultation and had expressed concern about the lack of the Student Voice and lack of reference to PGR provision;
- (k) That Appendix 3 of AQSC 27.17/18 should be strengthened and revised in view of the discussions for consideration at the Steering Committee on 4 December 2017;
- (l) That the Chair would be empowered to take Chair's action to approve the final version of the consultation to be submitted to the QAA pending changes made after the discussion of the response at Steering Committee.

32/17-18

Guidance on dealing with QAA document "Contracting to Cheat in Higher Education"

CONSIDERED:

The guidance issued by the QAA in October 2017 on how to address contract cheating and a proposal on how the University may wish to respond to this as set out in paper AQSC.28/17-18]

REPORTED:

- (a) That at the last meeting of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee on the 31 October 2017, it was agreed a short paper would be considered at the next meeting setting out the content of the QAA guidance on "Contracting to Cheat in Higher Education";
- (b) That the University had already revised its guidance and processes on plagiarism and proof reading which was effective from the start of the academic year 2017/18 with resultant changes to Regulation 11;
- (c) That the new QAA guidance recommended that the University consider:
  - (i) Education of students and staff as a crucial area to prevent plagiarism and contract cheating;
  - (ii) Providing a supportive environment for students to whistle blow if there is a suspicion that a peer might be cheating;

- (iii) Focus on assessment design to encourage resilient assessment methods, e.g. authentic assessments;
- (iv) Blocking essay mills from its computers and networks;
- (v) Sharing good practice with staff on how to detect plagiarism and cheating; e.g. sample interviewing students;
- (vi) Having clear regulations on cheating setting out the processes and penalties/consequences for cheating;

RESOLVED:

- (d) That assessment strategies to prevent plagiarism and cheating should be considered by the sub-group on the Review of Assessment called "Assessment Strategies" and led by Professor Gwen Van der Velden;
- (e) That a desk based exercise should be carried out by a member of Teaching Quality staff to ascertain if further changes to policy and processes were necessary in light of this guidance.

33/17-18 Update on Review of Assessment

RECEIVED:

An oral report from Acting Chair of the Review of Assessment.

REPORTED:

(By Professor A Clark, Director of Undergraduate Studies):

- (a) That the first meeting of the Review of Assessment had taken place on 15 November 2017;
- (b) That membership has now been fully agreed with the second representative for the Faculty of Arts being identified as Dr J Lee;
- (c) That Ms J Bowskill will continue to be a member of the Review of Assessment once her secondment finished in April 2018 and would then fill the role of FYBOE Secretary which was currently vacant;
- (d) That the Review of Assessment Group agreed on the following four work streams:
  - (i) Assessment and Remediating Failure (chaired by Dr Phil Young from the School of Life Sciences);
  - (ii) Examination Board procedures and IT systems (Chair: TBC);
  - (iii) Mitigating Circumstances and Reasonable Adjustments (Chair: Professor Andy Clark);
  - (iv) Assessment Strategies (chaired by Professor Gwen Van der Velden);

- (e) That secretarial support for these four work streams was required from the Teaching Quality Office and the Acting Deputy Academic Registrar would be consulted to identify relevant personnel;
- (f) That the highest priority for the Review of Assessment were the review of mitigating circumstances and remedying failure and that potential members of these two groups would be approached in due course by the Chair and Secretary of the Review of Assessment Group;
- (g) That a short briefing document would be sent out soon to the Directors of Undergraduate Studies, the Directors of Graduate Studies in departments raising awareness of the Review of Assessment and also asking for comments on initial considerations/suggestions from departments to feed into the Review of Assessment;
- (h) That the Chair of the Review Group would also meet with the Students' Union to resolve student membership on the sub-groups;
- (i) That in due course, open workshops might be held to enable members of academic staff to feed back on the Review of Assessment and to create a dialogue between the Review Group and the wider University;
- (j) That ideally the sub-groups would be reporting progress made by 21 January 2018 to report back to the Academic Quality and Standards Committee;
- (k) That further background paperwork would be provided to all sub-groups in due course on work already carried out by University Committees and working groups informing their area of work;
- (l) That expectations needed to be managed in relation to what could be achieved by each sub-groups and that some work groups may not be able to deliver concrete proposals by the end of the current academic year.

34/17-18

Credit and Module Framework

CONSIDERED:

A discussion paper on the credit and module framework at the University of Warwick (paper AQSC.29/17-18)

REPORTED:

(By Professor Chris Hughes, Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education)):

- (a) That the current module and credit framework in operation at the University of Warwick was complex and fragmented with different credit sizes operating across different departments;

- (b) That any credit size should be aligned to workloads and standards;
- (c) That the credit framework should lend itself to interdisciplinarity by making it easy to fit in optional modules;
- (d) That it was strategically important to review the University's module and credit framework, this had been noted in the draft Education strategy and had also formed one of the recommendations arising from the ITLR 2017;

(By Mrs Katharine Gray, Acting Deputy Academic Registrar):

- (e) That the issue of compatibility of module sizes across departments had long been a barrier to module availability for joint degree students and exchange students;

(By Professor Colin Sparrow, Academic Director, Graduate Studies):

- (f) That it was not surprising that the University had over time come up with many permutations of credit sizes as 120 was easily divisible by many numbers;
- (g) That it might be necessary to decide on the lowest common denominator when dividing 120 credit and considering minimum module sizes; e.g. 4 or 5;
- (h) That if any change to harmonise module sizes was agreed, the University should consider calling this correcting an anomaly rather than asking departments to have all modules and course reapproved as any unnecessary bureaucracy would act as a barrier to achieve buy in for any changes agreed;

RESOLVED:

- (i) That members of the Committee were broadly supportive to review the complex module and credit framework at the University of Warwick with a view to aspire to a simpler model;
- (j) That some work would need to be carried out across the sector to understand what kind of models were operating when considering module and credit sizes;

35/17-18

Partnerships Committee

Revised policy for approval and review of collaborative programmes  
(minutes CFDLSC.21 & 36 and 54/16-17 and PC.9/17-18 refer)

REPORTED:

- (i) That at its meeting on 19 May 2017, the Partnerships Committee *considered* a series of papers proposing a new collaborative taxonomy with glossary and guidance flowchart as set out in papers CFDLSC.73.16-17, CFDSL.7b.16-17{revised} and CFDLSC.74.16-17 and *resolved* (inter alia):

- (A) That the documents be approved, subject to minor amendments;
  - (B) That the taxonomy would be reported to Senate;
  - (C) That the Secretary and incoming Chair consider the Schedule of Collaborative Reviews for 2017-18, noting that there were currently too many and some were low risk;
  - (D) That work on a framework for placements and work-based learning; and doctoral study be progressed over the summer;
- (ii) That at its meeting on 10 October 2017, it was reported to the Partnerships Committee that:
- (A) A revised approval and monitoring and review process and policy had been drafted to replace the existing separate policies and coincide with the introduction of the new course approval process, academic governance arrangements and the introduction of a new monitoring and review process;
  - (B) That the proposed procedure would take a risk-based approach proportionate to the characteristics of the partner and the collaborative arrangement;
  - (C) Changes to both the process and policy for course approval and monitoring and review of all University programmes were still underway;
  - (D) That the “Principles of Quality Assurance of programmes delivered in partnership with others” (paper PC.10/17-18 Appendix V) could serve as a reference point for the those members reviewing and categorising a proposal at the outline stage;
  - (E) That further work packages on the following would be necessary:
    - Collaborative arrangements involving doctoral study
    - Work-based learning
    - Professional Placements
    - Degree Apprenticeships
    - Study Abroad and student mobility
  - (F) That the local procedures in place in departments with professional placements, such as WMS and CTE, would need to be made explicit as a reference point for the Committee and other review or audit functions by non-specialists across the University;
  - (G) Revisions to academic policy and procedure would need to be recommended for approval to the Academic Quality and Standards Committee and the Senate;
- (iii) That at its meeting on 10 October 2017, the Partnerships Committee *considered* a revised Procedure for Approval and Monitoring of collaborative courses as set out in paper PC.10/17-18 (With appendices I – XII) and *resolved* that the revised procedure and resources be approved, subject to

changes in terminology used in Appendix II and III to avoid confusion with existing roles and Committees prevalent at departmental level;

CONSIDERED:

- (iv) A revised Procedure for Approval and Monitoring of collaborative courses as set out in paper PC.10/17-18{revised} (With appendices I – XII) as follows:
  - (A) Appendix I{revised} - Responsibilities for approval and monitoring
  - (B) Appendix II{revised} – University Course Coordinator Responsibilities
  - (C) Appendix III{revised} – Validation or Franchise Group or Course Management Committee: Guidelines for Good Practice
  - (D) Appendix IV - The Collaborative Strategy and Policy (*Previously approved by Senate 2016*)
  - (E) Appendix V - Principles of QA of programmes delivered in partnership with others
  - (F) Appendix VI {revised} - Process for outline and full approval of collaborative programmes
  - (G) Appendix VII - Procedure for Collaborative Review (*Previously approved by Senate in 2012*)

RECEIVED:

- (H) Appendix VIII - Guidance Flowchart (CFDLSC.74.16-17{revised} ,
- (I) Appendix IX - Collaborative Glossary (CFDLSC.7b.16-17{revised}),
- (J) Appendix X – Collaborative Risk Assessment Form ,
- (K) Appendix XI – Collaborative staff proposal coversheet (HEI) ,
- (L) Appendix XII – Collaborative staff proposal coversheet (non-HEI),
- (M) Appendix XIII – Site visit form (excerpt from course approval form)

REPORTED:

- (v) That this proposal required all collaborations to be proposed in outline (simple document of maximum of 2 pages), this would then be considered by Chairs of the University Education Committee, the Academic Quality and Standards Committee, the Partnerships Committee and the relevant Faculty Education Committee and will provide flexibility to assign a different approval route for collaborative proposals depending on the nature of the collaboration and risk they posed.

RESOLVED:

- (vi) That the revised Procedure for Approval and Monitoring of collaborative courses as set out in paper PC.10/17-18{revised} should be adopted.

36/17-18 Chair's Action

(a) Engineering Year Abroad

REPORTED:

- (i) That the Chair, acting on behalf of the Committee, had approved the principle for variants of the Undergraduate Engineering programmes to have their year abroad credit awarded on a pass/fail basis only instead of using a marks conversion scheme, due to concerns raised by the accrediting bodies;
- (ii) That early communication of this change with current and prospective students would be necessary;
- (iii) That revisions to the course would be submitted by the School of Engineering as soon as possible.

37/17-18 Digest of FEC minutes

RECEIVED:

A digest of the minutes of the Autumn 2017-18 meetings of the Faculty Education Committees AQSC 30.17-18

RESOLVED:

That issues arising from this digest would be discussed at the next meeting of the Academic Quality and Standards Committee on 22 January 2018.

38/17-18 Board of Graduate Studies

RECEIVED:

The minutes of the meeting of the Board of Graduate Studies on 10 October 2017 (published online: <https://warwick.ac.uk/services/gov/committees/bgs/minutes/>);

39/17-18 Progress of Committee Recommendations

REPORTED:

- (a) That at its meeting on 18 October 2017, the Senate approved recommendations from the Committee under the following headings:

Revised Collaborative Risk Assessment form

40/17-18 Next meeting

REPORTED:

That the next meeting of the Committee is scheduled to be held on  
**Monday 22 January 2018 at 9.30am in CMR 1.0, University House.**