

UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK

ACADEMIC QUALITY AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE

OPEN MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD 10:00, TUESDAY 2 JUNE 2021 (ONLINE MEETING)

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)
	Christopher Bisping	CB	Academic Director (Postgraduate Taught) (from 3:00pm)
	Dr Jon Burrows	JB	Representative of the Board of Faculty of Arts
	Professor David Davies	DD	Chair of the Faculty Education Committee (Science, Engineering and Medicine)
	Shingai Dzumbira	SD	Students Union Representative
	Joanne Garde-Hansen	JGH	Representative of the Board of Faculty of Arts
	Dr Lucy Hammond	LH	Representative of the Faculty of Science, Engineering and Medicine
	Professor Jonathan Heron	JH	Representative of the Institute for Advanced Teaching and Learning
	David Lees	DL	Faculty Senior Tutor, Faculty of Social Sciences (in place of Dean of Students)
	Professor Sarah Richardson	SR	Chair of the Faculty Education Committee (Arts)
	Dr Ross Ritchie	RR	Representative of the Faculty of Social Science (until 3:40pm)
	Dr Chris Rogers	CR	Representative of the Faculty of Social Science
	Professor Jane Sinclair	JS	Representative of the Faculty of Science, Engineering and Medicine
	Professor Colin Sparrow	CS	Academic Director (Graduate Studies)
	Professor Pat Tissington	PT	Academic Director (Employability)
	Gwen van der Velden	GvdV	Deputy Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Student Learning Experience)
	Dr Naomi Waltham-Smith	NWS	Chair of the Faculty Education Committee (Social Sciences)
	Dr Philip Young	PY	Representative of the Faculty of Science, Engineering and Medicine (until 3:30pm)
Attending			
	Katharine Gray	KG	Senior Assistant Registrar (Teaching Quality) (Secretary)
	Geraldine Connelly	GCon	Assistant Registrar (Assessment)
	Alison Greenhalgh	AG	Assistant Registrar (Learning and Teaching)
	Mahfia Watkinson	MW	Assistant Registrar (Learning and Teaching) (for Items 130 and 131)
	Andrew Higgins	AH	Director of Student Administrative Services (for Item 127)
Ref	Item		
119	<p>Apologies for absence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apologies were received from Robin Clark, Gill Cooke, Megan Clarke, Shingai Dzumbira, Beccy Freeman, Jonny Heron, Chris Hughes, Maureen McLaughlin, Jo Angouri and Jo Garde-Hansen. • Thanks was given to Colin Sparrow, who would be retiring at the end of the academic year, for all of their participation and engagement with AQSC. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was also the last meeting of AQSC for Katharine Gray, who would be moving on to a new role in the University and had been acting as Secretary to the committee for 11 years. Particular thanks was given to Katharine for all of her work on AQSC and would be very much missed.
120	<p>Declarations of Interest</p> <p>No new declarations were made.</p>
121	<p>Minutes of meeting held on held on 4 May 2021</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 4 May 2021 were received and approved.</p>
122	<p>Matters arising from meeting held on 4 May 2021</p> <p>The Committee received and noted report (122- AQSC020621). The key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many of the matters arising were now complete or scheduled for the September meeting of AQSC. Item 33: Examinations Committee - It was noted that the membership had been expanded to include an additional 3 academic representatives from each of the faculties. Item 56: First Year Board of Examiners – Item should now be removed from the list of matters arising. Item 85: Update to WMS Health, Welfare and Professionalism and Fitness to Practise Operational Procedures – Colleagues have now met and created a baseline document for departments with FTP to use. The item will come back to AQSC in September for approval, following review by two new FTP Chairs.
Substantive Items	
123	<p>Chair’s Business</p> <p>No matters of business were raised.</p>
124	<p>Students’ Union Update</p> <p>The Student’s Union representatives were not in attendance and no update was received.</p>
125	<p>Rules for Award</p> <p>The Committee received a report (125- AQSC020621) and a verbal update from the Assistant Registrar (Assessment). The key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Rules for Award had been shared with Faculty Education Committees and AQSC, who have provided their feedback and amendments to the Rules were made to reflect the comments shared. It was noted that clauses would 6.3, 7.7 and 8.6 had prompted questions from various colleagues, and as they were existing convention would need further exploration to determine any knock-on effect if changes were to be made. Amendments were required to the credit volumes for Pass Degrees in table 2 of appendix A, as it was agreed that the minimum credit to be taken should be 300 credits and the minimum credit to be passed would be 240 credits. The minimum credit to be taken at the highest level would be 60 credits, to align with the harmonised credit tariffs. These credit requirements would be applicable from the academic year 2021/22, when the new harmonised progression requirements for undergraduate students would be in place. Colleagues were supportive of exploring clause 6.3 further, but acknowledged there would be two different types of discussion required here within the one clause, which are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion on right to remedy failure that would impact on policy, which was developed to align with current convention. Impact on current arrangements for Mitigating Circumstances and shift in policy. That work was ongoing to determine if the additional assessment conventions currently published remain accurate. That, dependant on the outcome of the Progression and Remedying Failure recommendations to the Senate, clause 8.2 would need to be expanded to confirm the arrangements for core modules within the undergraduate progression requirements for 2021/22 onward.

	<p>DECISION: The Committee approved the Rules for Award, subject the amendment of pass degree credit volumes.</p> <p>ACTION: Work to assess any impact of changes to clauses 6.3, 7.7 and 8.6 would be undertaken by EPQ colleagues in 2021/22.</p>
126	<p>Policy on the Right to Remedy Failure</p> <p>The Committee received a report (126- AQSC020621) and a verbal update from the Assistant Registrar (Assessment). The key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Policy on the Right to Remedy Failure had been shared with Faculty Education Committees and AQSC, who have provided their feedback and amendments to the policy were made to reflect the comments shared. <p>DECISION: The Committee recommended that the Policy on Right to Remedy Failure be approved by the Senate.</p>
127	<p>Report from the Progression and Remediating Failure Sub-Group</p> <p>The Committee received a report (127-AQSC020621) and a verbal update from the Chair of the Progression and Remediating Failure Sub-Group. The key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recommendations from the Progression and Remediating Failure Sub-Group had been approved to the last meeting of AQSC, however, following approval it came to light that there were operational constraints to be considered. The concerns raised were reviewed and the recommendations tweaked for reconsideration by AQSC. • The changes made sat under the timing of examinations, but due to the need to discuss any changes in line with the timing of related processes and events, implementation in the academic year 2021/22 would not be possible. • It was recommended that the iteming of exams remain as per the existing academic year, where the resit period sits slightly earlier than previous years, with a full implantation review to take place as soon as possible. The proposed changes to the timing of examinations were based on the need to improve the student experience and colleagues were keen to have a timeframe for implementation in place at the earliest opportunity. • The recommendation suggested all exam boards need to happen prior to week 10, but should be amended to say all undergraduate finalist exam boards, with all other boards needing to take place to meet the published DRL submission deadlines. <p>Decision: The Committee recommended that the following recommendations from the Progression and Remediating Failure Sub-Group be approved by the Senate, subject to the amendment in wording of point c:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Approve that the Chair of the Progression and Remediating Failure Group engage in discussions with relevant stakeholders to determine whether changes to the timing of exams are possible outside of discussions on the timing of related processes and events. (b) Approve for an implementation review, including an impact assessment, to take place to consider the recommendation of a reduced examinations period in the Summer and a reassessment session to take place over the last week of August and first week of September. (c) Approve that all undergraduate <u>finalist</u> exam boards in term three must take place by the end of week 10 within each academic year <u>and all other boards</u> must take place at a time that which will to also ensures progression and award decisions are submitted for processing and conferral by the <u>DRL submission deadlines</u>. (d) Note that all Undergraduate re-assessments will continue be held in the current September exam window, with September exam boards required to return the required decisions by the <u>DRL submission deadlines</u>. (e) Approve the recommendation that reassessment papers should be produced and finalised, with sign off from the External Examiner, by the end of the second week of July in each academic year.

	<p>(f) Approve the module classification definitions as outlined in Appendix A.</p> <p>(g) Approve the following recommendations for inclusion in the harmonised progression requirements being introduced for students commencing on their programme of student in 2021/22 that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Where departments have less than 90 credits of core modules, all core modules must be passed and the student will progress if they pass enough additional credits to meet the 90 credit progression requirement, without restrictions on where the remaining credits should be gained. Where there are accreditation requirements in place for a course, these harmonised requirements would be superseded by the requirements of the Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body, ii. Where departments have more than 90 credits of core modules, the department should identify, at the course level, which of these modules are required to be passed for progression or award. These modules will be classified as ‘required core’ modules. <p>(h) Approve the recommendation that departments should update online information and student handbooks to confirm the harmonised course progression requirements for students registering for the first time in the academic year 2021/22.</p>
128	<p>Updates to the Policy on the Deferral of an Examinations Period</p> <p>The Committee received a report (128-AQSC020621) and a verbal update from the Deputy Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education and Policy). The key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Policy on the Deferral of an Examinations Period had been amended to reflect changes over the past 2 years, since it was first approved. • Senior tutors reported that the policy appeared to be working well and had been welcomed in departments. <p>DECISION: The Committee recommended that the Deferral of an Examinations Period be approved by the Senate.</p> <p>ACTION: That any changes to policy that impact on the Personal Circumstances portal be considered for development for the academic year 2021/22.</p>
129	<p>Information and Digital Group Update</p> <p>The Committee received a verbal update from the Director of Digital Strategy and Transformation. The key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IDG have introduced a single transformation function to work across the University. The Strategic Programme Delivery have been incorporated as part of DST to permit the unit to function and draw the people, process, and technology side of change together. • Work on communications regarding the organisational change for information, but to also clarify role of team and reassurance that projects won’t be impacted is ongoing. • The function aims to provide more meaningful support, and to ensure consistent service in place to get work completed. • The team are currently working through the organisational structure which will be developed over the summer in time for next academic year.
130	<p>Academic Integrity Update and Revisions to Regulations 10, 11 and 36</p> <p>The Committee received a report (130-AQSC020621) and a verbal update from the Academic Director (Postgraduate Taught) and Assistant Registrar (Learning and Teaching). The key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There had been three core regulations updated, with regulation 11 having been substantially re-written. The intention behind the work on Academic Integrity was to put a more positive spin on approach and encourage students to take pride in their work. • A new definition of academic misconduct had been developed, where the onus of establishing intention is with the University. However, with increased training and communications this onus should not be too difficult.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Departments would need to keep records of training and communications with their students. • Wording changes would be required to the following sections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Guidance: adding reference to aiding/abetting and an example on ‘providing paper’s’ to be explicit. ○ Clause 5.3: Amend to say students have right to remedy failure if ACP agrees to this. <p>DECISION: The Committee recommended that the guidance on Academic Integrity and revisions to Regulations 10, 11 and 36 be approved by the Senate, subject to the wording changes agreed.</p>
131	<p>Policy on Remote Proctoring</p> <p>The Committee received a report (131-AQSC020621) and a verbal update from the Academic Director (PGT) and Assistant Registrar (Learning and Teaching). The key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy had been difficult to develop in what is a controversial and changing field and should be subject to review after the Institutional Teaching and Learning Review or after three years, whichever is sooner. • The policy would be in place on an interim basis whilst awaiting confirmation and clarity on the technical aspects and the procurement of the end-to-end assessment system. • There was very much a divided opinion amongst staff and students on the use of proctoring, but the policy had been drafted to balance out different pedagogic and operational needs. • Requests for approval must be given on a module-by-module basis, via the Examinations Committee. In the long term, the requests could potentially be added to the module approval system but not for 2021/22. <p>DECISION: The Committee recommended that the policy of Remote Proctoring be approved by the Senate.</p> <p>DECISION: Proctoring approval requests would be considered on a module basis by the Examinations committee.</p>
132	<p>External Examiners’ Report Analysis for Undergraduate Courses 2019/20</p> <p>The Committee received a report (132-AQSC020621) and a verbal update from the Chair. The key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That there were 43 reports with outstanding responses from departments, but there appeared to be a reduction in the number of main issues of concern raised than were normally seen in the reports. • There was a difference in view amongst the reports over the 20-point marking scale, but a review of the scale would be honoured in 2021/22. • Some External Examiners noted that they were unaware of the marking criteria, which was a thought also raised by students in the NSS. • External Examiner reports for collaborative provision were reviewed by the Partnerships Committee and would be submitted for information to AQSC in September. <p>ACTION: AQSC to review the 20-point marking scale in 2021/22.</p> <p>ACTION: That for future reports, the Institutional Board of Examiners and Chief External Examiner Reports should be incorporated into the analysis.</p> <p>ACTION: Secretariat to confirm if the External Examiner Analysis reports should be submitted to SSG for information.</p>
133	<p>Assessment Submission Deadline for the Academic Year 2021/22</p> <p>The Committee received a report (133-AQSC020621) and a verbal update from the Assistant Registrar (Assessment). The key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that although representatives from the Students Union were not present, it was important to note that they previously felt a deadline with a fixed position would be preferable. • The Committee agreed that given the ongoing impact of covid-19 on teaching, learning and assessment, greater flex would be required for a further year.

	DECISION: The Committee recommended that the Senate approve that AQSC grant a general exemption to the 12 noon assessment submission deadline, and enable departments to set submission deadlines between 10:00am and 4:00pm (GMT) for the academic year 2021/22.
134	<p>Committee Effectiveness</p> <p>The Committee received a report (134-AQSC020621) and a verbal update from the Assistant Registrar (Assessment). The key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That there would be further work to take place to understand the committee’s effectiveness. • Efforts were being undertaken by the Governance team to look at diversity and inclusivity, and how representative membership is and should be considered when reviewing memberships.
135	<p>Updates to Regulation 42</p> <p>The Committee received a report (137-AQSC020621) and a verbal update from the Assistant Registrar (Assessment). The key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The changes proposed were intended to provide greater clarification on grounds for appeal and to reflect changes made to the constitution. • The terminology of PRP was to remain consistent with what is included in the guidance and regulation on Academic Integrity. <p>DECISION: The Committee recommended that the amendments to Regulation 42 be approved by the Senate.</p>
136	<p>AOB - Online assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee members raised that the move to online assessments has been welcomed and whilst it has its benefits and permits innovation, it has not been without issue, and this has mainly been regarding concerns of academic integrity. Members confirmed that there would be circumstances when exemptions may be sought, even when social restrictions are removed, and departments would be looking to determine what process or approach would be taken to request exemptions. • The Chair confirmed that a process was being worked on, and exemptions would be looked at by Examinations Committee, which has increased membership from faculty and academic representatives that would be asked to consider proposals made. • A criterion would need to be developed by the Examinations Committee as soon as possible. • Although online assessment is the preferred option, an exemption process would be required due to the operational oversight needed, the requirement for a consistent approach and the potential external regulatory scrutiny this may come order. <p>ACTION: Interim arrangement for exemption requests to online assessment to be considered by the Examinations Committee as a matter of urgency.</p>
<i>Items below this line were for receipt and/or approval, without discussion</i>	
For Information	
Approved by Chair’s Action	
137	<p>List of approved courses Dec 2019 – May 2021</p> <p>The Committee received and noted the report (135-AQSC020621)</p>
138	<p>Curriculum Change Logs Term 2 and 3 2020/21</p> <p>The Committee received and noted the report (136-AQSC020621)</p>