

<b>UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK</b>		
<b>ACADEMIC QUALITY AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE</b>		
<b>OPEN MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD 10:00, TUESDAY 22 NOVEMBER 2022, MS TEAMS</b>		
<b>Present</b>	Professor Andy Clark	Co-Chair, Deputy Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education and Policy) (Meeting Chair)
	Professor Dan Branch	Academic Director (Doctoral College)
	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
	Chih-Hsiang Lo	The Vice President Education of the Students' Union and Co-Chair of the Student Learning Experience and Engagement Committee
	Dr Helen Nolan	Representative of the Faculty of Science, Engineering & Medicine
	Hamza Rehman	The Vice President Postgraduate of the Students' Union
	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
	Professor Dmitriy Rumynin	Representative of the Faculty of Science, Engineering & Medicine
	Professor Patrick Tissington	Academic Director (Employability and Skills)
	Professor Gwen van der Velden	Deputy Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education)
	Dr Naomi Waltham-Smith	Chair of the Faculty Education Committee (Social Sciences)
	Dr Jane Webb	Representative of the Faculty of Arts
<b>Attending</b>	Lauren Baker	Quality and Partnerships Development Manager, (for items 029 and 031)
	Katie Berlin	Student Engagement Officer (for item 31)
	Dr Lynne Bayley	Senior Policy Advisor (Assessment), Acting Secretary
	Will Ellis	Project Manager, IDG
	Naomi Grew	Business Change Manager, IDG (for item 028)
	David Lees	Associate Professor, SMLC
	Vicky Marsh	Quality Review and Enhancement Manager, (for items 029 and 031)
	Andrew McGwinn	Project Manager, IDG (for item 028)
	Rob Stevens	Policy Advisor (Curriculum and Partnerships), Assistant Secretary
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Item</b>	
022	<p><b>Welcome and Apologies for absence</b></p> <p>The Chair welcomed all members, noting the following had joined the committee since the last meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will Ellis, Project Manager, IDG (attending)</li> </ul> <p>Apologies were received from Professor Jo Angouri, Dr Chris Rogers, Professor Chris Hughes, Dr Rebecca Freeman, Professor Will Curtis and Dr Tim White.</p>	

	<p>Professor Georgia Kremmyda left the meeting at 10:50, and Professor Sarah Richardson left the meeting at 11:50.</p> <p>Dr David Lees attended <i>in lieu</i> of Professor Rebecca Freeman.</p>
023	<p><b>Declarations of Interest</b></p> <p>No new declarations were made.</p>
024	<p><b>Minutes of last meeting on 28 September 2022</b></p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 28 September 2022 (024-AQSC211122, Public) were <b>approved</b>.</p>
025	<p><b>Matters arising from last meeting on 28 September 2022</b></p> <p>The matters arising were presented by the Deputy Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education and Policy).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was noted by the Director of Education Policy and Quality that the Rules for Award, minute 125 (20/21), and the 20-point marking scheme, minute 132 (20/21) were currently not resourced due to available capacity in EPQ and prioritisation of resource.</li> <li>• The timescales for the review of the 20 point marking scale was discussed, and the Chair of the Arts Faculty Education Committee requested that the minutes reflect that the Faculty believes that this should considered as a priority in the project to reform academic regulations.</li> </ul>
<b>Chair's Update</b>	
026	<p><b>Chair's Business and Actions</b></p> <p>The Committee received and noted a verbal update from the Chair.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Academic Director (Postgraduate Taught) will bring a summary of External Examiner Reports to the Committee in March 2023 covering the 2020/21 and 2021/22.</li> <li>2. An Online Assessment Project Group had been convened by the Interim Academic Registrar to cover information gathering and whether students bring their own device or third-party offerings are considered. It was noted that the group has a wide range of factors to consider.</li> </ol>
<b>Updates</b>	
027	<p><b>Students' Union Update</b></p> <p>The Committee received a verbal report from the Vice President Education and the Vice President Postgraduate of the Students' Union, with key details and discussions, as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Course Reps have completed training for this year but would run extra sessions if required.</li> <li>• The Course Rep system had been running satisfactorily.</li> <li>• The first draft of the TEF submission had been completed following consultation with focus groups and Core Insights.</li> <li>• The Students' Union (SU) had been working on various surveys in policy areas such as self-certification and lecture capture, that aligned to priorities. These would be presented through the University Committee Structure.</li> <li>• The SU were mandated to support industrial action and looked at how best to mitigate the action.</li> <li>• It was noted that the PGR survey is out, and the SU would be working with the Academic Director (Doctoral College) to focus on international students.</li> </ul> <p>The Committee thanked the Vice President Education and the Vice President Postgraduate of the Students' Union for their update and looked forward to receiving further updates.</p>
028	<p><b>Curriculum Management Project – Progress Update</b></p> <p>The Committee received a report (028-AQSC221122, Public) from the Business Change Manager and Project Manager with key details and discussions, as below:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was noted that the Request for Information process had been completed, with subsequent demos attended by the project team and stakeholders.</li> <li>• Formal approval had been obtained of the Initial Qualification Assessment for the project</li> <li>• Mapping of the end-to-end processes for all University departments and approval for a business case would take place over the next 6 months.</li> <li>• There was discussion around Curriculum Development and that IDG were looking at interim solutions for the current system, for example work already completed on the Course Approval system.</li> <li>• The Committee asked for information on the timescales for development of a module selection tool. It was noted that a module selection tool would be contingent on reliable data from the curriculum management system. It was also noted that the a system for module selection cannot be implemented without having agreement on the process for module selection and that process mapping could occur concurrently with the curriculum management project.</li> <li>• AQSC members were invited to contact the project team or AQSC secretariat if they had further questions.</li> </ul> <p>The Committee thanked the Business Change Manager and Project Manager for their update and looked forward to receiving further updates.</p>
029	<p><b>ITLR Update</b></p> <p>The Committee received a verbal update and presentation from the Quality Review and Enhancement Manager and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The six cluster leads for Professional Services had all been assigned, with support sessions planned.</li> <li>• An update on Common themes was provided, detailing that Blended Learning, Education for Sustainable Development and Interdisciplinary Learning themes had all convened.</li> <li>• ITLR was about to move into the second stage of the timeline, pending some external reviewers in some instances.</li> <li>• A plan of forthcoming review stages was provided, detailing the impending schedule for ITLR.</li> </ul> <p>The Committee thanked the Quality Review and Enhancement Manager for their update and looked forward to receiving further updates.</p>
<b>Substantive Items</b>	
030	<p><b>Annual Report from Examinations Committee</b></p> <p>The committee received the report (030-AQSC221122, Public) from the Head of Student Records. The key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The report was particularly data heavy but indicated a significant increase in small rooms and rest breaks.</li> <li>• The main issue highlighted was marks management and how results were getting to the centre due to the variety of people that could ask questions.</li> <li>• Discussion took place around problems with resits and resit coding, in particular the exam board date and submission to centre date – departments were having issues with that due to the number of processes through Tabula. Pre-Covid all required was the decision and whether they could go to Degree Congregations. Now marks had to be in before the decision could be submitted, which is significant. The Business Analyst in IDG was leading on this and it was work in progress.</li> <li>• It was noted that the increase in number of students having reasonable adjustment was not the issue, students with rest breaks had to sit in the departments due to recommendations from Wellbeing which became a resource issue. Discussion took place around the timing of the exam boards and that the reliance on the summer assessment period placed pressure on deadlines for boards.</li> <li>• The purpose of the report from Examinations Committee and how Academic Quality and Standards Committee could review the effectiveness was discussed.</li> </ul>

	<p><b>ACTION:</b> The Secretariats of the Examinations Committee and Academic Quality and Standards Committee to tailor the content of the annual report for AQSC in 23/24. (SM)</p>
031	<p><b>Results of the National Student Survey 2022</b></p> <p>The Committee received the report from the Quality Review and Enhancement Manager and the Student Engagement Officer (031-AQSC221122, Protected) and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Quality Review and Enhancement Manager advised that 61% of final year undergraduates at Warwick completed the 2022 survey, which had fallen year on year, but had a faster rate of decline at the institution. Discussion continued around the campaign being 4 years old and needed revitalising.</li> <li>• Overall satisfaction amongst our students was 81.4%, which was 5.4% above the sector average and Warwick retained third place in the Russell Group.</li> <li>• Warwick was 27<sup>th</sup> in the table for overall satisfaction, higher than their position pre-pandemic, and were 2<sup>nd</sup> in the West Midlands.</li> <li>• The Student Engagement Officer announced the headlines on ups and downs, which was narrowed down by department.</li> <li>• Members welcomed the report, however raised concerns around whether there was a strategic plan for the response to the two new questions.</li> <li>• The Deputy Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) advised that the institution should do nothing this year about the two new questions, see the first set of outcomes, and then see where we are with our baseline.</li> </ul>
032	<p><b>Undergraduate External Examiners' Report Analysis</b></p> <p>The Committee received the report from the Deputy Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education and Policy) (032-AQSC221122, Public) and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was noted that comments on External Examiner reports were outstanding from 29 departments.</li> <li>• One Final Year External Examiner remarked they had not received departmental comments on their report for three consecutive years.</li> <li>• Areas of good practice included quality of feedback and moderation, and in assessment with well-articulated and helpful marking criteria in some departments.</li> <li>• Common themes on areas for improvement included IT access, password provision, eVision, which needs to be looked at by IDG.</li> <li>• Analysis has been undertaken to try and to triangulate with NSS scores, but there did not appear to be any correlation.</li> <li>• The University was addressing many of the concerns raised in the External Examiners' reports. In particular, ITLR, development of a central online assessment session, review of regulations and policies to be initiated in 23/24 and the Curriculum Review and Course Approval projects.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTIONS:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) IDG to address the concerns of external examiner around IT issues and password provision for 22/23. (WE)</li> <li>2) Education Policy and Quality (EPQ) to review the workflow process for 'follow-up' of external examiner reports to ensure full records are obtained and responses to reports are thorough and robust from departments and the central University (when required). (Secretariat)</li> <li>3) Seek approval from departments who have been highlighted under areas of good practice to share the practices identified. (EPQ)</li> <li>4) To consider how to close the feedback loop and inform External Examiners on actions being taken at an institutional level based on their reports. (DD/AC)</li> <li>5) To consider how to use ITLR to discuss issues identified in external examiner reports with individual departments. (DD/AC)</li> </ol>

033	<p><b>University of Warwick Link Tutor Role and Responsibilities</b></p> <p>The Committee received the report presented by Quality and Partnerships Development Manager (033-AQSC221122, Public) and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The institution validated a range of UG and PG programmes that were delivered by UCB. Over the last year work had taken place to operationalise the partnership and embed quality assurance mechanisms to assure the quality of delivery and awards that Warwick will be validating.</li> <li>• The paper proposed a model of quality assurance through the introduction of Link Tutors in the partnership with UCB.</li> <li>• UCB had robust and thorough quality assurance processes in the form of reviews, so this role was to introduce extra layers of assurance to show external regulators and council that we had a watertight approach.</li> <li>• The foundations of this approach had been pulled together from practice elsewhere.</li> <li>• Link tutors would give a line of sight on how UCB were quality assuring at programme level and module level.</li> <li>• Accreditation Visitors were already in place who took an institutional view of quality assurance. This role delved deeper into programme level quality assurance and allowed the Accreditation Visitors to step back and see the whole picture.</li> <li>• The proposal was for some academic colleagues from the institution at programme level to have sight of quality processes. Although they were not subject level experts, they would understand the discipline.</li> <li>• Next steps would be led by accreditation visitors, who do not have subject level experts due to nature of UCB programmes</li> </ul> <p><b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved</b> the recommendation for the creation of the Link Tutor role.</p>
034	<p><b>Annual Report on Academic Misconduct Cases</b></p> <p>The Committee received the report presented by the Academic Integrity Lead (034-AQSC221122, Public) and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The analysis showed that that there were slightly fewer investigations which dropped from 12.5% to 7.66%, but the percentage upheld had increased, but this was the first year that they have had a two pronged approach.</li> <li>• There was huge variety in reporting between departments, so the data was not very meaningful, therefore in the future there needed to be thought about how the data was collected.</li> <li>• The Committee would like to see number of module registrations but cannot get down to that level of data, as it was not recorded.</li> <li>• It would have been helpful if there was a case management system that started things being logged and allowed easy access to data.</li> <li>• There was support for the idea of an end-to-end system but thought needed to be provided about changes to the system and how the impact was assessed.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTIONS:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Academic Misconduct Departmental Reporting Form to be amended to enable analysis of sanctions and to avoid requesting data which is centrally available (module registration, number of discrete assessment components per module). The updated Academic Misconduct Departmental Reporting Form to be published significantly in advance of the deadline, on a webpage with guidance on the information being requested.</li> <li>2) Departments to be able, but not required, to provide a narrative on their Academic Misconduct Return to provide relevant information on trends in academic integrity in the Departmental context.</li> <li>3) An academic misconduct return to be requested for Autumn 2023 from IATL and ADC.</li> </ol>

	<p>4) Communicate to IDG that a case management system to support Academic Misconduct remains a goal to reduce workload, mitigate information security risks and support analysis and understanding of trends.</p>
035	<p><b>Annual Report on Timeliness of Feedback</b></p> <p>The Committee received the report presented by the Senior Policy Advisor (Assessment) (035-AQSC221122, Public) and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compliance with the policy was in most cases described as remaining steady with the majority of feedback being returned within the turnaround time.</li> <li>• Analysis was undertaken to identify if there was a correlation between NSS and reports, but there did not appear to be.</li> <li>• Two reasons were identified as being reasons for not meeting feedback turnaround times: the turnaround time should have been extended due to late student submission. Guidance should be provided to make it clearer that the 20-working day turnaround period started at the student deadline or the submission date, whichever is later.</li> <li>• It was discussed that the primary issue with large numbers of students self-certifying is not the turnaround for the individual submissions, but that it was not possible to start moderation of an assessment until later.</li> <li>• It was discussed that the self-certification period of extension is particularly long over the Christmas vacation due to the University closure days.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTIONS:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) There are significant areas of good practice around the university in curriculum review, development of localised marking practices, localised policy, and administrative procedures. Consideration should be given to facilitating the sharing of good practice. (LBay)</li> <li>2) Some of the reported reasons for not meeting feedback turnaround times relate to circumstances where the turnaround time should have been extended due to late student submission. Guidance should be provided to make it clearer that the 20-working day turnaround period starts at the student deadline (which is the extended deadline if an extension or self-certification has been granted) or the submission date, whichever is later. (LBay)</li> <li>3) The Centre for Teacher Education should be invited to discuss feedback turnaround times over school holidays with their SSLC and to submit a proposal for AQSC consideration if a supported local policy is agreed. (Secretariat)</li> <li>4) The requested system related support should be shared with IDG. (Secretariat)</li> </ol>
036	<p><b>Analysis of Award Trends</b></p> <p>The Committee received the report presented by the Senior Policy Advisor (Assessment) (036-AQSC221122, Protected) and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was noted that there may be legitimate reasons for the increases in first, upper second class and good honours outcomes, including the entry tariff and diversification of assessment started in the assessment review prior to the pandemic.</li> <li>• It was discussed that the proscribed 20 point marking scale defines the mark to be awarded and changes to combat grade inflation would require a review of the marking scale.</li> <li>• It was noted that changes to policy such as the right to remedy failure would be expected to contribute to the increase in good awards.</li> <li>• It was agreed that there is a complex set of factors contributing to the percentage of good outcomes and that the University should be prepared to defend the reasons for the changes, but there does not appear to be a significant cause for concern over grade inflation at the moment.</li> </ul>

037	<p><b>Training for Roles Relating to Boards of Examiners</b></p> <p>The Committee received the report presented by the Senior Policy Advisor (Assessment) (037-AQSC221122, Public) and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A steer on mandatory training for Exam Board Chairs and Secretaries had already been provided by Academic Quality and Standards Committee.</li> <li>• The recommendation for training was that mandatory training should also be provided for Chairs of Mitigating Circumstances Recommendation Panels as there were some areas of policies that were being inconsistently applied by departments.</li> <li>• It was noted that staff who are Mitigating Circumstances Recommendation Panel Chairs may be Senior Tutors and already undertake training with the Dean of Students.</li> <li>• It was agreed that the Dean of Students should be consulted to check whether the Boards of Examiner training would duplicate or overlap with existing training for Senior Tutor, and that the proposal could be approved by Chair's Action following this consultation.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION:</b> Dean of Students to be asked to provide a view on the overlap between Board of Examiner Training for Mitigating Circumstances Recommendation Panel Chairs and existing training for Senior Tutors. (LBay)</p>
<b>Items below this line were for receipt and/or approval, without discussion</b>	
038	<p><b>Chair's Actions</b></p> <p>The Committee received and noted the report (038-AQSC221122, Public)</p>
039	<p><b>Department Academic Misconduct Reports</b></p> <p>The Committee received and noted the report (039-AQSC221122, Public)</p>
040	<p><b>Timeliness of Feedback Reports</b></p> <p>The Committee received and noted the report (040-AQSC221122, Public)</p>
041	<p><b>Report on courses approved between October 2021 and September 2022</b></p> <p>The Committee received and noted the report (041-AQSC221122, Public)</p>
042	<p><b>Process for Exam Boards, Award and Graduation under the UCB/ UoW Partnership</b></p> <p>The Committee received and <b>approved</b> the report (042-AQSC221122, Public)</p>
043	<p><b>PSRB Register Update</b></p> <p>The Committee received and noted the report (043-AQSC221122, Public)</p>
<b>Other</b>	
044	<p><b>Any other business</b></p> <p>There was no other business.</p>
<b>Next meeting: Tuesday 31 January 2023, 14:00, Microsoft Teams</b>	

DECISIONS AND ACTIONS			
ITEM	DECISION/ACTION	LEAD AND DUE DATE	STATUS
[2022-2023]			
030 Annual Report from Examinations Committee	<b>ACTION:</b> The Secretariats of the Examinations Committee and Academic Quality and Standards Committee to tailor the content of the annual report for AQSC in 23/24. (SM)	Sharon Miles November 2023	Not yet due
032 Undergraduate External Examiners' Report Analysis	<b>ACTION 1:</b> IDG to address the concerns of external examiner around IT issues and password provision for 22/23.	Will Ellis Summer 2023	In progress
032 Undergraduate External Examiners' Report Analysis	<b>ACTION 2:</b> Education Policy and Quality (EPQ) to review the workflow process for 'follow-up' of external examiner reports to ensure full records are obtained and responses to reports are thorough and robust from departments and the central University (when required).	Secretariat to report to MMA team, TBC	Not yet due
032 Undergraduate External Examiners' Report Analysis	<b>ACTION 3:</b> Seek approval from departments who have been highlighted under areas of good practice to share the practices identified.	EPQ Deferred Action, TBC	Not yet due
032 Undergraduate External Examiners' Report Analysis	<b>ACTION 4:</b> To consider how to close the feedback loop and inform External Examiners on actions being taken at an institutional level based on their reports.	Dan Derricott / Andrew Clark	Complete
032 Undergraduate External Examiners' Report Analysis	<b>ACTION 5:</b> To consider how to use ITLR to discuss issues identified in external examiner reports with individual departments.	Dan Derricott / Andrew Clark January 2023	Complete
033 University of Warwick Link Tutor Role and Responsibilities	<b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved</b> the recommendation for the creation of the Link Tutor role.		
034 Annual Report on Academic Misconduct Cases	<b>ACTION 1:</b> Academic Misconduct Departmental Reporting Form to be amended to enable analysis of sanctions and to avoid requesting data which is centrally available (module registration, number of discrete assessment components per module). The updated Academic Misconduct Departmental Reporting Form to be published significantly in advance of the deadline, on a webpage with guidance on the information being requested. Departments to be able, but not required, to provide a narrative on their Academic Misconduct	Lee Griffin / Lynne Bayley April 2023	Complete



<b>034 Annual Report on Academic Misconduct Cases</b>	<b>ACTION 2:</b> An academic misconduct return to be requested for Autumn 2023 from IATL and ADC.	Lynne Bayley September 2023	Not yet due
<b>034 Annual Report on Academic Misconduct Cases</b>	<b>ACTION 3:</b> Communicate to IDG that a case management system to support Academic Misconduct remains a goal to reduce workload, mitigate information security risks and support analysis and understanding of trends.	Secretariat November 2023	Complete
<b>035 Annual Report on Timeliness of Feedback</b>	<b>ACTION 1:</b> There are significant areas of good practice around the university in curriculum review, development of localised marking practices, localised policy, and administrative procedures. Consideration should be given to facilitating the sharing of good practice.	Lynne Bayley June 2023	Not yet due
<b>035 Annual Report on Timeliness of Feedback</b>	<b>ACTION 2:</b> Some of the reported reasons for not meeting feedback turnaround times relate to circumstances where the turnaround time should have been extended due to late student submission. Guidance should be provided to make it clearer that the 20-working day turnaround period starts at the student deadline (which is the extended deadline if an extension or self-certification has been granted) or the submission date, whichever is later.	Lynne Bayley September 2023	Not yet due
<b>035 Annual Report on Timeliness of Feedback</b>	<b>ACTION 3:</b> The Centre for Teacher Education should be invited to discuss feedback turnaround times over school holidays with their SSLC and to submit a proposal for AQSC consideration if a supported local policy is agreed.	Secretariat December 2022	Complete
<b>035 Annual Report on Timeliness of Feedback</b>	The requested system related support should be shared with IDG.	Secretariat December 2022	Not yet due
<b>037 Training for Roles Relating to Boards of Examiners</b>	Dean of Students to be asked to provide a view on the overlap between Board of Examiner Training for Mitigating Circumstances Recommendation Panel Chairs and existing training for Senior Tutors.	Lynne Bayley November 2022	Complete
<b>040 Process for Exam Boards, Award and Graduation under the UCB/ UoW Partnership</b>	The Committee received and <b>approved</b> the report.		