

**UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK**  
**ACADEMIC QUALITY AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE**  
**PUBLIC MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD 10:00, 23 MAY 2024**

<b>Present</b>	Professor Andy Clark	Co-Chair, Deputy Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education and Policy) (Meeting Chair)
	Professor Will Curtis	Co-Chair, Deputy Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education Quality and Standards)
	Professor Jo Angouri	Deputy Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education and Internationalisation)
	Professor Caroline Elliott	Chair of the Faculty Education Committee (Social Sciences)
	Professor Lorenzo Frigerio	Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education)
	Professor Beccy Freeman	Deputy Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education)
	Lee Griffin	Academic Director (Postgraduate Taught)
	Dr Marta Guerriero	Chair of the Faculty Education Committee (Arts)
	Dr Jeff Jones	Co-opted member of academic staff in a quality assurance role
	Professor Georgia Kremmyda	Chair of the Faculty Education Committee (Science, Engineering and Medicine)
	Dr Helen Nolan	Representative of the Board of the Faculty of Science, Engineering and Medicine
	Professor Ross Ritchie	Representative of the Board of the Faculty of Social Sciences
	Professor Jose Rodrigo	Representative of the Faculty of Science, Engineering and Medicine
	Holly Roffe	The Vice President Education of the Students' Union and Co-Chair of the Student Learning Experience and Engagement Committee
	Dr Chris Rogers	Representative of the Board of the Faculty of Social Sciences
	Dr Gavin Schwartz-Leeper	Associate Professor (Teaching Focussed), Liberal Arts
	Dr Jane Webb	Representative of the Board of Arts
Dr Tim White	Representative of the Board of Arts	
<b>Attending</b>	Lauren Baker	Head of Education Quality and Partnerships, Secretary
	Dr Lynne Bayley	Senior Policy Advisor (Assessment)
	Lauren Botham	Quality Assurance Manager (for item 092)
	Adam Child	Academic Registrar (for item 090)
	Will Ellis	Head of Portfolio - Student Lifecycle, IDG
	Dr Alexa Kirkaldy	Associate Professor (Teaching Focussed) (for developmental reasons)
	Siân Moore	Senior Policy Advisor (Assessment) (for item 091)
	Dr Nathan Morris	Senior Assistant Registrar (Student Complaints and Academic Casework) (for item 093)
	Eleanor Musson	Senior Project Officer (Online Assessment) (for item 090)
	Dr Claudia Rei	Associate Professor (Teaching Focussed), Economics (for items 094 and 101)
	Professor Jeremy Smith	Director of Undergraduate Studies, Economics (for items 094 and 101)
	Rob Stevens	Policy Advisor (Curriculum and Partnerships), Assistant Secretary
	<b>Ref</b>	<b>Item</b>

083	<p><b>Chair’s welcome and introduction</b></p> <p>The Chair welcomed all members, including Dr Marta Guerriero who attended their first meeting as Chair of the Faculty Education Committee (Arts).</p> <p>The Chair also expressed his thanks to Professor Caroline Elliott, who was attending their last meeting, and to the members approaching the end of their terms of membership:</p> <p>Dr Jeff Jones, Dr Helen Nolan, Vaishnavi Ravi, Professor Ross Ritchie, Holly Roffe, Dr Chris Rogers and Dr Tim White.</p>
084	<p><b>Apologies for absence</b></p> <p>Apologies were received from Professor David Davies, Dan Derricott, Dr David Lees, Dr Elena Riva, Professor Pat Tissington and Professor Phil Young.</p> <p>Dr Gavin Schwartz-Leeper was attending <i>in lieu</i> of Dr David Lees.</p>
085	<p><b>Declarations of Interest</b></p> <p>No new declarations were made.</p>
086	<p><b>Minutes of meeting held on 20 March 2024</b></p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 20 March 2024 (086-AQSC230524) were <b>approved</b>.</p>
087	<p><b>Matters arising from meeting held on 20 March 2024</b></p> <p>It was confirmed that an extraordinary meeting of the Committee was held on 26 April 2024 to consider a request from Classics and Ancient History (082-AQSC260424) for the assessment type to be amended to in-person examinations in several modules. This was due to a departmental pre-planned module briefing session for students.</p> <p>In addition, due to staffing changes, the Chair confirmed that CX230 and CX330 Epic &amp; Epyllion had now been approved for in-person examinations.</p>
088	<p><b>Chairs’ Business</b></p> <p>It was noted that the Committee Effectiveness item was absent from the final meeting of the Academic Quality and Standards Committee due to the ongoing Academic Governance Review.</p> <p>The Chair briefed the Committee on changes made to Rules for Award, where students must now take and pass 90 Level 6 credits instead of 80, impacting students who first enrolled in 21/22:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 48 students had been noted as not currently meeting this requirement.</li> <li>• Special Cases Committee was being set up to allow impacted students to be awarded and not disadvantaged.</li> <li>• To understand why this has happened, a Task &amp; Finish group was recommended.</li> <li>• To mitigate against this issue in the future, course handbooks were now required to be checked by EPQ.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION:</b> Secretariat to form a Rules for Award Task and Finish Group.</p> <p><b>ACTION 2:</b> Departments to submit course handbooks to EPQ by 9<sup>th</sup> September 2024 (Secretariat).</p>
089	<p><b>Students’ Union Update</b></p> <p>The Committee received a verbal report, and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The new Postgraduate SU Officer was being announced on 24 May 2024, with other new officers already been elected.</li> <li>• The SU undertook a student survey which included key issues including examination timetabling and assessment stacking which was being presented to Education Committee in June 2024.</li> </ul>

## Substantive Items

<b>090</b>	<p><b>Examination Methods: Policies and Guidance</b></p> <p>The Committee received the report (090-AQSC230524, Public) from the Academic Registrar, and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <p>The Academic Registrar convened a task and finish group of colleagues to ensure that policy and recommended operational practices for online assessment were applied consistently across online assessment systems, agreed changes to policy and recommended operational practice, agreed needs for additional information and guidance, and ensured communication and dissemination of both existing and new online assessment policy and practices.</p> <p>The group considered four main areas, with consideration given to student experience:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The approach to late submission due to technical issues, failure to submit, mitigating circumstances and the 'upload window' for online exams.</li> <li>2. Reading Time.</li> <li>3. 24-hour timeboxed exams.</li> <li>4. Invigilation.</li> </ol> <p>The task and finish group noted the implications on the mitigating circumstances policy and a lack of guidance available supporting operationalisation of Policy O: Examination Methods.</p> <p>New recommendations were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Definition of an Examination (published on module approval system web pages)</li> <li>• Code of Practice on Examination Methods (published as a link from Policy O)</li> <li>• Proposal to review assessment types/ categories and the online module approval system recommended to Senate.</li> </ul> <p>Recommendations for revision were to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy O: Examination Methods, recommended to Senate</li> <li>• Mitigating Circumstances Policy.</li> <li>• Further staff guidance regarding mitigating circumstances relating to on-line examinations.</li> </ul> <p>An issue was raised around the overlap of take-home examinations, which was recommended to be raised directly with Examinations Committee.</p> <p><b>DECISION 1:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved</b> the Code of Practice on Examination Methods and further staff guidance regarding mitigating circumstances relating to online examinations.</p> <p><b>DECISION 2:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>recommended approval to Senate</b> for Policy O: Examination Methods and the Mitigating Circumstances Policy.</p> <p><b>ACTION 1:</b> To form a task and finish group to review assessment types / categories and the online module approval system (MMA Team).</p> <p><b>ACTION 2:</b> Students' Union representatives to contact Examinations Committee to raise the issue of overlap of take-home examinations (Students Union)</p>
<b>091</b>	<p><b>University Criteria for Appointment of External Examiners</b></p> <p>The Committee received the report (091-AQSC230524, Public) from the Senior Policy Advisor (Assessment), Education Policy and Quality, and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Criteria for the Appointment of External Examiners document was last updated and approved for the 2016/17 academic year.</li> <li>• Since then, both the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) and Advance HE published revised governing documents and formed the basis for the recommended revisions to the following sections:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Person Specification</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Conflicts of Interest</li> <li>○ Term of Office</li> </ul> <p>Discussion from Committee members included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Concerns that recruitment of External Examiners (EEs) was very difficult.</li> <li>● It was often the case that departments relied on their own networks, including former PhD students to source new EEs.</li> <li>● EEs were expected to complete the job very quickly with a tight marking timeframe, which made it difficult to perform well.</li> <li>● The fee payments to EEs were recommended to be reviewed to determine whether these needed to be increased.</li> <li>● Some EEs were unhappy about the University’s approach to the Marking and Assessment Boycott in 2023.</li> </ul> <p>These comments were recommended to be fed into the upcoming Institutional Audit.</p> <p><b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved</b> the report.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> Comments to be fed into the External Examiner Institutional Audit (Lauren Baker)</p>
092	<p><b>Requirements for engaging students with curriculum change</b></p> <p>The Committee received the report (092-AQSC230524, Public) from the Quality Assurance Manager, Education Policy and Quality, and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The revised Curriculum and Partnerships Approval Policy was approved by Senate at the April 2024 meeting.</li> <li>● A key aspect of the policy, as informed by CMA expectations, was that the course students received must be what they reasonably expected it to be, based on the information provided pre-enrolment.</li> <li>● Where changes were made to a course, students must have been meaningfully consulted as part of the approvals process.</li> <li>● This guidance complimented the policy by providing details on how to fulfil the policy requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provided context on why engaging students, when making curriculum change, was an essential aspect of the approvals process.</li> <li>○ Supported the implementation of the Curriculum and Partnerships Approval Policy by providing clarity on how to engage students with curriculum change to ensure a positive student experience and compliance with statutory requirements.</li> <li>○ Provided three distinct engagement categories (inform, discuss and consent) and attached a category to individual change requests.</li> <li>○ Focused on the consultation requirements for when a late change is made.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Discussions from the Committee included the implications on format of assessment, notably on online examinations moving to in person examinations, and recommended changes including clarification that the assessment method can change for the next cohort without consent, only consultation.</p> <p>The Committee recommended that the guidance document needed to be clearer in places, including greater specificity as to what is required by ‘Consent’.</p> <p><b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved in principle</b> the report, with the resubmitted report to be circulated and approved by correspondence.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> The report to be edited and resubmitted to the Secretariat for Committee consideration (Lauren Botham)</p>
093	<p><b>Regulation 42 Changes</b></p>

	<p>The Committee received the report (093-AQSC230524, Protected) from the Senior Assistant Registrar (Student Complaints &amp; Academic Casework), and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The University had identified a historical anomaly within Regulation 42: Governing Academic Appeals that resulted in differential treatment for undergraduate and taught postgraduate students.</li> <li>• This was discussed at a previous AQSC (073-AQSC200324, Protected) where the Committee determined that this historical anomaly should be addressed by proposing an amendment to Regulation 42 to harmonise the approach for academic appeals for all taught students going forward at the next available opportunity.</li> <li>• All academic departments were approached, via the Director of Graduate Studies (or equivalent), to determine if there was broad support for this proposed amendment to Regulation 42 and if there were any concerns that they wished to raise, particularly considering the resource implications that had been highlighted previously to the AQSC.</li> <li>• Responses were received from 18 academic departments and all but one academic department was in favour of the proposed amendments.</li> </ul> <p><b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>recommended approval to Senate</b> for the report.</p>
094	<p><b>Bespoke Borderline Criteria for UG Degrees Offered by the Department of Economics</b></p> <p>The Committee received the report (094-AQSC230524, Public) from the Director of Undergraduate Studies and Associate Professor (Teaching Focussed), Economics, and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The existing University Guidelines for borderline cases risked, in the view of the Teaching and Learning Committee of the Department of Economics, lowering the expectations in terms of the requirement for a higher degree, particularly L100, compared to what was currently in place.</li> <li>• The department proposed that, for Economics degrees, a bespoke set of rules in Section 8.9(b)(i) and (ii) of Rules for Award should have been introduced.</li> </ul> <p>The Committee members had extensive discussions and were concerned that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The University has an underlying principle and direction of travel towards consistency across programmes and departments, and this request would go against this principle.</li> <li>○ There was no implementation plan for when the change would come into effect, and that the changes would make it more onerous for students to be promoted.</li> <li>○ It was not possible to bring in a change that disadvantaged students after they had started their course.</li> <li>○ There was no rationale for why Economics should have different borderline criteria compared to the rest of the university.</li> <li>○ The consistency of regulations and policy were important in OfS Conditions of Registration and the Degree Outcome Statement: it must be explainable how classifications were derived and why there were any variations.</li> </ul> <p>The Committee voted 11 to 2 in favour of not approving this report.</p> <p><b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>did not approve</b> the report.</p>
095	<p><b>Exemption Right to Remedy Failure</b></p> <p>The Committee received the report (095-AQSC230524, Public) from the Senior Policy Advisor (Assessment), and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Right to Remedy Failure Policy was introduced for students first enrolling on a programme of study in the 21/22 academic year onwards.</li> <li>• The policy originally exempted laboratory modules and modules that could not be reassessed for PSRB reasons.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy was updated for the 23/24 academic year to allow AQSC approval of modules that were exempt from the right to remedy failure to cover situations such as placement modules and modules that required laboratory work but did not have laboratory in the title.</li> <li>• Where modules were exempt from the right to remedy failure, this meant that students were not automatically entitled to an additional attempt, however reassessment could still have been offered if possible to do so.</li> <li>• Where it was not possible to guarantee that reassessment could be offered for a module, there must have been clear and consistent criteria for when reassessment could be offered.</li> <li>• In early 2024 it was observed that no independent requests for exemption from the right to remedy failure policy had been received by AQSC, however anecdotally it was apparent that some intercalated year, placement, or study abroad modules were not being reassessed.</li> <li>• Departments were asked to confirm the laboratory and PSRB modules that were historically exempt from the right to remedy failure policy and to make a request to submit any additional modules for approval.</li> <li>• There was an expectation that reassessment would still be offered for these modules wherever possible.</li> <li>• The requests for exemption from the right to remedy failure submitted by Departments were reviewed and categorised.</li> <li>• Requests for laboratory, placement modules and audit only modules, where clear from the submission that reassessment would be offered, were recommended to AQSC for approval.</li> <li>• The remaining modules requested for exemption were deemed to require detailed evaluation by a subject specialist as to whether it was acceptable not to offer reassessment.</li> <li>• Consequently, Science, Education and Medicine Faculty Education Committee required a mechanism for considering these modules and recommending as appropriate to AQSC for exemption from the right to remedy failure by Chair's Action.</li> </ul> <p><b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved</b> the modules in Appendix B as exempt from the right to remedy failure.</p> <p><b>ACTION 1:</b> Faculty Education Committee Chairs to determine a mechanism for considering modules in Appendix C and recommend to AQSC as exempt from the right to remedy failure where appropriate. (Lynne Bayley)</p> <p><b>ACTION 2:</b> Recommend that options in regulations and policies on reassessment with attendance and continuation of study be evaluated. (Lynne Bayley)</p>
096	<p><b>Postgraduate Taught External Examiners' Report Analysis 2022-23</b></p> <p>The Committee received the report (096-AQSC230524, Public) from the Academic Director (PGT), and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was a significant improvement in the numbers and quality of responses from External Examiner reports.</li> <li>• Areas of good practice identified in several departments included quality of feedback and student support, well designed and innovative assessments, and some examples of unique/distinctiveness in the sector through content or structure.</li> <li>• It was noted that some Examiners were having some difficulty accessing and using eVision.</li> <li>• Following discussion, WBS would like amendments to be made to the report as they felt the themes derived from one or two examiner comments were imbalanced and not representative of the overall summary of 27 examiners.</li> <li>• The actions listed have been recommended to be included in the External Examiners Institutional Audit.</li> </ul>

	<p><b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved</b> the report with the updated report to be signed off by Chair’s Action.</p> <p><b>ACTION 1:</b> The report to be resubmitted with updated themes for Chair consideration. (Lee Griffin)</p> <p><b>ACTION 2:</b> 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). (Lee Griffin)</p> <p><b>ACTION 3:</b> Consider improvements to eVision (Lee Griffin)</p> <p><b>ACTION 4:</b> Seek approval from departments who have been highlighted under areas of good practice in order to share the practices identified. (Secretariat)</p>
097	<p><b>Proposal for Annual Review Practice for Degree Apprenticeships</b></p> <p>The Committee received the report (097-AQSC230524, Public) from the Head of Education Policy and Partnerships, EPQ, and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <p>Quality Assurance review mechanisms were in already in place for Degree Apprenticeships under the Collaborative Review and ITLR, which occurred every 5 years, but there was no annual review process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A review template was developed to enable assessment of the overall health of a programme on an annual basis.</li> <li>• This included data and reflective narratives, designed to encourage enhancement.</li> <li>• The activity required information normally asked for as part of an annual programme level SAR but had been combined to avoid duplication and reduce administrative burden on departments.</li> <li>• The timing allowed a reflection on the previous year’s provision while being fed into the institutional SAR that was written over the summer.</li> <li>• Guidance was being developed to accompany this form.</li> <li>• Plans were being made to pre-populate some of the data requested.</li> <li>• The apprentice tracker would subsequently allow an insight into more detailed apprentice level data.</li> <li>• Close Scrutiny groups were proposed to be allocated from the Steering Committee membership, to look at the reviews and to draw out themes and actions.</li> <li>• Actions were to be fed into the department level QIP and a summary of themes were proposed to be taken to the first Steering Committee of the 24/25 academic year.</li> <li>• Following Partnership Committee scrutiny, a few minor changes were recommended, including a hybrid approach for non-standard programmes where information was to be captured over two academic years.</li> </ul> <p><b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved</b> the new process, which is to be undertaken for the first time over the summer.</p>
098	<p><b>Proposal for return to in-person exams in specified Warwick Business School postgraduate taught modules</b></p> <p>The Committee received the report (098-AQSC230524, Public) from the Representative of the Board of the Faculty of Social Sciences, and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The department advised of a disproportionate increase in cases of suspected cheating or collusion during the pandemic when all examinations were moved online.</li> <li>• While evidence was often considered insufficient to reprimand students, it raised reasonable doubt concerning academic integrity in online exams.</li> <li>• While the burden of proof demands absolute standards of evidence that may lead to disciplinary penalties, the department considered the evidence they had as valid to inform assessment policy decisions.</li> <li>• As such, WBS was given approval in summer 2022 for most of its online exams to move back to face-to-face to ensure academic integrity in their assessments.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approval was being sought for the remaining WBS MSc modules assessed by online exams to be moved to in-person.</li> <li>• Student support for in-person exams was provided in study skills sessions, and multiple communications were issued to students regarding eligibility and deadlines for Reasonable Adjustments.</li> </ul> <p>The Committee discussed the importance of student outcomes being monitored over time to identify awarding gaps, which was something the department confirmed already happened as standard practice.</p> <p><b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved</b> the report with the conditions that student outcomes are monitored over time to identify any awarding gaps, and appropriate training and support are provided for students taking in-person examinations.</p>
099	<p><b>Proposal for an in-person examination for the foundation module FP058 Biology Principles and Practice</b></p> <p>The Committee received the report (099-AQSC230524, Public) and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The IFP modules were benchmarked to A-Levels to allow international students to have gained a comparative qualification to apply for Undergraduate programmes in the UK.</li> <li>• The FP058 module had therefore undergone an alignment and benchmarking process to the intended learning outcomes, specification, and assessment methods of the major A-Level Biology qualification to satisfy Higher Education institutions that candidates were of a similar academic standard.</li> <li>• Biology A-Level qualifications were assessed through unseen, in-person, end of year examinations, and this request was to ensure international students were not disadvantaged by having an in-person examination in preparation for Level 4 studies.</li> <li>• The Committee confirmed that as this was a Level 3 assessment and equivalent to an A-Level, which were assessed in-person, this request would be approved without detailed discussion.</li> </ul> <p><b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved</b> the report with the conditions that student outcomes are monitored over time to identify any awarding gaps, and appropriate training and support are provided for students taking in-person examinations.</p>
100	<p><b>Application for 24/25 In-person EAP examinations for Warwick Foundation Studies</b></p> <p>The Committee received the report (100-AQSC230524, Public) and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During the pandemic the department delivered EAP Listening, Reading, and Speaking examinations online.</li> <li>• To increase security, the department proctored the Listening and Reading examinations.</li> <li>• However, it was challenging to guarantee their security so requested a return to in-person examinations from 2024/25.</li> <li>• The Committee confirmed that as this was a Level 3 assessment and equivalent to an A-Level, which were assessed in-person, this request would be approved without detailed discussion.</li> </ul> <p><b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved</b> the report with the conditions that student outcomes are monitored over time to identify any awarding gaps, and appropriate training and support are provided for students taking in-person examinations.</p>
101	<p><b>In-person invigilated exams for the Department of Economics</b></p> <p>The Committee received the report (101-AQSC230524, Public) from the Director of Undergraduate Studies and Associate Professor (Teaching Focussed), Economics, and key points and discussions were as follows:</p>

	<p>Following the AQSC approval of in-person examinations for 2023/24 Year 2 and Year 3 quantitative modules, the Department of Economics were requesting approval for all UG and PGT modules to return to in-person examinations from 2024/25.</p> <p>The rationale included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Academic integrity - the improvement of automated text generation technology was making online examinations unfit for formative assessment. The only way available to accurately test knowledge acquisition was through in-person examinations.</li> <li>b) Reputational Cost – to guarantee the quality and standards of a Warwick degree, it was vital to have assessment methods that met sector expectations.</li> <li>c) Inadequacy of the Warwick Assessment System.</li> </ul> <p>The Committee discussed the possibility of varying assessment types in the first year, and confirmed they would have conversations with module leaders about this. There was concern raised around the data bundling of BAME students, and that the Department should go down a level with their analysis to specifically look at the Black awarding gap.</p> <p>The department also confirmed that all students had been given appropriate training and support for in-person examinations.</p> <p><b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved</b> the report with the conditions that student outcomes are monitored over time to identify any awarding gaps, and appropriate training and support are provided for students taking in-person examinations.</p>
<b><i>Items below this line were for receipt and/or approval, without discussion</i></b>	
<b>102</b>	<p><b>Chair's Actions</b></p> <p>The Committee received and <b>noted</b> the report (102-AQSC230524)</p>
<b>103</b>	<p><b>Update on the Curriculum Management Project</b></p> <p>The Committee received and <b>noted</b> the report (103-AQSC230524)</p>
<b>104</b>	<p><b>Regulation 8.10</b></p> <p>The Committee received and <b>approved</b> the report (104-AQSC230524)</p>
<b>105</b>	<p><b>Update to Degree Apprenticeships Admissions Statement (under 18s)</b></p> <p>The Committee received and <b>approved</b> the report (105-AQSC230524)</p>
<b>106</b>	<p><b>PSRB Activity</b></p> <p>The Committee received and <b>noted</b> the report (106-AQSC230524)</p>
<b>107</b>	<p><b>Variation to Rules for Award (School of Engineering)</b></p> <p>The Committee received and <b>approved</b> the report (107-AQSC230524)</p>
<b>108</b>	<p><b>AQSC Membership Update</b></p> <p>The Committee received and <b>noted</b> the report (108-AQSC230524)</p>
<b>109</b>	<p><b>Standing Exemption Form – Liberal Arts</b></p> <p>The Committee received and <b>approved</b> the report (109-AQSC230524)</p>
<b>110</b>	<p><b>External Examiner Handbook 24/25</b></p> <p>The Committee received and <b>approved</b> the report (110-AQSC230524)</p>
<b>111</b>	<p><b>UCB Generic Learning Outcomes</b></p>

	The Committee received and <b>approved</b> the report (111-AQSC230524)
<b>112</b>	<b>UCB Early Childhood Validation</b> The Committee received and <b>approved</b> the report (112-AQSC230524)
<b>Other</b>	
<b>113</b>	<b>AOB</b> The Chair read a request received by email from ECLS requesting a move to in-person examinations for two modules in 24/25. The Committee discussed the item and concluded that an extraordinary meeting of AQSC should be held to be consistent. <b>ACTION:</b> Secretariat to contact department and members to organise a meeting as soon as possible. (Lauren Baker)
<b>Next meeting: 01 October 2024</b>	

<b>DECISIONS AND ACTIONS</b>			
<b>ITEM</b>	<b>DECISION/ACTION</b>	<b>LEAD AND DUE DATE</b>	<b>STATUS</b>
[2023-24]			
<b>088 Chairs' Business</b>	<b>ACTION:</b> Secretariat to form a Rules for Award Task and Finish Group.	Lauren Baker	Completed
<b>088 Chairs' Business</b>	<b>ACTION 2:</b> Departments to submit course handbooks to EPQ by 9 <sup>th</sup> September 2024 (Secretariat).	Secretariat	Ongoing
<b>090 Examination Methods: Policies and Guidance</b>	<b>DECISION 1:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved</b> the Code of Practice on Examination Methods and further staff guidance regarding mitigating circumstances relating to online examinations.		
<b>090 Examination Methods: Policies and Guidance</b>	<b>DECISION 2:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>recommended approval to Senate</b> for Policy O: Examination Methods and the Mitigating Circumstances Policy.		
<b>090 Examination Methods: Policies and Guidance</b>	<b>ACTION 1:</b> To form a task and finish group to review assessment types / categories and the online module approval system (MMA Team).	MMA Team	Ongoing
<b>090 Examination Methods: Policies and Guidance</b>	<b>ACTION 2:</b> Students' Union representatives to contact Examinations Committee to raise the issue of overlap of take-home examinations (Students Union)	Students' Union	Ongoing
<b>091 University Criteria for</b>	<b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved</b> the report.		

Appointment of External Examiners undergraduate modules			
091 University Criteria for Appointment of External Examiners undergraduate modules	<b>ACTION:</b> Comments to be fed into the External Examiner Institutional Audit (Lauren Baker)	Lauren Baker	Completed
092 Requirements for engaging students with curriculum change	<b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved in principle</b> the report, with the resubmitted report to be circulated and approved by correspondence.		
092 Requirements for engaging students with curriculum change	<b>ACTION:</b> The report to be edited and resubmitted to the Secretariat for Committee consideration (Lauren Botham)	Lauren Botham	Completed
093 Regulation 42 Changes	<b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>recommended approval to Senate</b> for the report.		
094 Bespoke Borderline Criteria for UG Degrees Offered by the Department of Economics	<b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>did not approve</b> the report.		
095 Exemption Right to Remedy Failure	<b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved</b> the modules in Appendix B as exempt from the right to remedy failure.		
095 Exemption Right to Remedy Failure	<b>ACTION 1:</b> Faculty Education Committee Chairs to determine a mechanism for considering modules in Appendix C and recommend to AQSC as exempt from the right to remedy failure where appropriate.	Lynne Bayley	Ongoing
095 Exemption Right to Remedy Failure	<b>ACTION 2:</b> Recommend that options in regulations and policies on reassessment with attendance and continuation of study be evaluated.	Lynne Bayley	Ongoing
096	<b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved</b> the report with the updated report to be signed off by Chair's Action.		

Postgraduate Taught External Examiners' Report Analysis 2022-23			
096 Postgraduate Taught External Examiners' Report Analysis 2022-23	<b>ACTION 1:</b> The report to be resubmitted with updated themes for Chair consideration.	Lee Griffin	Ongoing
096 Postgraduate Taught External Examiners' Report Analysis 2022-23	<b>ACTION 2:</b> 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).	Lee Griffin	Ongoing
096 Postgraduate Taught External Examiners' Report Analysis 2022-23	<b>ACTION 3:</b> Consider improvements to eVision.	Lee Griffin	Ongoing
096 Postgraduate Taught External Examiners' Report Analysis 2022-23	<b>ACTION 4:</b> Seek approval from departments who have been highlighted under areas of good practice in order to share the practices identified.	Rob Stevens	Ongoing
097 Proposal for Annual Review Practice for Degree Apprenticeships	<b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved</b> the new process, which is to be undertaken for the first time over the summer.		
098 Proposal for return to in-person exams in specified Warwick Business School postgraduate taught modules	<b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved</b> the report with the conditions that student outcomes are monitored over time to identify any awarding gaps, and appropriate training and support are provided for students taking in-person examinations.		

<p><b>099</b>  <b>Proposal for an in-person examination for the foundation module FP058 Biology Principles and Practice</b></p>	<p><b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved</b> the report with the conditions that student outcomes are monitored over time to identify any awarding gaps, and appropriate training and support are provided for students taking in-person examinations.</p>		
<p><b>100</b>  <b>Application for 24/25 In-person EAP examinations for Warwick Foundation Studies</b></p>	<p><b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved</b> the report with the conditions that student outcomes are monitored over time to identify any awarding gaps, and appropriate training and support are provided for students taking in-person examinations.</p>		
<p><b>101</b>  <b>In-person invigilated exams for the Department of Economics</b></p>	<p><b>DECISION:</b> The Academic Quality and Standards Committee <b>approved</b> the report with the conditions that student outcomes are monitored over time to identify any awarding gaps, and appropriate training and support are provided for students taking in-person examinations.</p>		
<p><b>113</b>  <b>AOB</b></p>	<p><b>ACTION:</b> Secretariat to contact department and members to organise a meeting as soon as possible.</p>	<p>Lauren Baker</p>	<p>Completed</p>