

UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK
FACULTY OF SCIENCE, ENGINEERING AND MEDICINE EDUCATION COMMITTEE
OPEN MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD THURSDAY 3 FEBRUARY 2022

Present	Professor David Davies	DD (Chair)	Chair
	Professor Till Bretschneider	TB	Computer Science
	Dr Claudie Fox	CF (Psych)	Psychology
	Dr Daniel Franklin	DF	Life Sciences
	Dr Lucy Hammond	LEH	Warwick Medical School
	Dr Paul Jenkins	PJ	Statistics
	Dr Alex Jones	AJ	Life Sciences
	Dr Matt Jones	MJ	WMG
	Dr Russ Kitson	RK	Chemistry
	Professor Georgia Kremmyda	GK	Engineering
	Dr James Lloyd-Hughes	JLH	Physics
	Professor Dan Nunan	DN	WMG
	Dr Anastasia Papavasileiou	AnP	Statistics (Deputy Chair)
	Dr Michael Pounds	MP	Physics
	Professor Lesley Roberts	LR	Warwick Medical School
	Professor Jose Rodrigo	JR	Mathematics
	Professor Dmitriy Rumynin	DR	Mathematics
	Professor Mark Steel	MS	Statistics
	Dr Helen Toner	HT	Faculty Senior Tutor
	Dr Cagatay Turkyay	CT	Faculty of Social Sciences representative
Dr Adrian von Muhlenen	AvM	Psychology	
Professor Martin Wills	MW	Chemistry (Deputy Chair)	
Dr Dave Wood	DW	Mathematics	
Attending	James Alexander	JA	Strategic Change Director, Information & Digital Group (item 033)
	Amanda Bishop	AB	Faculty Widening Participation Coordinator
	Megan Caulfield	MC	Senior Projects Officer (Student Success)
	Amy Collins	AHC	Assistant Secretary
	Dan Derricott	DD (EPQ)	Director of Education Policy & Quality (item 032)
	Craig Franklin	CF (Sec)	Secretary
	Beccy Freeman	BF	Dean of Students (item 034)
	Dr Gemma Gray	GG	Faculty Student Engagement Coordinator
	Gwen Van Der Velden	GvdV	Deputy Pro Vice Chancellor (Education), WIHEA (item 033)

Ref	Item
022	<p>Apologies for absence</p> <p>Apologies were received from Adam Chester (Computer Science) and Nikola Chmel (Chemistry).</p> <p>Apologies were also received from Gill Cooke (Engineering) and Bo Kelestyn (Chemistry) who had both stepped down from the Committee; the Chair thanked them for their service.</p> <p>The Chair welcomed the new Secretary: Craig Franklin (EPQ) replacing Louise Hasler.</p>

023	<p>Declarations of Interest</p> <p>No new declarations were made.</p>
024	<p>Equality diversity and inclusion</p> <p>Members were reminded to engage with agenda items in light of the University’s policies that support equality, diversity and inclusion.</p>
025	<p>Minutes of last meeting on 27 October 2021</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 27 October 2021 were received and approved.</p>
026	<p>Matters arising from last meeting on 27 October 2021</p> <p>(a) Agenda planning and order of business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Widening Participation item had been placed after the Strategic item as per the action on the Secretariat, and this would be done for future meetings. • Similarly, the other two regular update items (Postgraduate Business and SLEEC Update) had been placed alongside Widening Participation. <p>(b) Circulation of minutes of Student Learning Experience and Engagement Committee (SLEEC) meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A link to published SLEEC agendas and minutes had been included below the line as per the action on the Secretariat, and this would be done for future meetings.
Chair’s Update	
027	<p>Chair’s Business</p> <p>The Committee received and noted a verbal update from the Chair as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The disestablishment of the First Year Board of Examiners (FYBoE) had been approved by Senate. • The proposal for a future Shape of the Academic Year had been returned for further work by Senate; the proposed model was not well received by Senate and so the expectation was that a range of models would be presented to give further options at a future meeting. • The University had retained a commitment to the use of face coverings in teaching settings, albeit other Covid-19 mitigations had been eased; members reported variance in compliance amongst the student body, but with acknowledgement that students would generally comply when explicitly asked. • The Office for Students had released a Consultation on the Teaching Excellence Framework which was being digested by the Education Executive; it was noted that there would be a fourth category of “no award” in addition to gold, silver, and bronze; metrics would remain but would not form more than 50% of the overall judgement; and panels would not make their initial evaluation based solely on metrics. • Georgia Kremmyda would serve as SEMEC representative on the Board of the Faculty (BFSEM), replacing Gill Cooke; this had been approved on Chair’s Action.
Strategic Item	
028	<p>What’s the use of Lectures?</p> <p>The Committee engaged in discussion led by the Chair as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose of this discussion was to consider and evaluate the purpose of the lecture in science, technology, engineering and medicine (STEM) subjects, and in light of the recent experiences of the pandemic. <p>Various departments had engaged with students to understand preferences between online and face-to-face lectures with findings as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chemistry found an even split in preference blended/traditional. • Life Sciences had a strong steer from students to return to face-to-face lectures.

- About 45% of Physics students recently surveyed found no benefits to blended and/or online aspects of learning; 45% felt there were some benefits; only 10% were fully positive about the experience.
- There were students on the MBChB in Warwick Medical School (WMS) that benefitted from online lectures (called “lecture-light”), in terms of flexibility to fit this around other learning in an intensive course; but WMS also had other varying views from students in line with above reports from other departments.
- The WP team also had students at a recent event in a lecture theatre express that they had not entered a lecture theatre until that point, but nonetheless had significant positive feedback about online learning as an experience (ability to re-watch and digest, not having to travel, flexibility).

Members noted the following advantages and challenges of face-to-face lectures:

- Face-to-face lectures could still be recorded and re-watched using lecture capture technology, for those students who found this aspect of the online experience beneficial.
- Chemistry students had expressed surprise, and a resultant sense of scale, over the number of students on their course when attending large face-to-face lectures; this would not have the same effect with seminars or smaller groups.
- Several factors might influence the benefits of different media and methods of delivering them, including level of study, past experience, and disciplinary specifics.
- Social benefits of face-to-face study were evident, and members also raised that the more important thing to consider was therefore how to get the best of whatever forms of face-to-face contact with students.
- Some students reported that it was easier to focus on lectures in person than online.
- There was a pedagogical tension between concerns around passive learning, versus the efficiency of the lecture as a medium for delivering content to large numbers in a short time and a single space; however, there were known solutions to this challenge such as lecture theatres with booth-style formations (allowing for large scale delivery but integrated small group discussion in real time).
- Where most teaching was in-person, but some was synchronous online, physical and online sessions could not be scheduled back-to-back with each other for logistical reasons.
- Statistics had only been able to go back to about one third face-to-face lectures, which was in part due to cautiousness, but also in particular due to timetabling challenges; for example, finding big enough rooms that also had blackboards (for the specific content being taught).
- One example given from WMS was around handling triggering topics; students with past trauma might find these more navigable if engaging online, but equally tutors would not know if a student was struggling with such a topic and might need any pastoral support intervention in that scenario.

There was some discussion on lecture as a medium and other connected media:

- LR cautioned that lecture was the medium whereas the distinction between in-person and online was about the method of delivering this medium; if the question was about the purpose of lectures, it was important to consider this notwithstanding the method.
- CT (Social Sciences Faculty Representative) reported that the Centre for Interdisciplinary Methodologies (CIM) had been delivering most lecture content as short, pre-recorded lectures, subsequently using the classroom for discussion and reflection on these, as well as noting the discussions often continued further asynchronously on Teams channels; noted also as a caveat that CIM was a department dealing with cross-faculty students but only PGT.

The Chair facilitated some discussion of student numbers and scalability:

- The Chair opened this topic with a question of whether departments could sustain current operations with an increase of 30-40% in student numbers.
- Life Sciences did not have anticipated resource increasing in line with student numbers; therefore, if lectures were online, only these would be scalable, but not everything else.
- Life Sciences also reported that during the online period they had offered students campus-based Question and Answer sessions, which they could no longer sustain with lectures in person, but which students were expressing that they valued and wanted to experience again.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AP commented that it would be better not to plan for a 30-40% increase in students if the University and/or departments could not achieve the necessary aligned resource increase. <p>Closing notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair offered assurance there would be a consultation on the plans for the new teaching building within the STEM Grand Challenge, so there would be further opportunities for input in this space.
Main Section	
029	<p>Widening Participation</p> <p>The Committee received the report (029.SEMEC.21-22), with key points and discussions as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training on the Attainment Dashboard had taken place and slides could be circulated to members who wished to see these; it was noted that Teaching Excellence Group (TEG) meetings would include the same dataset, so AB voiced an offer of support to departments in digesting and analysing this in the TEG context. • The safeguarding team had approval to renew their online licence with Educare; departments were encouraged that any staff or student involved in working with under-18s (open days, events on campus and in schools) complete the Safeguarding in Education module. • AB had been running Department Ambassador and Societies training to ensure there were no gaps in provision; in particular this was important because the Students Union did not have safeguarding training of its own, but some societies had activities with young people that required such training. • There was a new pilot programme supporting local secondary schools, by matching Warwick students to local GCSE/A-Level students for mentoring. <p>AB also highlighted these forthcoming events from the report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slice of Science Family Event: Sunday 13th March 2022 • Slice of Science Schools Day: Wednesday 16th March 2022 <p>AB provided the names of the Safeguarding Contacts in SEM departments for circulation in these minutes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chemistry: Michael Ward • Computer Science: Claire Rocks • Engineering: Dave Britnell and Caroline Whitehouse • Maths: Jen Bowskill • Physics: Ayesha Rahman and Ally Caldecote • Psychology: Kate Messenger and Linda Wilson • Life Sciences: Leanne Williams • Statistics: Horatio Boedihardjo • WMG: Catherine Gordon • Warwick Medical School: Celia Brown and Kate Owen
030	<p>Postgraduate Business</p> <p>The Committee received a verbal report, with key points and discussions as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main scholarships and studentships were closed for applications, and departments would be in the process of making their submissions. • There was no limit on China Scholarship Council (CSC) applications for the current cycle. • Warwick Industrial Fellowships (WIF) calls were open with an internal SEM deadline of Tuesday 1st March 2022 and an initial quota of 12; as usual if other faculties did not meet their quota there may be added opportunities made available later for SEM. • Thanks was given to all who had agreed to become faculty selectors for the above. • The Doctoral College were undertaking visits to departments; this was an opportunity to feed back on PGR matters which MW encouraged departments to engage with.

031	<p>Student Learning Experience and Engagement Committee Update</p> <p>The Committee received a verbal report, with key points and discussions as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There had been a report from the Warwick International Higher Education Academic (WIHEA) learning circle on peer mentoring which was next due for consideration at Education Committee; this was recommending a bare minimum of one form of support being put in place per department as well as establishment of peer mentoring champions in each department. • There was a project in transforming digital education, which was condensing multiple platforms for assessment, curriculum management, and student data. • Priorities for the next academic year included: new course approval system; phase II of review of assessment; curriculum review; inclusive education; enhancement of blended learning.
032	<p>Institutional Teaching and Learning Review (ITLR)</p> <p>The Committee received the report (032.SEMEC.21-22), with key points and discussions as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DD (EPQ) reported that Education Policy and Quality (EPQ) were in the process of planning ITLR as per the report. • There were aspects to be inherited from past years but also new elements being introduced. • ITLR would still check quality assurance, but with an expectation that departments already doing well in this area would have this aspect minimised. • A key innovation would be the use of themes: EPQ wished to engage with departments to garner suggestions, noting that one theme would likely relate to the recent use of online and blended learning; there would probably be three themes in total. • The timeline would be approximately as identified in the paper, and whilst it was acknowledged that no timing would be perfect, EPQ would appreciate any feedback as to whether the timeline proposed would be better on balance than any other timeline. • Senate had approved this model. • In response to a question from the Chair, DD (EPQ) confirmed that consultation was currently being undertaken at FEC level but would be coming more directly to departments in due course. • Members were advised to email DD (EPQ) directly with any feedback as the ITLR resource email was not yet fully set up.
033	<p>Online Assessment</p> <p>The Committee received a verbal report, with key points and discussions as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Online Assessment system procurement was on track with the University awarding the contract to Uniwise; this was felt to be the most versatile option, and one with evidence of successful, smooth, and swift roll-out at other comparable institutions in recent months. • Pilots should start around March 2022 but departments to engage in the pilot had not had this confirmed themselves so GvdV could not confirm where this would be. • The pilots would hopefully identify all sorts of associated needs including training, how to rollout, impact on process, policy and administration. • The roll-out was expected to take 3 years at 10-12 depts per year, at the present stage of planning. • The scope of the system would go through from the point of module approval to the agreement of marks which would be written to SITS; this would mean the Tabula Marks Management system would require significant improvements. • JA confirmed that contracts were in place and additional resource was being inducted to begin work on improvements to Tabula. • A team had been working on highlighting the most critical developments to deliver most urgently for the 21/22 summer cycle; other items might be problematic but had known mitigations in place and so might not be delivered in this same cycle. • Possible training needs had also been identified where there was suspected incorrect usage of the systems as intended. • JA provided assurance that despite resourcing issues in the development sphere, IDG did not believe there was a significant risk of support being compromised should an incident occur on a system.

	<p>There was a brief discussion as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DF asked whether the Tabula prioritised development items would be published for the knowledge and understanding of departments; this would be coming over the following weeks. • The Chair noted that the committee’s departmental membership comprised Directors of Education whereas those at the “coal face” in this activity were mainly administrators, and asked how those people would be consulted; JA responded with caution that whilst there would be information and a means to raise if a critical issue had been overlooked, this could not form a full consultation per se. • The Chair asked for more information about training intentions; JA mentioned that there was an intention to feed back case-by-case on the specific issues identified which were actually misuse; in more general terms GvdV directed members to refer to Marks Management Community of Practice (MAMACOP) for announcements in this arena.
034	<p>Inclusive Education</p> <p>The Committee received a verbal report (slides pre-circulated as 034.SEMEC.21-22), with key points and discussions as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusive Education was part of the overall Social Inclusion strand of the University strategy, along with the Access and Participation piece, and the Taskforces and Groups in this area. • The strategic approach had been approved by Senate after consultation over the past year, with a single outcome of “equitable opportunities for all students to attain to the best of their abilities.” • The team were focussed on developing different workstreams; lots of training was being run; there was a community and student values education project for students; and there had been excellent engagement and feedback on Active Bystander training. • Inclusive education was often about many little things with a big impact (the Say My Name pilot proving very successful in this for example). • Next steps would include further planning and sharing through mechanisms such as TEG. • BF and MC offered to receive any questions offline if desired (as there were no live questions or comments).
Items below this line were for receipt and/or approval, without discussion	
035	<p>Student Data Report 2020/21</p> <p>The Committee received and noted the report (035.SEMEC.21-22 {protected}).</p>
036	<p>Curriculum Review Project Update</p> <p>The Committee received and noted the report (036.SEMEC.21-22 {protected}).</p>
037	<p>Business from Student Learning Experience and Engagement Committee (SLEEC)</p> <p>The Committee received and noted the minutes (Agenda and Minutes).</p>
Other	
038	<p>Any other business</p> <p>There was no other business.</p>
Next meeting: 2.00pm, Thursday 5 May 2022, Senate House Council Chamber	

DECISIONS AND ACTIONS			
ITEM	DECISION/ACTION	LEAD AND DUE DATE	STATUS
[2021-2022]			
No new actions.			