

OF WARWICK
FACULTY OF SCIENCE, ENGINEERING AND MEDICINE EDUCATION COMMITTEE
OPEN MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD 11.00, THURSDAY 24 OCTOBER 2019
IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, SENATE HOUSE

Present	Dr David Davies	DD	(Chair)
	Maya Alestwani	MA	Postgraduate Taught Student
	Alex Baker	AB	Postgraduate Research Student
	Professor Gavin Brown	GB	Mathematics
	Dr Nikola Chmel	NC	Chemistry
	Professor Gill Cooke	GC	Engineering
	Dr Miriam Gifford	MG	Life Sciences
	Dr Lucy Hammond	LH	Warwick Medical School
	Dr Paul Jenkins	PJ	Statistics
	Adam Jones	AJ	Undergraduate Student
	Dr Matt Jones	MJ	Warwick Manufacturing Group
	Dr Russ Kitson	RK	Chemistry
	Naveen Kumar	NK	Postgraduate Taught Student
	Professor Jason Madan	JM	Warwick Medical School
	Valentin Mancas	VM	Undergraduate Student
	Dr Anastasia Papavasileiou	AP	Statistics
	Professor Yorck Ramachers	YR	Physics (colleague sent in lieu of their formal members)
	Professor Lesley Roberts	LR	Warwick Medical School
	Dr Jane Sinclair	JS	Computer Science (Deputy Chair)
	Dr Helen Toner	HT	Faculty Senior Tutor
	Professor James Tresilian	JT	Psychology
	Dr Adrian von Muhlenen	AVM	Psychology
	Professor Martin Wills	MW	Deputy Chair
Dr Dave Wood	DW	Mathematics	
Dr Philip Young	PY	Life Sciences	
Attending	Amanda Bishop	AB	Faculty WP Coordinator
	Amy Collins	AC	Assistant Secretary
	Dr Beccy Freeman	BF	Dean of Students
	Louise Hasler	LH	Secretary
	Dr Elke Thonnes	ET	Faculty Student Engagement Coordinator
	Professor Pat Tissington	PT	Academic Director Employability and Skills
	Dr Ian Tuersley	IT	Faculty Student Engagement Coordinator
	Roberta Wooldridge Smith	RWS	Director of Student Opportunity
Ref	Item		
001	Apologies for Absence Apologies for absence were received from Professor Robin Clark (WMG), Professor Georgia Kremmyda (Engineering) and Dr Michael Pounds (Physics).		
002	Declarations of Interest No declarations of interest were reported.		
003	Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Members were reminded that they are asked to engage with agenda items in light of the University's policies that support equality, diversity and inclusion.		

004	<p>Minutes of the meeting held on 16 May 2019</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 16 May 2019 in 004.SEMEC.19-20 were received and approved.</p>
005	<p>Membership and Terms of Reference 2019-20</p> <p>The key points reported and discussed were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointment of Dr David Davies from WMS as Chair of SEMEC (<i>ex officio</i> as Deputy Chair of the Faculty), replacing Dr Dave Britnell. • Appointment of Dr Jane Sinclair from Computer Science as Deputy Chair, replacing Professor Lesley Roberts who continues as a member in light of the newly appointed Chair being also from WMS. • The Chair thanked Dave Britnell and Lesley Roberts for their previous contributions. • Faculty representation on AQSC had also been aligned with membership of SEMEC. • The membership implied that there was still a distinction drawn between the two areas represented by the two UG student members; it was clarified that the Students Union had removed this distinction and the two UG representatives both represented UG generally. • The TOR referred to module approval “pending the availability of Phase 2 of the SITS workflow” and this should be removed now that the system was in place. • The TOR referred to “best practice” but members felt the term “good practice” was more appropriate and accurate. <p>ACTION:</p> <p>LH to make the following amendments to membership and TOR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of specified areas of representation from UG student members • Removal of reference to phase 2 of new SITS workflow pertaining to module approval • Amendment of “best practice” to “good practice”
006	<p>Matters Arising from Meeting held on 16 May 2019</p> <p>(a) 45.a.vii/18-19: update on WRAP report investigating the availability and accessibility of undergraduate research opportunities at Warwick</p> <p>The committee received Paper 006a.SEMEC.19-20 and the key points of the discussion were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The report recommends an inequality audit to allow less well-resourced students to be able to participate, and also embedding undergraduate research in the curriculum. • These recommendations are under consideration by the PVC for Education. • If the recommendation regarding the formalisation of undergraduate research within the curriculum is pursued, this will be submitted to Faculty Education Committees for consideration. • SEMEC members expressed a strong support of the scheme which they wished to be shared with the PVC for Education. <p>(b) 46/18-19: Student Voice Committee</p> <p>It was reported that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst supportive of a meeting, there was not capacity within Educational Policy and Quality to provide Secretarial Support; the Secretary for SEMEC had offered to provide clerical support with room booking ongoing, and papers would continue to be shared in good time. • The student representatives had not been able to convene a term 1 meeting due to the timing of SU elections; they were only elected to post the week before the committee. • Other faculties are now considering emulating this idea from SEMEC, noting that there should not be excessive overlap between faculties in terms of business.

	<p>(c) 47.i/18-19: Graduate Outcomes Data</p> <p>It was reported that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No high level coordination was known of (after investigation). • It would be beneficial to convene a group at Faculty level. • 4-5 volunteers were sought and names should be submitted to the Secretary. • This group would develop a framework that departments could work to in term 2 19/20. • It was felt strongly by committee members that Chemistry could contribute well to this work given the comprehensive nature of their response to the original data scrutinised in term 3 18/19. <p>ACTIONS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) LH to convey SEMEC's strong support for the WRAP report recommendations to the PVC for Education 2) All members to convey names of any volunteers for the Graduate Outcomes Data Framework Group to LH
Chair's Business	
007 a	<p>Education Strategy</p> <p>The committee received 007.SEMEC.19-20; related discussion was held under Strategic Item 008.</p>
007 b	<p>Course and Module Approval</p> <p>The committee received a verbal update with key points as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systems went live in September. • Work was ongoing to populate them: all module data held by departments had been input; course data input was nearing completion. • Departments were being asked to validate what had been input and were now being asked to create missing MA1s. • The data would be used to create a module catalogue which departments could then use to populate web pages rather than manually duplicating data. <p>The key points of the subsequent discussion were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair noted there seemed to be 5 types of submission being put through the system: new modules for 20/21, revisions for 20/21, modules being populated where the department previously held no MA1, modules being validated by departments, and actual late changes for 19/20; due to dates of change being put into the system and its automation of the late review process, more of these than necessary were coming through to the Chair for late review. • Members raised concerns about the number of notifications of submission for review, submission for departmental review, submission for late review, and coding, which were being received by system users as a result of the validation process. • Members from several departments raised concerns about the deadlines given for validation to be completed, given the time of year and the workload in departments. • The member from Chemistry raised the concern that a course proposal submission was currently being delayed because they had to wait for the modules involved to have been validated, approved and coded, before they could share them as part of the course proposal; Engineering reported a similar situation. • The member from WMS raised a strong concern that actual review and submission of revisions to existing modules was being delayed by the validation process; it was not possible to work on revisions to a module until it had been validated. • The Chair agreed to follow this up personally as issues were clearly widespread. <p>ACTION: DD to follow up on the concerns raised at SEMEC over the Course and Module Approval Systems roll-out</p>

007 c	<p>Peer Dialogue</p> <p>The committee received a verbal update to the effect that the Peer Observation consultation (renamed Peer Dialogue) would be rolled out University wide, although the minute from the last meeting indicated it was likely that the majority of departments of the Faculty were compliant already.</p>
007 d	<p>Dyson Degree Awarding Powers</p> <p>The committee received a verbal update to the effect that Dyson had applied for degree awarding powers (noting the QAA had not yet agreed but there would be a reapplication); the member from WMG clarified that it was not yet clear what level of degree awarding powers Dyson would receive initially and that WMG would continue to support the course at least until Dyson had full level 6 powers.</p>
Strategic Item	
008	<p>Sharing Good Practice in Teaching</p> <p>The key points of the discussion and suggestions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Faculty could reinstitute the termly showcases it used to hold. • Task-and-finish groups could be set up to feed into themes for showcases. • The Faculty should take care not to neglect use of existing mechanisms (e.g. WIHEA learning circles) and should promote the use of those mechanisms notwithstanding any new initiatives. • It would be important to consider what could be good practice in the future rather than solely focussing on what good practice was taking place in the present. • It could be beneficial to establish champions of good practice within departments who could influence their department and act as a key contact. • Formation of a more formal network for good practice sharing could be beneficial; members reported that they might talk with colleagues from other departments where a relationship was pre-existing, but a formal network would allow for more opportunities. • It might be beneficial to seek input from SSLCs as to what is felt by students to be good practice; this as an initial step should not be as burdensome to staff workload. • The Student Engagement Coordinator (also from WMG) offered to discuss this wider faculty-level interest at a forthcoming WMG visit from the PVC for Education and Academic Director of Employability and Skills, which was due to take place in November. • One student member queried whether University committee minutes were generally accessible to students. <p>ACTIONS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) DD and LH to consider further ways to introduce good practice sharing into SEMEC both in and out of meetings 2) LH to seek clarity over availability of committee minutes to students
Main Section	
009	<p>Warwick Core Skills</p> <p>The committee received 009.SEMEC.19-20 and the key points of the discussion were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A query as to whether this was to result in a mapping exercise; PT confirmed it would but that students would make a first attempt at that mapping; there was further discussion around this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Engineering raised a concern that academics should be involved in this mapping process since they already undertake similar exercises with PSRBs (students not having as much experience of such exercises). ○ Engineering were also concerned that this could be duplication of work that has already been done for these PSRBs. ○ It was generally agreed that this exercise would be critical for courses that do not have PSRB accreditation, but some members felt it should be exempt to courses which are accredited.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PT emphasized a belief that the skills would already be present in courses and therefore this should be a simple confirmation exercise; this was more about identifying whether students were conscious of the skills they were obtaining. ● Noted there is a placeholder for this in the course/module approval system. ● Clarified that PT had been working with SU Sabbatical Officers for student input into this; there had been a number of focus groups and ambassadors would be used to further the consultation. ● AB offered to pass this through the Widening Participation student network as this would ensure consultation by a fuller representation of student body. ● Point 4 on communications – use of word ‘seniority’ might better be replaced with ‘expertise’ as it was felt to be a problematic term (PGR student representative). ● The Chair encouraged participation in this consultation, especially regarding the concerns raised around pre-existing comprehensive skill-mapping with respect to PSRB accreditation.
010	<p>Examination Communication</p> <p>The committee received a verbal update and the key points were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There have been two strands of the project, around exam communication, and around ensuring efficient timely exam timetable construction (owned by Kim Eccleston, the Head of Admissions). ● There was an urgency to ensure these strands would be resolved for summer 2020. ● The Dean of Students has been meeting with outgoing and incoming Sabbatical Officers over summer, as well as with SSLC chairs; academic departments had also been contacted to feed in (noted that although the response deadline was last week, responses would still be appreciated if this deadline had been missed). ● Clarified that the SSLC chairs had submitted a report in summer 2019 and that a subset of these chairs were initially consulted in response to that report, as well as then being consulted on the wider issues. ● The Dean of Students had also shared the questions sent to academic departments with these SSLC chairs.
011	<p>Postgraduate Business</p> <p>The committee received 011.SEMEC.19-20 and the key points of the discussion were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● WMS had a number of scholarships ring-fenced (including Chancellor’s International Scholarships and WCPRS) in 18/19 with the faculty merger, but would be considered as part of a faculty total in 19/20 with no specific number of scholarships set aside. ● For 19/20 the pencilled deadline for WCPRS applications for the faculty was 3 Feb 2020 but further details would be circulated when available. <p>The committee received a further verbal report with the following key points and discussions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Graduate School had been renamed the Doctoral College, with a refined remit of PGR education; there was a PGT Strategy Working Group considering PGT arrangements, with Debbie Marais (WMS) and Stuart Allen (SLS) representing the Faculty of SEM; it was clarified by email correspondence after the meeting that this group also had student representation as the SU Postgraduate Sabbatical Officer was a member. ● The Doctoral College would handle annual reviews of PGR education ongoing, and SEMEC would receive a report in term 2 for consideration. ● The Doctoral College was to move towards involvement in the approval of PhD programmes. ● The Chair noted the importance of ensuring that Faculty representatives have a key into the Faculty committees. ● Chemistry reported that skills training within the faculty was going through an accreditation process; noted that a recent analysis had indicated that students who had gone through this training were 10% more likely to find work. ● SLS raised a concern that SEMEC appears to consider PG business in one item (on account of how the regular agenda is constructed) whereas it should be represented and considered within all items.

	<p>ACTIONS:</p> <p>1) MW to finalise the WCPRS process for the faculty.</p>
012	<p>Widening Participation</p> <p>The committee received a verbal report and presentation and the key points were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a WP Coordinator and forum for each faculty, working to facilitate good practice in this area across the faculty. • There is a WP Committee from which AB will be able to share updates. • There is a staff network for any staff who want to be involved in this area, and a student network for self-identifying WP students; there is a particular interest in encouraging WP students to get more involved in SSLCs. • The University of Warwick has submitted an Access and Participation Plan to the Office for Students. • Low Participation Neighbourhoods are a key factor in WP and one which the government wishes to promote; one of our targets is to move our ratio of quintile 5: quintile 1 from 7.5:1 to 3:1. • Warwick Scholars Programme is an ongoing programme whereby WP students get various support/discounts from fees if they accept a Warwick offer. 33 schools within 25 miles of the University are involved. • An individualised data set per department will be sent out soon to allow HODs and named departmental WP contacts to scrutinise departmental data. • AB is anticipating a faculty event within British Science Week in March 2020. • AB would be very happy to support departments before and after TEG meetings in the area of WP. <p>The following key points came out of further discussion and questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted that although non-continuation data could suggest WP students were over-represented, a recent workshop gave indication this was not the case; it is always important to scrutinize individual data. • AB confirmed that the 5 year plan covers a desire to investigate PGT and PGR Widening Participation, as it was rightly noted by members that there had often been a focus solely on UG in this area. • WMG queried whether non-UCAS students would be factored into the data (such as part time or Degree Apprentices); AB answered that this can be scrutinized if details can be passed over. • AB confirmed that it would be possible to identify which schools students came from within the data analysis (in response to a query from WMG as to how much the WMG Academy was represented in the data). • AB confirmed a willingness to support SLS in their investigations into implementing an Inspire programme as it was thought this could be beneficial at Faculty level.
013	<p>Student Learning Experience and Engagement Committee (taken after 006)</p> <p>The committee received a verbal update and the key points were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLEEC would henceforth be sharing all minutes and papers with SEMEC. • SLEEC felt that the Student Engagement Coordinator (SEC) roles ought to be full members of Faculty Education Committees rather than 'in attendance'; a formal recommendation could be expected. • At the recent meeting of SLEEC they had reviewed NSS and PTES, set up a sub-group for ethics of analytics of student data, reviewed academic representation, and discussed the role of the SECs.
014	<p>Academic Representation SU/University Partnership Agreement</p> <p>The committee received and noted 014.SEMEC.19-20.</p>
015	<p>National Student Survey Results 2019</p> <p>The committee received and noted 015.SEMEC.19-20.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PGR student rep raised a concern about the opening of the paper seeming to trivialise the student body's experience through 18/19 of the group chat incident and the exams timetabling issues: the specific

	quotation was “despite a challenging year for student sentiment on campus” in the first page of the main report (after the cover sheet).
016	<p>Peer Dialogue</p> <p>The committee received and noted 016.SEMEC.19-20</p>
017	<p>Appeals in Progress</p> <p>The committee received a verbal report and the key points were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 23 academic appeals have been submitted by students required to withdraw from their studies, ten of whom are intermediate year (year 2), several of whom are WMG students on the AEP. • This marks a shift from previous years where the largest number of appeals were from first year Engineering students, which could be due to the availability of a non-accredited BSc in Engineering which is a transfer option to students who fail year 1.
018	<p>Audit of Departmental Quality Assurance Processes for Module Approval</p> <p>The committee received 018.SEMEC.19-20 and approved the departmental QA processes, noting that it was not yet known whether this regular item would still be required since the introduction of the new approval systems.</p>
019	<p>Termly Timeliness of Feedback Report</p> <p>The committee received 019a.SEMEC.19-20 and 019b.SEMEC.19-20 and the key points of the discussion were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 9/12 cases (WMG report UG and PG separately, and WMG report MBCHB and PGT separately) 100% compliance had been maintained or rates had improved; in the 3 cases where rates of compliance had decreased, in one case the reduction was by only 1%, and in another it was due to one out of three reported modules not being compliant so the impact on compliance was larger than where there was a wider range of modules to assess. • The number of modules running in departments was usually lower in term 3, hence the low numbers to be reported on (in response to a query from the UG student representative). • WMS queried how necessary it was to report on compliance where a specific student’s feedback was late because their submission was late (due to extension or otherwise). <p>ACTION: LH to investigate and respond separately to WMS over the requirement for reporting on compliance with respect to late-submitting students.</p>
020	<p>Annual Plagiarism Report</p> <p>The committee received 020.SEMEC.19-20 and the key points of the discussion were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computer Science figures needed to be checked as 50 did not seem plausible. • Chemistry figures needed to be checked as the members from Chemistry did not believe the 0 figure to be accurate, the return having been received from their administrative team. • It was suggested that the digest report should still split out the different outcomes rather than solely reporting on cases investigated; similarly clarity over the size of department would be required to contextualize the data. <p>ACTIONS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) LH to liaise with Computer Science and Chemistry members to clarify the accuracy of their annual plagiarism reports. 2) LH to adjust the next digest report for this annual summary to break down the different outcomes and to contextualise the departmental statistics by their number of live students (or a similar metric to be determined).

021	<p>Any Other Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The member from Chemistry raised a concern over mock TEF data having included temporarily withdrawn students within non-continuation statistics; there was a need to understand if this was by design since it would need to feed into TEF submissions (Chemistry felt that such students should not be included). LH confirmed that SPA were looking into this as a known issue. WMS agreed to a request to share their MBChB FYBoE data for future First Year Board of Examiners (FYBoE) reports (item 022 below the line). <p>ACTION: LH to ensure WMS are asked for FYBoE data for the MBChB to form part of future FYBoE reports</p>
<i>Items below this line were for receipt and/or approval, without discussion</i>	
022	<p>First Year Board of Examiners 2018-19</p> <p>The committee received and noted 022.SEMEC.19-20.</p>
023	<p>Warwick Education Conference 2020: SAVE THE DATE</p> <p>The committee noted that the conference would be held on 12 May, with pre-conference workshops held on 11 May. All details, including a call for contributions would be confirmed later in term 1.</p>
Next meeting: 11.00 THURSDAY 16 JANUARY 2020, COUNCIL CHAMBER, SENATE HOUSE	

DECISIONS AND ACTIONS			
ITEM	DECISION/ACTION	LEAD AND DUE DATE	STATUS
005	LH to make the following amendments to membership and TOR: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removal of specified areas of representation from UG student members Removal of reference to phase 2 of new SITS workflow pertaining to module approval Amendment of “best practice” to “good practice” 	LH, end of term 1	
006	LH to convey SEMEC’s strong support for the WRAP report recommendations to the PVC for Education	LH, end of term 1	
	All members to convey names of any volunteers for the Graduate Outcomes Data Framework Group to LH	LH, end of term 1	
007b	DD to follow up on the concerns raised at SEMEC over the Course and Module Approval Systems roll-out	DD, end of term 1	
008	DD and LH to consider further ways to introduce good practice sharing into SEMEC both in and out of meetings	DD, end of term 1	
	LH to seek clarity over availability of committee minutes to students	LH, end of term 1	Completed
011	MW to finalise the WCPRS process for the faculty.	MW, end of term 1	
019	LH to investigate and respond separately to WMS over the requirement for reporting on compliance with respect to late-submitting students.	LH, end of term 1	
020	LH to liaise with Computer Science and Chemistry members to clarify the accuracy of their annual plagiarism reports.	LH, end of term 1	Completed
	LH to adjust the next digest report for the annual plagiarism reports to break down the different outcomes and to contextualise the departmental statistics by their number of live students (or a similar metric to be determined).	LH, end of term 1	

021	LH to ensure WMS are asked for FYBoE data for the MBChB to form part of future FYBoE reports	LH, end of term 2	
-----	--	-------------------	--