

UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK
FACULTY OF SCIENCE, ENGINEERING AND MEDICINE EDUCATION COMMITTEE
OPEN/ RESTRICTED MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 2.00PM, TUESDAY 27 OCTOBER 2020
VIA MS TEAMS

Present	Professor David Davies	DD	Chair
	Alex Baker	AB	Postgraduate Research Student
	Jasmine Brittan	JB	Undergraduate Student
	Dr Adam Chester	AC	Computer Science
	Dr Nikola Chmel	NC	Chemistry
	Dr Nick d'Ambrumenil	NA	Physics
	Alex Fletcher	AF	Undergraduate Student
	Dr Paul Jenkins	PJ	Statistics
	Dr Matt Jones	MJ	WMG
	Professor Georgia Kremmyda	GK	Engineering
	Dr James Lloyd-Hughes	JLH	Physics
	Professor Jason Madan	JM	Warwick Medical School
	Dr Gioia Panzarella	GP	Faculty of Arts
	Dr Anastasia Papavasileiou	AP	Statistics
	Dr Michael Pounds	MP	Physics
	Dr Kevin Purdy	KP	Life Sciences
	Professor Lesley Roberts	LR	Warwick Medical School
	Professor Jose Rodrigo	JR	Mathematics
	Professor Dmitriy Rumynin	DR	Mathematics
	Professor Jane Sinclair	JS	Computer Science (Deputy Chair)
	Dr Helen Toner	HT	Faculty Senior Tutor
	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	AHC	Assistant Secretary
	Louise Hasler	LH	Secretary
	Dr Elke Thonnes	ET	Faculty Student Engagement Coordinator
	Professor Ian Tuersley	IT	Faculty Student Engagement Coordinator
	Mahfia Watkinson	MWt	Assistant Registrar (Teaching & Learning) For item 008 only
	Alison Greenhalgh	AG	Secretary to Arts Faculty Education Committee (attending to observe) / Assistant Registrar (Teaching & Learning)
	Dr Jon Duffy	JD	Chair of the SEM Faculty Employability Forum For item 009 only
Ref	Item		
001	Apologies for absence Apologies were received from Dr Lucy Hammond (Warwick Medical School), Professor Mark Steel (Statistics), Professor James Tresilian (Psychology), Professor Gill Cooke (Engineering), and Professor Robin Clark (WMG).		
002	Declarations of Interest No new declarations were made.		
003	Equality diversity and inclusion		

	The Chair reminded members to keep in mind the University's policies relating to equality, diversity and inclusion.
004	<p>Minutes of last meeting on 16 January 2020 and the meeting held via correspondence circa May 2020</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 16 January 2020 (004a.SEMEC.20-21) were received and approved.</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held via correspondence circa May 2020 (004b.SEMEC.20-21) were received and approved.</p>
005	<p>Membership and Terms of Reference 2020-21</p> <p>The Membership and Terms of Reference 2020-21 report (005.SEMEC.20-21) were received and approved, noting that the committee would continue to receive regular updates of new courses approved (as below the line at this meeting for example – item 018). It was agreed that subject to other Faculty Education Committees being in agreement, the terms of reference would be amended to remove the historical reference to approval of changes to undergraduate modules.</p>
006	<p>Matters arising from the meeting held on 16 January 2020 and the meeting held via correspondence circa May 2020</p> <p>The matters arising were as follows:</p> <p>(a) Decolonisation of the Curriculum (minute 034/19-20 refers)</p> <p>The Chair had fed back that SEMEC supported the Decolonisation of the Curriculum paper; it was noted that funding for a post responsible for this area was in place (if not yet recruited) and that the University was progressing the recommendations of the paper.</p> <p>(b) PGT Welcome Week (minute 038/19-20 refers)</p> <p>The Secretary had investigated the PGT welcome week consultation process, and had been advised that the process had included the following consultation mechanisms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PGT students were surveyed • During development work all departments were represented <p>The Secretary also received assurance that further review of correct representation of departments would be continued for future iterations.</p>
Chair's Update	
007	<p>Chair's Business and Actions</p> <p>The Committee received and noted an update from the Chair covering the following key details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Faculty of SEM Teaching and Learning Admin Group had been set up on Teams by Clare Watters (Teaching and Learning Services Manager, Chemistry) as a way of supporting colleagues in similar roles, or to use as a sounding board. The Chair encouraged members to share this with relevant administrators in the departments in case further colleagues should be added; anyone wishing to join should contact Clare via C.Watters@warwick.ac.uk. • There had also been a forum set up for Faculty Teaching and Learning colleagues specifically to discuss and collaborate in the area of risk assessments, which had been dormant but would be reactivated if a need was identified to review the effectiveness of those risk assessments in practice.
Strategic Item	
008	<p>Adapting to Blended Learning</p> <p>The Committee received (008a.SEMEC.20-21) and (008b.SEMEC.20-21) with key details and discussions, as below.</p>

The Assistant Registrar (Teaching & Learning) (MWt) was invited to summarise the Curriculum Change Log process as an overview and reminder of the progress made thus far in adaptation to blended learning:

- Thanks were expressed to departments for their responsiveness in complying with the change log process, especially at a time which was challenging in various respects.
- The curriculum change log came about as result of the need for agile changes in response to Covid-19; in the early summer of 2020 the University published a strongly preferred model for delivery for 20/21, and subsequently asked departments to submit logs of their anticipated changes, ideally in line with that model where possible.
- This was arranged into three tiers representing the level of approval required – the first tier being departmental (proposals in line with the strongly preferred model), the second faculty (proposals needing exemption from the strongly preferred model), and the third institutional (where any collaboration was involved).
- The largest volume of decision-making work was in the second tier at faculty level, which was handled as a coordinated approach across the three Faculty Education Committee Chairs to ensure standardisation, consistent application of criteria, and consistent interpretation of the structure across faculties. The FEC Chairs also sat on the third tier institutional panels as a moderation exercise.
- Possible outcomes had included direct approval, conditional approval subject to recommendations or further information provision, and also escalation to a higher tier where deemed appropriate.

The Assistant Registrar (Teaching & Learning) (MWt) also drew out some key examples of good practice from the report:

- Departments had evidently been careful in consideration of these changes and communication between departments for joint awards had been thorough.
- The Campus Reopening Working Group, which looked at lab provision in particular, had commended the level of detail in proposals.
- Quite a few departments had co-created the logs with their students, which gave a very clear evidence base for student involvement and satisfaction with the decisions being made.
- Some departments consulted with prospective postgraduate students, recognising that with postgraduates changes would be the prospective.
- Logs which made the top-level or course-level approach very clear were particularly helpful.
- Other examples of good practice could be found in the report.

The Chair invited the Undergraduate students to comment on experience of blended learning from the autumn term so far:

- AF reported flexibility of choice around when to engage with asynchronous lectures was particularly helpful when also working shifts.

There was a general discussion around student consultation ongoing:

- NC (Chemistry) asked whether there would be an institutional follow-up in terms of student consultation, given that departments had varying levels of consultation and that it would be beneficial in particular to understand the broadest examples of good practice – i.e. not only from this faculty.
- MW confirmed there were updates to the logs planned for terms 2-3 (which would make further opportunity for next-stage departmental student consultation) but nothing was in train at that point regarding institutional student surveys or consultation; this suggestion would be fed back.
- AB noted there had been a Term 3 2019-20 student survey with some useful data around blended learning experiences, which might be useful to circulate. It was agreed that the results of this should be sought to be shared departmentally if they had not been previously. **Action LH.**
- AP (Statistics) commented that from departmental module reviews, there had been an impression that established students seemed to be happy with the situation, while first years were as happy as could be expected but facing additional challenges as also expected from being new to the University.

A discussion around staff workload impact was prompted by AP (Statistics) who raised a concern that staff were struggling to keep up with the pace, with a few specific examples which might be addressed:

- The logistics of students moving between online and face-to-face was proving a particular burden, and some more centralised coordinated approach to how to handle this might help. Statistics had been trying to keep groups of students together to create a sense of community but this was proving impossible. Any advice from other departments would equally be appreciated.
- There was a plea from staff within Statistics in particular that anything from the University level that would add to immediate workload might be delayed (specifically the requirement that resit exams be written at same time as first sits, in particular for January exams).
- There were specific issues with efficiency of marking in Moodle which needed addressing and resolving; DR (Maths) agreed in particular with this point and had made a set of suggestions earlier in the year (including noting there was no 'undo' option when adding comments whilst marking work and this in particular ought to be addressed). In contrast PY (Life Sciences) noted they had experienced comparatively little trouble in Moodle, suggesting it may have had to do with type of assessment.
- There was insufficient GTA support for small group teaching support and a coordinated approach to ensure sufficient coverage in future would be appreciated. There had been a suggestion around combining scholarships with some form of teaching assistantship which might merit future consideration in the appropriate forum.
- It was suggested that the University might snap-survey staff to get a more general sense of these issues beyond the specific experience of the Statistics department shared at the meeting. NC (Chemistry) agreed with this; in Chemistry they would be undertaking a departmental survey but an institutional one would be all the more beneficial. Other departments echoed this feeling including Life Sciences and Maths.

Issues were raised regarding the University test and trace system:

- DR (Maths) raised a concern that the information about which students were self-isolating was not getting to the department quickly or efficiently enough.
- It was noted that departments were only being informed by Test and Trace where students tested positive, and not where students were self-isolating due to having been in contact with someone who tested positive (the latter being the student's responsibility to tell the department); however, the burden on the department to rearrange a student's schedule was just the same regardless of their reason for not being able to attend something face-to-face, so it would be more conducive to efficiency to be notified of all self-isolations regardless of reason.
- PY (Life Sciences) provided an example of learning 10-12 days after a session that someone on that session had tested positive (with lots in face-to-face teaching having been undertaken in the interim, putting further classes at risk).
- NC (Chemistry) noted a recent positive experience of efficiency with the system by comparison.
- LR (WMS) felt the system was variable and raised an example of being notified of 6 names that week, of which only 4 were WMS students.
- The above colleagues also variously noted that the issues had been appropriately and separately flagged through the proper channels, appreciating SEMEC was not the forum to resolve these specifics directly.
- The Chair advised colleagues to provide this feedback to their Department Administrators so that it could be fed back to the Test and Trace system owners.

There was a discussion relating to risk assessments and their relation to the changing scientific evidence and understanding of Covid-19:

- AB (student representative) raised the concern that risk assessments were not progressing alongside the evolving scientific evidence (noting for example that there was strong evidence at this point in time that face visors alone were not sufficient, but that colleagues and students were still wearing face visors alone without masks). There were also concerns around ventilation. These concerns were echoed by the Faculty Senior Tutor and MP (Physics).

- In Chemistry there had been robust discussions around this but the concern raised was more general related to other departments and other faculties.
- The Chair suggested that the representatives of other faculties at this meeting could feed this into their Education Committees.

AB (Widening Participation) gave a brief update regarding the IT bursary scheme:

- The scheme had received around 1400 applications in its first term of which only 30 were unsuccessful, which highlighted the need for support in this area.
- There might be benefit to further discussion of future-proofing for students who may have missed but needed the opportunity (for example missing the deadline).
- The future of the scheme was under discussion.
- The Faculty Senior Tutor affirmed that departments should continue to make the Faculty Senior Tutor team and Department Senior Tutors aware of any IT access issues for students, such that they could escalate and support ongoing, beyond the end of the scheme.

The Chair concluded that:

- The pre-existing faculty teaching staff forum or the pre-existing SEMEC members team could be resurrected and this might help good practice sharing (with support expressed by departments). AB (Widening Participation) noted that different channels could be set up for different topics which might be beneficial given the breadth of discussion.
- Issues raised around workload, systems, and test and trace would be escalated appropriately to the Pro-Vice Chancellor for Education and the Faculty Administrator.
- Departmental risk assessments should be evolving and should be kept up-to-date.
- Departments should remain aware of the prevalence of digital isolation and digital poverty, with a hope that the above-mentioned bursary scheme might be later reinstated.
- Feedback on systems could also be channelled through appropriate routes by colleagues; in particular with respect to the assessments priority within paper 008b, there was to be a subgroup set up with a remit of examinations, which would be reviewing assessment system options. Faculty representatives to this group from SEM were: Dr Dave Wood (Mathematics) and Dr Phil Young (School Life Sciences, ex officio as Chair of Review of Assessment subgroup Progression, Remedying Failure and Timing of Examinations). Feedback could also be channelled into the Student Personalised Information Project.

ACTIONS:

- 1) DD to raise the following requests and concerns with Chris Hughes (Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education)) and Ruth Cooper (Director of Administration, Faculty SEM):
 - a. The wish to defer any new initiatives where possible, in particular the need to create resit in tandem with first sit examination papers;
 - b. Logistical difficulties of students moving between f2f and online seminar groups;
 - c. That the functionality of marking in Moodle could be improved, or other options investigated;
 - d. That departments are consulted on the specification and functionality of future online assessment systems.
- 2) DD to raise with Caroline Meyer (Chair of Faculty) the need for flexibility in departmental GTA budgets where there is an increased need for PGR students to teach small groups of students
- 3) LH to find out to what extent the results of the internally coordinated term 3 student survey have been cascaded

009

Faculty Employability Forum and Employability and Skills Working Group

The Committee received a verbal report from JD (Chair of the SEM Faculty Employability Forum) and key points and discussions were as follows:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Faculty Employability Forum had been in place since 2013, meeting 3-4 times per year, with representation across the SEM faculty. • This group had an informal set-up with the aim of catalysing discrete projects in the arena of employability and skills (with past examples including the “Alumni at Work” video series, and a “Physics Challenge” which was an employer-led department activity that the Forum would like to see scaled up to faculty level if funding could be secured). • Particular recent discussion topics were identified in the slides, in particular discussions over student internships and how to get students engaged with that process at the right time, and ideas around departmental targeted careers fairs. • JD noted the distinction between this forum and the Employability and Skills Working Group which fed directly into higher level committees, chaired by the Academic Director of Employability and Skills (Professor Pat Tislington). • The Chair noted that discussions were ongoing as to the possibility of extending the Faculty Employability Forum into an institutional forum (rather than creating equivalents in other faculties).
010	<p>Embracing Black Lives Matter as Scientists</p> <p>The Committee received (010.SEMEC.20-21) and key points and discussions were as follows.</p> <p>AB (student representative) introduced the paper:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This was originally written for a SEM HODs’ forum which had taken place shortly after the death of George Floyd, and was written to explain how Universities should embrace and learn from the Black Lives Matter movement, as well as to identify how this should affect teaching and how it had affected students. • In the wake of the death of George Floyd many Warwick students, especially from black backgrounds, were immensely affected; some departments had responded more strongly than others at the time. • Decolonisation had raised questions about what we teach our students (noting that if there is a diverse body of students, the content of their education ought to be equally diverse and not Eurocentric). • In particular it was felt this should be seen as something equally important for sciences as for arts, history, law, politics etc. In teaching science there could be conscious choices and decisions made around choice of examples to put forward in teaching and around how science might be taught to enable students to view their scientific knowledge through many and more varied lenses. • It was noted that WMS and Psychology had been setting up attainment gap working groups and making training for staff around bias compulsory. • There were practical examples given in the paper which other departments should consider, with a strong emphasis that this was an important point for scientists and should not be rejected as being only for other faculties. • There was a Warwick Inclusive Science Group being put in place to consider how to put these recommendations into practice. <p>Further discussion was held as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AB (Widening Participation) noted that a number of the paper’s recommendations might be best tackled in a joined-up way – for example noting that each department already had a Widening Participation representative who might fill the role of ‘link person’ identified in point 1 of the action plan. • AB (Widening Participation) also echoed and reinforced the points in the action plan around disambiguation of BAME/BME into more well delineated categories, allowing for a move away from those broad terms in future. • The Chair commented that the Education Strategy Priorities (paper 008b) also identified a need to address attainment gaps: this was in relation to a wider imperative from the Office for Students relating to a number of characteristics where gaps needed to be closed, including disability, socio-

	<p>economic background, and gender, as well as the black attainment gap as a priority in relation to this agenda.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
011	<p>Graduate attainment outcomes and departmental responses</p> <p>The Committee received (011.SEMEC.20-21) introduced as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair expressed gratitude for the work of departments in responding to these data despite other workload priorities (given the timing). • The Chair also framed the item as an opportunity to discuss what could be done going forward to make further sense of graduate attainment data. It was acknowledged that some departments had raised concerns around integrity of the data, and these were being fed back and investigated. <p>AB (student representative) raised some specific comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The approach from Life Sciences was commended where they had driven down into the data to understand certain key points of intersectionality. For example where other departments may have noted they had X% black students and this was higher than the UK proportion of black population, Life Sciences had observed that their Y% black students were predominantly from non-UK domiciles and therefore comparison to the UK population as a threshold may not be appropriate. • It might not be best practice to compare department outcomes to faculty averages given that this would still be comparison against ourselves rather than a comparison that directly assesses whether the gaps are being closed. • Departments with no gender attainment gap but a huge gender participation gap ought to be considering and acknowledging that disparity rather than presenting as a purely positive 'no attainment gap'. <p>Further comments and discussion were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PY (Life Sciences) agreed with the above, adding that transitional year 1-2-3 data was missing from what had been provided, but in Life Sciences they had investigated to that level of detail and identified attainment gaps starting to widen in the transition between years. • LR (WMS) raised a concern that there were problems in this transitional phase with a lot of central time going into the data presentation then being duplicated at department level when concerns were identified (by those departments which had found capacity to redo their analysis and observe issues with the alignment between raw and reported data). • NC (Chemistry) noted that the data layout was based on the feedback and consideration following the previous year's analysis and also observed that it might be unreasonable to expect all departments to do this to the Life Sciences level unless there was resource provided. There might be tiers of acceptable response perhaps depending on capacity in departments, and/or there could be benefit to establishing a faculty working group to look at these in more detail and make faculty recommendations. • RK (Chemistry) raised the need for a robust statistical approach particularly where the datasets were small for particular characteristics, and where there may be a temptation to group certain characteristics together, which could be problematic in itself. RK also raised the issue that equality of attainment could be a problematic aim when equality of opportunity was not yet achieved, and in particular when some unknown factors outside of a student's time at University might be beyond the control of departments and of the University. • KP (Life Sciences) suggested that more detail to allow identification of economic background would be useful, since only LPN and POLAR data were made available, and real family economic data (e.g. family income, progression and attainment) would be far more beneficial to layer on top of ethnicity. • MJ (WVG) observed that the data had also been partially skewed with degree apprenticeships. For example, WVG worked with employers to encourage widening participation, but if a faculty group

	<p>were to be created to review graduate attainment then degree apprenticeships should also be featured, but perhaps as a separate grouping so that Warwick could encourage employers to continually attract a diverse apprentice cohort.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Chair noted that there was no institutional methodological approach and that SEM was ahead of curve in this, although a Widening Participation research group was starting to look at a consistent statistical faculty or institutional approach. As per the suggestion from Chemistry, if there were willing volunteers for a faculty group to put together the next analysis according to this group's recommended methodology, this might be a way of making progress. <p>ACTION: members to send LH any further views on how best to operate a putative forum in the arena of faculty attainment</p>
012	<p>Postgraduate Business</p> <p>The Committee received a verbal report and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MW (Deputy Chair, Chemistry) advised to expect some news early November on Studentships (as this had been on hold but would at least not be reduced, even if timescales were as yet unclear). There had been a process for gathering data on funded extensions for UKRI and Warwick funded students (covering extensions up to March 2021), which was almost complete. The UKRI position regarding students with end dates beyond March 2021 was as yet unclear. Priorities for 20/21 included: employability, funding for projects around BAME access and participation, and the set-up of a BAME student network.
013	<p>Student Learning Experience and Engagement Committee</p> <p>The Committee received a verbal report and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Black Lives Matter paper and Education Strategy Priorities had been discussed, as at this meeting of SEMEC. There had been a review of the compulsory questions for Module Evaluation with respect to suitability for online provision, which had concluded those questions were still appropriate.
014	<p>Annual Plagiarism Reports for 2019-20</p> <p>The Committee received (014a.SEMEC.20-21) and (014b.SEMEC.20-21) and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contextual data had been added as previously requested by WMS which clarified where high numbers of cases might still be low percentages overall when the student enrolments onto modules were taken into account. There were queries over the Life Sciences data where there had been an extremely high number of investigations with a 'no case' outcome; PY identified this as a fault in the data submitted by the administration, which had mistakenly included initially sifted data based on Turnitin alone rather than those which actually went to any form of formal investigation. PY agreed to send updated figures for information. <p>ACTION: PY to send updated Life Sciences plagiarism investigation data to LH, to account for the misinterpretation of the first sift of 'no case' cases.</p>

015	<p>Termly Timeliness of Feedback Reports for terms 2 and 3 in 2019-20</p> <p>The Committee received (015a.SEMEC.20-21) and (015b.SEMEC.20-21) and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Secretary noted that this was combined data for terms 2 and 3 but that not all departments had indicated which modules fell into which term, hence the comparison to the previous academic year had defaulted to comparing to term 2 in those cases. • It was noted that WMG's drop in timeliness was mainly still within a tolerance of an additional 10 days (i.e. within 30 days instead of 20). • It was noted that the Chemistry data had been received too late for the summary report but had been made available online.
016	<p>Any other business</p> <p>No other business was raised.</p>
<i>Items below this line were for receipt and/or approval, without discussion</i>	
017	<p>National Student Survey Results</p> <p>The Committee received and noted the report (017.SEMEC.20-21 (online only)).</p>
018	<p>New Courses Approved</p> <p>The Committee received and noted the report (018.SEMEC.20-21 (online only)).</p>
Next meeting: 11.00, THURSDAY 14 JANUARY 2021	

DECISIONS AND ACTIONS			
ITEM	DECISION/ACTION	LEAD AND DUE DATE	STATUS
2020-2021 SEMEC			
008	<p>1) DD to raise the following requests and concerns with Chris Hughes (Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education)) and Ruth Cooper (Director of Administration, Faculty SEM):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The wish to defer any new initiatives where possible, in particular the need to create resit in tandem with first sit examination papers; b. Logistical difficulties of students moving between f2f and online seminar groups; c. That the functionality of marking in Moodle could be improved, or other options investigated; d. That departments are consulted on the specification and functionality of future online assessment systems. 	DD, Nov 2020	
	<p>2) DD to raise with Caroline Meyer (Chair of Faculty) the need for flexibility in departmental GTA budgets where there is an increased need for PGR students to teach small groups of students</p>	DD, Jan 2021	

	3) LH to find out to what extent the results of the internally coordinated term 3 student survey have been cascaded	LH, Jan 2021	
010	Members to send LH any further views on how best to operate a putative forum in the arena of faculty attainment	LH, Jan 2021	
014	PY to send updated Life Sciences plagiarism investigation data to LH, to account for the misinterpretation of the first sift of 'no case' cases.	PY, Nov 2021	