

UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK
FACULTY OF SCIENCE, ENGINEERING AND MEDICINE EDUCATION COMMITTEE
OPEN/ RESTRICTED MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 27 OCTOBER 2021
VIA MS TEAMS

Present	Professor David Davies	DD	Chair
	Prince Binu Joseph	PBJ	PGT Student representative
	Professor Till Bretschneider	TB	Computer Science
	Dr Adam Chester	AC	Computer Science
	Dr Nikola Chmel	NC	Chemistry
	Professor Gill Cooke	GC	Engineering
	Dr Nick d'Ambrumenil	NA	Physics
	Dr Claudie Fox	CF	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 Bo Kelestyn	BK	Chemistry
	Dr Russ Kitson (arrived item 014)	RK	Chemistry
	Professor Georgia Kremmyda	GK	Engineering
	Professor Ken Mao	KM	Engineering
	Professor Dan Nunan	DN	WMG
	Aesha Pan	AeP	PGT Student representative
	Dr Anastasia Papavasileiou	AnP	Statistics (Deputy Chair)
	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
	Dr Jessica Savage	JS	Faculty of Arts representative
	Professor Mark Steel	MS	Statistics
Dr Helen Toner	HT	Faculty Senior Tutor	
Dr Cagatay Turkey	CT	Faculty of Social Sciences representative	
Professor Martin Wills	MW	Chemistry (Deputy Chair)	
Dr Dave Wood	DW	Mathematics	
Attending	Amanda Bishop	AB	Faculty Widening Participation Coordinator
	Amy Collins	AHC	Assistant Secretary
	Craig Franklin	CF	Administrative Officer, EPQ
	Dr Gemma Gray	GG	Faculty Student Engagement Coordinator
	Lee Griffin (items 009 and 010)	LG	Academic Director (Postgraduate Taught)
	Dr Sam Hardy (item 011)	SH	Director of Flexible and Online Learning Division
	Chris Luck (item 007)	CL	Senior Project Manager (Information and Digital Group)
Ref	Item		
001	<p>Apologies for absence</p> <p>Apologies were received from Louise Hasler (Secretary), Dr Russ Kitson (Chemistry), Dr James Lloyd-Hughes (Physics), Alex Fletcher (PGR Student Representative), Dr Adrian von Muhlenen (Psychology), Dr Jianhua Yang (Faculty Student Engagement Coordinator), and Professor Jason Madan (Warwick Medical School). Noted that</p>		

	<p>Dr Russ Kitson was able to attend in time to report under item 014 but had sent apologies for the majority of the meeting.</p> <p>The Chair welcomed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New co-Chair: Dr Anastasia Papavasileiou (Statistics) replacing Jane Sinclair • New representative of Faculty of Arts: Dr Jessica Savage (Cross Faculty Studies) • New representative of Faculty of Social Sciences: Dr Cagatay Turkay (CIM) • New members: Professor Till Bretschneider (Computer Science), Dr Dan Franklin (SLS), Dr Claudie Fox (Psychology), Professor Dan Nunan (WMG). • New Student Engagement Coordinators: Dr Yang Jianhua (WMG) and Dr Gemma Gray (Psychology) • New student representatives: PGR: Alex Fletcher (Computer Science); PGT: Prince Binu Jospheh, Aesha Pan; noted that a UG member would be elected in due course
002	<p>Declarations of Interest</p> <p>No new declarations were made.</p>
003	<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>
004	<p>Minutes of meeting on 5 May 2021</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 5 May 2021 (004.SEMEC.21-22) were received and approved.</p> <p>There were no matters arising to report.</p>
005	<p>Membership and Terms of Reference 2021-22</p> <p>(005.SEMEC.21-22)</p> <p>The Terms of Reference were accepted.</p> <p>Noted that Gill Cooke (Engineering) had become the SEMEC representative of undergraduate education on the Board of the Faculty, and that Russ Kitson (Chemistry) had become the representative on SLEEC.</p>
Chair's Update	
006	<p>Chair's Business and Actions</p> <p>The Committee received and noted an update from the Chair as follows.</p> <p>a) Processes relating to Examination Boards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback was acknowledged from Computer Science and Statistics relating to the processes and timings in respect of resit examinations this year. • It was acknowledged that departments were under considerable pressure in September 2021 to mark, hold exam boards, create Decision Record Logs (and also grids for First Year Board of Examiners) within the required timescale; this created a bottleneck of activity exacerbated by the deficiencies of Tabula as a means for producing examination grids. • The short turn around between decisions being released and the start of term was historic, although widely acknowledged to be very unhelpful to students: the difficulties were exacerbated in 2021 due to arrangements relating to Covid-19.

	<p>The Chair was able to report that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geraldine Connelly (EPQ assessment lead) was talking to some departments about use of Tabula for exam grids and would feedback to the Tabula team; and was also talking to Student Administrative Services to see if there was any capacity to change timings to improve matters for departments and students. • A paper recommending disestablishment of FYBoE would be submitted shortly to AQSC. • There was some institutional work commencing to look at the shape of the academic year (item 007 refers). <p>b) Warwick Awards for Teaching Excellence within the Faculty were acknowledged:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stefan Bon, Dani Pearson, and Mike Ward (Chemistry) • Matthew Leeke (Computer Science) • Andrew Brendon-Penn and Siri Chongchitnan (Mathematics) • Martyn Parker and Nicholas Tawn (Statistics) <p>c) Warwick Awards for Personal Tutoring Excellence within the Faculty were acknowledged:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Michael Pounds (Physics) <p>d) Changes in EPQ staff were acknowledged:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Louise Hasler had superseded Katharine Gray as Senior Assistant Registrar in EPQ. • Craig Franklin, who was already part of the EPQ team, would supersede Louise on 22 November. • Noted that Amy Collins (working in WMG) would continue to support as Assistant Secretary.
007	<p>Shape of the Academic Year</p> <p>Chris Luck, Senior Project Manager (Information and Digital Group), presented slides (recirculated alongside minutes) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This was a project in its infancy and the purpose of this presentation was to spread awareness. • There was no definitive decision at the time of presenting, and the Project Manager was keen to receive feedback and engage in consultation. • The timing of change would be considered but this would be after determining what (if any) change to make. • The shape of the academic year as advertised was not presently applicable to all programmes or departments but lacked any acknowledgement of this. • That there were a number of identified problems with the existing model, observations from research, and drivers for change from other institutions, as detailed in the slides. • The three high-level ways forward would be: to take no action, to apply fixes to the existing model, or to overhaul from scratch by introducing a new model of semesters. • There would be meaningful consultation prior to testing options; an in-principle high-level decision would then be made; subsequent to that decision there would be road mapping of impact, and then finally a decision on timing based on the preceding activities. <p>Discussion was as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nature of consultation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CL confirmed the consultation was intended to be genuine with the University not wedded to specific options (although acknowledging ‘no action’ was in reality unlikely). ○ Assurance was given that it was more coincidence than planning that the STEM Grand Challenge group had been discussing this same topic, but it had not been chosen as a definitive way forward by either project.

- CL clarified that although the initial consultation period was set at one month, a result of consultation could reasonably be a decision to undertake further consultation over a longer period.
- Identification of key areas to include in consultation:
 - PGT academic years did not follow existing shape anyway, so a change could risk clashes if this was not accounted for.
 - PGRs should also be involved in consultation proactively as they were involved with teaching and marking.
 - Support staff would also be affected and needed to be included in considerations and consultation as well; in particular the existing models and support systems placed a burden on administration that resulted in worsening the student experience due to untimely communications (for example of Exam Board decisions to withdraw).
 - Part Time courses were also part of the incongruity between Warwick's advertised academic year and its reality and would merit consideration.
- Addressing problems:
 - Fixing problems was a separate project to semesterisation, but both needed doing in conjunction; if problems were to be fixed then this would need to be within a new shape if a new shape was determined to be the way forward.
 - Risks around generation of new problems would need to be managed, but testing would be rigorously carried out to account for this.
 - CL encouraged members to share any known examples of problems faced by other institutions, as it had been difficult to secure this information; AnP had cited an example from King's College London of semesterisation resulting in an overall reduction of time allocated for sabbatical.
- Integration with other projects
 - The Review of Assessment would be taken into account, noting that there was already some indication from this work that January assessment may not be desirable for all programmes.
 - CL was in conversation with EPQ to account for any and all connected projects.
- Existing experience
 - Engineering co-taught PGTs and MEng students (for efficiency of teaching) and had encountered problems because of insufficient time for PGT project submission and marking at the end of the academic year.
 - A new system would need to work for both types of student and address this existing issue.
 - Engineering had introduced January exams with good outcomes so far but there were issues because this did not fit the current model.
 - Semesterisation was effectively already operational in Global Sustainable Development (within the Arts Faculty), but this was hidden within the advertised terms.
 - GSD found that students preferred this, but it was still challenging for staff with marking.
 - CL noted that some institutions had introduced mid-semester breaks which could help with marking load.
- Timing of change:
 - Statistics fed back that recent curriculum review due to the changes to the credit framework had taken 18 months, especially considering joint delivery between departments.
 - Further curriculum review would be prompted by this project as well and would take time in the same way.
 - AnP queried whether transition would be one year group per year or all at once (in the context of consumer protection); CL confirmed that the CMA had provided assurance transition would be acceptable with advanced planning and communication to affected groups of students.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In terms of change launch, 23/24 was really the very earliest possible time but this could in reality become 24/25 or later. ○ DR raised a concern over perpetuating a message that 23/24 would be a plausible launch given the apparent infeasibility of that timescale; CL responded that first identifying the problems and how to fix them was the core message rather than the possible timing.
008	<p>Education Strategy Priorities 21/22</p> <p>The Committee received the report (008.SEMEC.21-22) and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The attention given to the course approval process and system was greatly appreciated. ● Noted that departments would have opportunities to input to projects via task teams.
009	<p>Academic Director (Postgraduate Taught)</p> <p>The new Academic Director (Postgraduate Taught) outlined priorities coming into post:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LG was taking an approach initially of considering how Higher Education provision was considered both by society and also to some extent by the University – i.e., with a predominantly undergraduate lens – and by acknowledging this to identify some issues that result from undergraduate focus, and resultant priorities. ● One issue faced by PGT students was that study was far more like a job than UG study (50 out of 52 weeks expected to be working 9-5): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This could lead to a weakening of relationship with the University, noting that engagement with SU and societies was anecdotally low. ○ PGT students did not seem to greatly benefit from careers fairs (both from these having too many UG-focussed employers and also being set too early in the year to be meaningful for newly starting PGT students). ● Another issue was the narrow demographic and a lack of understanding of what Widening Participation should mean in a PGT context. ● The first priority discussed was diversity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Widening Participation was clear for undergraduate students but appeared often to cease to be a consideration once those students had graduated. ○ At an Office for Students meeting recently LG raised the question of PGT WP and not only observed that this did not seem to have been a consideration, but also that the response took an immediate turn towards PGR rather than PGT, identifying a gap in government perception. ○ LG also noted an over-dependence on specific markets (e.g. China), as well as underrepresentation from other markets (e.g. the African continent); this could result in cliques forming and less well-rounded experience for students. ○ LG observed another facet of diversity would be subject diversity and truly interdisciplinary or cross-faculty provision; there did not appear to academic opposition as much as financial from anecdotal discussion. ● The second priority discussed was coherence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PGT students had a variance of experience depending on their department and faculty, and whilst this was sometimes for valid reasons, there was also a lot of re-invention of practice in siloed pockets where some practice could reasonably be shared across the institution. ○ LG would like to promulgate best practice in order to decrease the amount of re-invention. ○ LG noted an example of WMG teaching in week blocks but therefore being unable to offer students modules from other departments. ○ A further objective was to achieve a more seamless transition from undergraduate to postgraduate study, including emphasising messaging around the positivity of postgraduate study as an option, noting that there seemed to be a perception (amongst students) of this being financially undesirable even if it might in fact be the better option for an individual.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The third priority discussed was community: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As noted, the general undergraduate focus was known to push PGT students away from engagement with the Students Union. ○ LG had asked the Students Union to do an introduction event for PGT students, so they might understand its purpose (especially since many PGT students came from overseas to study, and thus sometimes from contexts where Students Unions did not exist). ○ LG was also pushing for a PGT HEAR. <p>Discussion was as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● In response to a question, LG affirmed that part time PGT students would also be accounted for in plans and priorities. ● It was observed that care needed to be taken around what part time PGT students felt they wanted from their experience as often lack of engagement was due to lack of interest in certain areas more amenable to undergraduate and/or full-time student bodies. ● A suggestion in the Teams chat around UG/PGT pairing/mentoring could be considered or pursued. ● LG would be focussing on the existing difficulties of scheduling around cross-disciplinary activity as raised via the Teams chat. ● The Faculty Student Engagement Coordinator offered to provide further input on PGT engagement points raised by LG.
010	<p>Academic Integrity Update</p> <p>The Committee received the report (010.SEMEC.21-22) and key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Regulation 11 had been updated: the primary strand had been to clarify two types of issue – errors of omission, which were poor practice that could be dealt with in marking directly; versus errors of commission, which were attempts to cheat in some way. ● Academic Integrity Committees (replacing Investigating Committees of Senate) were permitted harsher sanctions for misconduct, including removal of students from the University. ● LG noted an expectation of issues arising and encouraged members to raise issues and questions with LH and LG initially so that such matters could be addressed promptly. ● Another key strand would be prevention, including the plans for a Celebration of Academic Integrity to reinforce a positive message about the topic overall. ● The final strand was detection, a large part of which would be technical support and training. <p>Discussion was as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LR noted a recent WMS issue of the interaction between academic conduct and fitness to practice (in the school’s context); the academic conduct letters almost prohibited taking the fitness to practice route; LG noted another new facet of the role would comprise fitness to practice, and so this could be reviewed. ● Clarity was needed over sanctions available for falsified mitigation evidence, which were likely to be disciplinary rather than academic but now fell under the same regulation and process.
011	<p>Flexible and Online Learning Division</p> <p>Sam Hardy, Director of this new Division, provided a verbal report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The role was within the Education Group and also comprised membership of Education Executive. ● Developing strategies for delivery of online and blended learning was the main focus. ● Areas of interest would include technology and how to use it to properly support learning design; for example, students had reported that 50-minute online lectures took 4 hours to work through.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SH was still in a transition phase with respect to staffing in the team and hence would be considering next steps in due course; members were welcome to email with initial input but with an understanding of resource constraints in the immediate term. • Some members noted that students taking longer over online lectures could be a sign of overall benefit to their learning; although SH agreed with this as a possibility, it would be necessary to undertake further investigation to establish whether there might also be inefficiencies in student approaches that were not yielding those benefits but still consuming as much time. • It was confirmed there were some existing online-only offerings as well as blended, and that this fell within the division's remit; there was a desire to grow further in this direction but this was perhaps not consistent across the institution.
012	<p>Postgraduate Business</p> <p>MW focussed on PGR given the earlier item on PGT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various standard scholarships were to open Tuesday 2 November; members were reminded to encourage applications. • DTPs and WIFs were in the final stages of organisation, with the expectation of an imminent announcement of details. • The Doctoral College had updated various policies online (https://warwick.ac.uk/services/dc/policies_guidance/), including a new definition of minor corrections.
013	<p>Widening Participation</p> <p>The Committee received a verbal report, and a paper was also circulated alongside the minutes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AB had met with HODs to consider 21/22 Widening Participation matters. • Specific contextual admissions requirements, including eligibility criteria, would now be available on course pages (as opposed to the previous general statement). • AB noted one area for improvement would be that some departments in the faculty were lacking in local students incoming, possibly as a result of A level availability (in particular Further Maths); this was a focus to address for 21/22. • A reminder was given that all staff involved in Open Days should have some form of safeguarding training (noting that this was not the same as a Disclosure and Barring Service check and that DBS was only required where colleagues might have regular contact with the same individual or individuals). • The Chair suggested that the Widening Participation item be moved further up the agenda at future meetings since often time was short, but this was a topic of importance. <p>ACTION: CF to arrange for Widening Participation to be placed earlier in future agendas.</p>
014	<p>Student Learning Experience and Engagement Committee Update</p> <p>A verbal report was received as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Departments were reminded to ensure SU representatives were invited to all SSLC meetings, as it had been observed that their attendance tended to fall after the initial meetings, but this may have been due to lack of invitation. • The SU were also reviewing their current SSLC representative election process, based on feedback from departments of dissatisfaction with this. • The Chair suggested that the minutes of SLEEC be put below the line at future SEMEC meetings, in addition to the substantive above-the-line item for RK's verbal report. <p>ACTION: CF to arrange for SLEEC minutes to be circulated below the line for future meetings.</p>
015	<p>Academic Misconduct Reports from Departments for 20/21</p> <p>The Committee received the report (015.SEMEC.21-22) and key points were as follows:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There were some differences between departments that could merit future investigation.
016	<p>Narrative Feedback Turnaround Reports from Departments for 20/21</p> <p>The Committee received the report (016.SEMEC.21-22) and key points were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted this was the first use of the narrative approach and it was appreciated that colleagues had engaged well with this change.
017	<p>Any other business</p> <p>Noted that the next meeting was scheduled to take place on campus.</p>
<i>Items below this line were for receipt and/or approval, without discussion</i>	
018	<p>Ofsted Debrief</p> <p>The Committee received and noted the report (018.SEMEC.21-22)</p>
019	<p>TABLE22</p> <p>The Committee received and noted the report (019.SEMEC.21-22)</p>
020	<p>National Student Survey Results 20/21</p> <p>The Committee received and noted the report (020.SEMEC.21-22)</p>
021	<p>Course Approvals Report 20/21</p> <p>The Committee received and noted the report (021.SEMEC.21-22)</p>
Next meeting: 2.00pm, Thursday 3 February 2022, Senate House Council Chamber	

DECISIONS AND ACTIONS			
ITEM	DECISION/ACTION	LEAD AND DUE DATE	STATUS
[2021-2022]			
013	CF to arrange for Widening Participation to be placed earlier future agendas.	CF, Jan 2022	New action
014	CF to arrange for SLEEC minutes to be circulated below the line for future meetings.	CF, Jan 2022	New action