

UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK
FACULTY OF SCIENCE, ENGINEERING AND MEDICINE EDUCATION COMMITTEE
OPEN/ RESTRICTED MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 5 MAY 2021
VIA MS TEAMS

Present	Professor David Davies	DD	Chair
	Alex Baker	ABak	Postgraduate Research Student
	Dr Adam Chester	AC	Computer Science
	Dr Nikola Chmel	NC	Chemistry
	Professor Gill Cooke	GC	Engineering
	Dr Nick d'Ambrumenil	NA	Physics
	Dr Lucy Hammond	LEH	Warwick Medical School
	Dr Matt Jones	MJ	WMG
	Professor Georgia Kremmyda	GK	Engineering
	Dr James Lloyd-Hughes	JLH	Physics
	Professor Jason Madan	JM	Warwick Medical School
	Dr Anastasia Papavasileiou	AP	Statistics
	Dr Michael Pounds	MP	Physics
	Dr Kevin Purdy	KP	Life Sciences
	Professor Lesley Roberts	LR	Warwick Medical School
	Professor Jane Sinclair	JS	Computer Science (Deputy Chair)
	Professor Mark Steel	MS	Statistics
	Dr Helen Toner	HT	Faculty Senior Tutor
	Dr Adrian von Muhlenen	AVM	Psychology
	Professor Martin Wills	MWil	Chemistry (Deputy Chair)
Dr Dave Wood	DW	Mathematics	
Dr Philip Young	PY	Life Sciences	
Attending	Chris Bisping (item 046)	CB	Academic Director PGT
	Amy Collins	AHC	Assistant Secretary
	Geraldine Connelly (items 042 and 043)	GC	Assistant Registrar (Assessment)
	Cameron Rae (item 041)	CR	Senior Data Analyst
	Amber Thomas (item 041)	AT	Head of Academic Technology and Digital Transformation
	Dr Elke Thonnes	ET	Faculty Student Engagement Coordinator
	Mahfia Watkinson	MWat	Assistant Registrar (Teaching and Learning)
Ref	Item		
034	<p>Apologies for absence</p> <p>Apologies were received from Professor Ian Tuersley, Professor Jose Rodrigo, Dr Paul Jenkins, Dr Gioia Panzarella, Alex Fletcher, Professor Ian Tuersley, Amanda Bishop, Professor Dmitriy Rumynin, Dr Russ Kitson, and Louise Hasler.</p>		
035	<p>Declarations of Interest</p> <p>No new declarations were made.</p>		
036	<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>		
037	<p>Minutes of last meeting on 14 January 2021</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 14 January 2021 (037.SEMEC.20-21) were received and approved.</p>		
038	<p>Matters arising from past meetings</p> <p>The matters arising were as follows:</p> <p>(a) Annual Timeliness of Feedback Turnaround Narrative (14 January 2021)</p>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The University would be adopting the agreed narrative approach on an annual basis, which would go to the October meeting of SEMEC. Members would have the opportunity to discuss the approach and provide feedback to share with AQSC to inform the ongoing review of the policy. Heads of Departments were reminded that where the 5 additional discretionary days had been granted (on top of the usual 20-day turnaround), a record should be returned to the EPQ Quality Resource account (quality@warwick.ac.uk), to inform the ongoing oversight arrangements. <p>(b) Terms of Reference (27 October 2020)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senate approved the removal of clause (h) from FEC Terms of Reference: “To consider and approve, on behalf of the Board, changes to undergraduate modules in the Faculty, pending the availability of Phase 2 of the SITS workflow.” The Committee ToR has been updated to reflect the change.
Chair’s Update	
Items beyond this point were taken out of order as a result of time constraints; the order was: 041, 046, 040, 042, 043, 045, 039, 047; 044 was effectively left below the line.	
039	<p>Chair’s Business and Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reported that approval was given to a change of assessment for an individual student from Computer Science who transferred course as Chair’s Action. Confirmed approval of the Faculty FYBoE membership (below the line item 048), as this was the last meeting before September and confirmed the exceptional approval that WMG may have a third member as requested due to the volume of cases. Noted that a high-level summary of TEG had been shared with the Chair from EPQ, but as the Chair was conscious many departments had not yet received their TEG outcomes themselves, this would be deferred to a future meeting. Noted that the University welcomed the support and engagement of departments with the recording of temporary changes in their Curriculum Change Logs; approval of these would be light-touch to facilitate departmental responsiveness to the ongoing restrictions and impact of Covid-19. The Faculty Director of Administration was initiating a rapid consultation regarding potential movement into departments of monitoring arrangements for students out on Study Abroad, which is usually undertaken by the central Study Abroad Team as well as some departments. Although not uniformly rejected by members, two departments reported workload impact concerns raised via the Teams chat, from Engineering and Chemistry which the Chair would relay. Professor Caroline Meyer had been appointed PVC for Research and a new SEM Faculty Chair and Vice Provost would be sought.
Strategic Item	
040	<p>STEM Grand Challenge</p> <p>Professor Georgia Kremmyda, STEM Grand Challenge lead for Education and Student Experience workstream, presented (040.SEMEC.20-21) with key details as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The STEM Grand Challenge was a programme based on the University strategy to grow STEM, with broad Faculty coverage but an initial focus on Chemistry, Engineering and Physics. This was not just a building project but an opportunity to reimagine how we use campus estate; it was also an opportunity for the Faculty to explore how cross-departmental teams work together, interdisciplinarity, and develop new ways of working to strengthen innovation. The project had moved to the workstream phase; hence this update was being given to member on the Education and Student Experience workstream in particular. The Education and Student Experience stream was the biggest stream with wide representation and was utilising smaller task and finish groups to work towards specific objectives. The four groups were: Existing Provision, New Provision, Organisation and Structure, and Space Requirements and its specific tasks include:

- **Existing Provision:** delivering a comprehensive mapping of current provision by programme, module and space etc. with the aim of informing future considerations about how provision will map across to grand challenge objectives.
 - **New Provision:** Presently investigating different approaches to and examples of STEM provision across the world to inform future models considered at Warwick. The work has noted trends in Interdisciplinarity, Degree Apprenticeships, Distance Learning and Online Delivery.
 - **Organisation and Structure:** Mapping of the three key departmental structures undertaken including governance, student experience, and wellbeing functions.
 - **Space Requirements:** Having undertaken a review of STEM infrastructure projects in the UK, it is in the process of contacting other experienced departments in Warwick to inform deliverables.
- GK invited SEMEC for any feedback for consideration and discussion; SEMEC was forewarned, with apologies, that forthcoming data requests were likely to have tight turnaround times.

There was subsequent discussion as below:

- MWil (Deputy Chair) queried what the wider feedback mechanisms would be; GK clarified for the workstream there was already representation from each department (which should therefore facilitate internal conversations and feed-through); they were also planning department level consultations too to allow for wider direct input from departmental staff.
- The Chair asked for clarification on any even wider (ex-STEM) representation or consultation, noting that true interdisciplinarity would require cross-faculty representation; GK noted an intention to seek representation from WBS.
- AP queried involvement of Statistics in the group; GK said this could be arranged if AP could suggest a suitable nominee; GK also reassured colleagues that a check would be maintained to monitor for broad representation.
- PY observed that such plans for incoming large-scale new provision would require a functional and suitable Course Approvals system. Several departments agreed that the current online Course Approval system used by the University was not fit for purpose; SEMEC was in shared agreement that urgent resolution was required regarding the functionality of this system, not only for the expected wave of new provision planned in relation to the STEM Grand Challenge, but also based on the negative experience of some departments that had recently undergone approval or re-approval of courses.

Main Section

041

Learner Analytics

Amber Thomas, Head of Academic Technology and Digital Transformation and Cameron Rae, Senior Data Analyst gave a verbal report and presentation, with key points and discussions as follows:

- CR provided an overview of the educational analytics framework; notably this could be focussed on various levels – student, cohort, and institution.
- Noted that the purpose of analytics was often to prompt some form of intervention, be that at student level, module design level, or otherwise.
- Limitations recognised included: that activity, attention and engagement were not always indicative of each other; also, data could be incomplete or recorded in an inappropriate way for monitoring purposes.
- Noted also data protection concerns when dealing with individual or small group data; but that most data to be used at a cohort level or higher, could be anonymised.
- The project aim was around improving provision of the personalised level of data to personal tutors in particular.
- The Chair suggested that members consider the questions posed in the slides for discussion at a future meeting rather than this meeting due to time constraints.
- AT noted that the team were looking for personal tutors to help with an assisted deep dive into their data needs.
- PY offered to contribute some experience out of SEMEC's previous investigations into the topic.
- LR cautioned the importance of considering whether supposed static characteristics were truly static after the point of joining, as student status could be more fluid; this was acknowledged.

042	<p>Right to Remedy Failure Policy</p> <p>The Committee received (042.SEMEC.20-21) with key details and discussions, as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GC provided background: in July 2019, the Review of Assessment Group (RAG) recommended all students from 21/22 should be entitled to remedy failure in all failed modules once and at the earliest opportunity; this policy was the enactment of that decision. • The draft policy was recently discussed at AQSC (4 May) and was to be revisited on 2 June before consideration by Senate in July. Further to AQSC’s discussion clause 2.5 was to be removed, along with the need to get assessment and reassessment approved at the same time (but still noting that approval should still be secured in a timely manner). • MP queried if the policy was meant to apply to all modules, in particular modules with laboratories; if there was no flexibility, the combination of urgency and having to generate a feasible alternative could result in a weaker assessment being approved; GC clarified exemptions were covered in Rules for Award but agreed this should be accurately covered in this policy as well. • In relation to the above MP requested care be taken by central teams when issuing student communications around the right to remedy failure; past experience had resulted in unexpected workload for departments when communications with little advance warning had indicated caveats without specific detail, and students had consequently overwhelmed their departments requesting clarity and answers. • ABak noted that this policy did not explicitly clarify there was a cap on a resubmission (although Rules for Award did); GC acknowledged and confirmed to update this change. • MJ brought up a concern around general wording for part-time students (e.g. references to the “final year”) which may be less meaningful for part time courses; GC acknowledged this also.
043	<p>Rules for Award Policy</p> <p>The Committee received (043.SEMEC.20-21) with key details and discussions, as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GC provided background: the policy arose from a RAG recommendation to harmonise UG and Integrated Masters award rules, and to bring in clear borderline discretion rules across UG and PGT; it would also endeavour to bring various disparate and related policies together in one place. • Noted that Appendix A from existing UG Rules for Award would be checked and updated in consultation with departments; and that consultation was ongoing in relation to the MBChB programme. • AP raised a concern about forcing year 2 modules to become core required (pass required) when this had not been the case previously; however, PY clarified this was not what the policy said – only that 90 CATS must be passed and that as long as the course specification, regulations, and handbooks were clear which modules did not require a pass, this was allowed. • PY offered to speak to any other departments to assist with implementation (as PY was involved in the RAG subgroup). • DW queried 8.6: the over-cutting rule was missing and so the policy suggested every module was to be included rather than using the rule; GC asked to speak to DW separately to discuss this. • HT queried whether the wording of the weighted mean also accounted for modules that only needed to be taken but did not count towards final grade (e.g. most first years); GC would check and update. • HT queried if year weightings were accounted for as well (e.g. where some years were differently weighted from each other); GC would double check this too. • PY clarified that 8.5 should cover the above points from HT.
044	<p>Widening Participation</p> <p>A written report was circulated before the meeting in place of a verbal report, due to the unplanned absence of the Widening Participation Coordinator (ABish). This was effectively received below the line, with members encouraged to contact ABish with any questions or comments outside of the meeting.</p>
045	<p>Postgraduate Business</p> <p>Martin Wills, Deputy Chair (Chemistry) gave a verbal report with details as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BGS met on 4 May and covered the AISG paper, governance, and the PGR course reviews. • Regarding WIF, the replacement for WCPRS, the Faculty had an initial allocation of 12 places, of which 10 applications were received by the deadline, and all funded; a second round had been called with a 6 May

	<p>deadline and 4 applications so far received (note: MWil was hopeful of securing extra allocations as had often been possible in past years).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Covid extensions were into phase III with 320 extensions to PGR registrations approved so far. • The Doctoral College was still awaiting clarity over Brexit implications. • PRES had opened with departments asked to encourage students to complete this. • Professor Colin Sparrow was coming to the end of their term of office as the Academic Director (Doctoral College) and would to be replaced by Professor Dan Branch (former Head of the Department of History). <p>The Committee received (045.SEMEC.20-21) with key details and discussions, as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A short executive report was provided on PGR course reviews, with a longer report below the line. • Recruitment was holding up quite well. • Tabula had been adopted for monitoring across the board. • A new question in the reports for this year related to Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (and responses could be noted in the full report). • Suggestions regarding the template and the dissemination of outcomes would be welcomed. • One department had drawn out learning around GDPR issues arising from the use of e-portfolios for PGRs; this was worth dissemination for awareness for all departments as good practice. <p>The Chair also drew members' attention to (050.SEMEC.20-21), which was below the line, and highlighted that there was a consultation ongoing as to where best to consider matters related to PGT provision; DD noted that these were often considered across a disparate selection of committees and groups.</p>
046	<p>Academic Integrity</p> <p>The Committee received (046.SEMEC.20-21) with key details and discussions, as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sub-group on Academic Integrity had formed out of the Review of Assessment; led by RC initially and handed to CB this year. • This was centred on reframing Academic Integrity to focus more on student integrity and less on the negative aspects (such as terminology focussed on cheating and plagiarism). • CB presented the regulation which was admittedly more focussed on those aforementioned negative aspects and how they should be dealt with; the choice of re-wording was key (for example, "cheating" had become "misconduct") and the distinction between exams and other assessments had been dropped in light of online examinations; they had redefined sanctions and separated this policy properly from other non-academic disciplinary procedures (such as the Student Disciplinary Procedure). • CB requested that if there were technical comments to make, these should be made by email, but welcomed any broad comments about the direction of travel. • MJ raised some concerns from WMG related to the operational impact of some aspects of the policy (offering to provide specific detail via email as requested); there was a concern around the conflict between requiring a diverse panel of three members for ACPs; there was also a concern around the feasibility of a 60-day turnaround including both local ACP and central AIC when the central AIC timing in particular was outside of the department's control. • CB noted WMG had been represented in the group and confirmed that the document needed to be finalised ideally w/c 10 May in order to meet the Senate timetable. • The Chair recommended that WMG make their concerns known through the sub-group rather than bringing any detail to this meeting. • ABak queried why section C was only good practice and not the required baseline approach; CB advised that this was to avoid prescribing approaches which may have adverse impact on departments of varying size or complexity and which could be to the detriment of students, for example appreciating that every effort should be taken to arrange a cross-representative ACP for joint degrees in practice this may not be feasible and could delay the scheduling of timely meetings. • ABak also noted on section A3.3.vii that some departments used question banks and others used questions from previous years and asked where the line was drawn. • ABak expressed a view that any issue with achieving diversity of panels should not be perceived as a problem with the policy but a problem that the department concerned should resolve.

Other	
047	<p>Any other business</p> <p>The following business was raised by HT relating to online assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HT raised the Senate’s resolved preference for online assessment (October 2020) and queried whether this merited some discussion or consideration within Faculty Education Committees, for wider implications, noting that the decision had not been consulted upon. • The Chair noted that there was a prompt clarification from Senate after its resolution that this stance was not intended to preclude assessments that could not be done online. • JS queried whether explicit approval for in-person exams would be required in future. • MWat noted that departments still had at their discretion their choice of alternative assessment types; in 2020 there had been a process from Exams to request exceptional on-campus examinations and that this process remained; such assessment requests would not require a Curriculum Change Log approval unless there were concerns such as feasibility or Health and Safety. <p>The Chair noted that there would be a follow-up blended learning forum for the Faculty in mid-late July.</p>
<i>Items below this line were for receipt and/or approval, without discussion</i>	
048	<p>First Year Board of Examiners</p> <p>The Committee approved (048.SEMEC.20-21) as noted above (039). It was noted that the Faculty membership for FYBoE would proceed the Board for confirmation before it is ratified by the Senate.</p>
049	<p>Postgraduate Research Annual Course Reviews – Appendix</p> <p>The Committee received (049.SEMEC.20-21).</p>
050	<p>Governance and management of PGT provision</p> <p>The Committee received (050.SEMEC.20-21).</p>
Next meeting: 14.00, Wednesday 27 October 2021, Senate House Council Chamber	

DECISIONS AND ACTIONS	
No actions were required arising from this meeting.	
048	<p>DECISION</p> <p>The Faculty Education Committee approved the Faculty membership of the September Faculty First Year Board of Examiners.</p>