

**UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK**  
**FACULTY EDUCATION AND STUDENT EXPERIENCE COMMITTEE**  
**(SCIENCE, ENGINEERING AND MEDICINE)**  
**PUBLIC MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD 10AM, WEDNESDAY 4 FEBRUARY 2026,**  
**WMG IMC BOARDROOM 2**

<b>Present</b>	Dr Martyn Parker	Chair, Reader, Statistics
	Dr James Archbold	Associate Professor, Computer Science ( <i>until end of item 022</i> )
	Dr Heidi Ashton	Faculty of Arts Representative and Associate Professor, Centre for Cultural and Media Policy Studies, SCAPVC
	Katie Berlin	Widening Participation Faculty Engagement Manager
	Dr Elisabeth Blagrove	Associate Professor, Psychology
	Michael Cavaliere	PGR Student Representative, Mathematics
	Dr Siri Chongchitnan	Associate Professor, Mathematics
	Professor Andrew Clark	Professor, Chemistry
	Dr Nicholas d'Ambrumenil	Associate Professor, Physics ( <i>until end of item 022</i> )
	Professor David Davies	Faculty Deputy Chair (External Engagement) and Professor, WMS
	Dr Ian Edwards	Associate Professor, Life Sciences
	Alfie Giffen	Undergraduate Student Representative, Mathematics
	Dr Elia Gironacci	Associate Professor, Engineering
	Thomas Hulley	Faculty Director of Administration nominee and Taught Programmes Manager, Computer Science
	Dr Nicholas Hopcroft	Associate Professor, WMS
	Dr Leda Mirbahai	Deputy Chair (PGT and PGR) and Associate Professor, WMS
	Dr Daniel Murdock	Associate Professor, Chemistry
	Dr Mucahit Ozden	Faculty Community Representative and Assistant Professor, WMG
	India Palmer	Faculty Community Representative and Apprentice Support Tutor, WMG
	Dr Michael Pounds	Deputy Chair (UG), Associate Professor, Physics
	Siobhan Qadir	Faculty Community Representative and Senior Careers Consultant, Student Opportunity ( <i>via MS Teams</i> )
	Dr Claire Rocks	Associate Professor, Computer Science
	Professor Parveen Samra	Professor, WMG
	Dr Gavin Schwartz-Leeper	Faculty Senior Tutor and Associate Professor, Liberal Arts
	Professor Samir Siksek	Professor, Mathematics
	Dr Cathy Slack	Associate Professor, Life Sciences
	Raven Taylor	Undergraduate Student Representative, Computer Science
Dr Elke Thonnes	Associate Professor, Statistics	
Dr Adrian von Muhlenen	Associate Professor, Psychology	
Dr Jianhua Yang	Faculty Student Engagement Co-ordinator and Associate Professor, WMG	
<b>Attending</b>	Dr Lynne Bayley	Senior Policy Advisor (Assessment), EPQ ( <i>for item 022 only</i> )
	Craig Franklin	Secretary, EPQ
	Dr Damien Homer	Head of Disability Services, Wellbeing Support Service ( <i>for item 023 only</i> )
	Jess Humphreys	Head of Department, WIHEA
	Dr John Kirkman	Associate Professor, Academic Development Centre
	Michelle Kitchen	Assistant Secretary, EPQ
	Professor Georgia Kremmyda	Deputy Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) ( <i>for item 024 only</i> )
	Enaya Nihal	Project Support Lead, Warwick Wellbeing ( <i>for item 023 only</i> )

	Andy Smith	Director of Wellbeing and Safeguarding, Wellbeing Support Service <i>(for item 023 only)</i>
	Joanne Wale	Head of Academic Projects and Administration, IATL
Ref	Item	
016	<p><b>Welcome and Apologies for absence</b></p> <p>The Chair welcomed all members and attendees to the meeting, including:</p> <p><b>New members:</b></p> <p>Thomas Hulley</p> <p><b>New colleagues joining ‘in attendance’:</b></p> <p>Jess Humphreys; Dr John Kirkman; Joanne Wale</p> <p><b>Apologies were received from:</b></p> <p>Dehuti Agarwal; Dr Gurpreet Chouhan; Dr Jon Duffy; Dr Richard Everitt; Gemma Gray; Dr Anthony Lyons; Dr Thomas Popham; Professor Lanre Sorinola; Professor Rob Thornton; Fiona Wallace; Professor Phil Young</p>	
017	<p><b>Declarations of Interest</b></p> <p>No new declarations were made.</p>	
018	<p><b>Minutes of last meeting on 06 November 2025</b></p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 06 November 2025 (018-SEMSE040226, Public) were <b>approved</b>, subject to revisions raised at the meeting.</p>	
019	<p><b>Matters arising from last meeting on 06 November 2025</b></p> <p><b>a) Academic Calendar Reform</b></p> <p>The Chair reported that the plan for this area had matured. The Academic Registrar had met with individual departments to discuss the Academic Calendar and canvassed further opinion. Term 3 would potentially be the time for a paper to be shared with the Committee.</p> <p><b>ACTION - Secretariat to invite the Academic Registrar to Term 3 meeting.</b></p> <p><b>b) Fully-enrolled Under-18 Year Old Students</b></p> <p>The Chair reported that this issue was raised at the Faculty Steering Group (FSG) and it was agreed that the Chair would investigate methods of support across the institution. Meetings had taken place, but the complexity of the issues raised meant that the <b>action from the previous meeting was ongoing.</b></p> <p><b>c) SSLC Chairs details to PGR student representative</b></p> <p>The PGR student representative reported that the majority of departments had provided details of their SSLC Chairs. They were in contact with the few outstanding departments regarding when their information would be available. The Chair asked those departments to provide their SSLC Chair details as soon as possible. <b>The action from the previous meeting was ongoing.</b></p> <p><b>d) Scholarship of Teaching &amp; Learning (SOTL)</b></p> <p>The Chair had emailed members to encourage participation in the Scholarship of Teaching &amp; Learning (SOTL). Faculty participation was good, as reported by the initiative lead. The Chair thanked members for their engagement. <b>The action from the previous meeting was closed.</b></p>	

	<p><b>e) Academic representation on the Student Experience Management Group</b></p> <p>It was agreed with the Director of Student Experience that the Science, Engineering and Medicine (SEM) faculty should have an academic representative from the Faculty Education and Student Experience Committee (FESEC) on the Student Experience Management Group (SEMG). Expressions of interest were sought from the SEM FESEC membership. Following a recruitment process, Dr Elisabeth Blagrove was appointed and had attended the first meeting. <b>The action from the previous meeting was closed.</b></p>
<b>Chair's Update</b>	
020	<p><b>Chair's Business and Actions</b></p> <p>The Committee received and noted an update from the Chair regarding the following issues:</p> <p><b>a) Academic Freedom Champions Role – call for volunteers</b></p> <p>An email was sent to members, who were staff, inviting expressions of interest (EOI) for this role. The Committee was then asked to vote for their chosen representative. Dr Anthony Lyons was chosen as the SEM FESEC representative. The Chair thanked all those who provided EOIs and wished Anthony every success in the role.</p> <p><b>b) Timetabling</b></p> <p>The Chair updated the Committee on recent developments from the University Space Management Committee. Communication was sent to departments for consideration regarding large cohort teaching. Departments received a set of questions regarding the use of Butterworth Hall (700 capacity) and Theatre Venue (500 capacity). The deadline for responses was 30<sup>th</sup> January 2026.</p> <p><b>c) UKVI Remote Delivery Policy</b></p> <p>The Chair thanked departments who had returned their remote delivery returns. Some conversations had been held with those departments reporting 0% to ensure some headroom. As a result, the Chair requested an adjustment from 0% to 20% to allow some headroom in cases such as for emergency remote teaching.</p> <p><b>d) Reform of Academic Regulations and Policy Project Update</b></p> <p>The Chair drew members' attention to the paper below the line (027- SEMESE040226, Public). A new academic manual webpage had been launched, and members were encouraged to provide feedback directly via the webpage.</p> <p><b>e) Inclusive Education Update</b></p> <p>The Chair drew members' attention to the paper below the line (030- SEMESE040226, General), specifically to page 5 which highlighted a cross-faculty inclusive education event, scheduled for 21<sup>st</sup> May 2026, aimed at encouraging collaboration and sharing best practices. Members of the Committee and department colleagues were encouraged to attend.</p>
<b>Substantive Items</b>	
021	<p><b>Student Representatives Update</b></p> <p>The Student Representatives gave a verbal update. The key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SSLC Chairs had met recently, and it was reported that the meeting was positive. The issue of calculator policies was raised at that meeting and would be followed up. The Chair highlighted that</li> </ul>

	<p>exam regulation which include the use of calculators was potentially being considered as part of the Reform of Academic Regulations and Policy Project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Students' Union was experiencing some resourcing issues in the academic representation team. Academic planning meetings were being held to address this.</li> <li>• The need for consistent communication regarding reasonable adjustments across departments was highlighted, which tied into broader accessibility concerns. The Chair noted some movement in this area, but that further work was needed.</li> </ul>
022	<p><b>Right to Remedy Failure: SEM Implications</b></p> <p>The Committee received the report (022-SEMSE040226, General) and welcomed the Senior Policy Advisor (Assessment), EPQ who provided an overview of the issues. The key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The paper presented a series of questions within two areas for discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Discussion part 1: Reassessment in Modules Exempt from the Right to Remedy Failure</li> <li>○ Discussion part 2: Proposed Amendments to Right to Remedy Failure</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The Committee was asked about implementing algorithmic conditions for reassessment in modules exempt from the right to remedy failure, using lab-based modules as an example. Members discussed the need for curriculum-level definitions, the importance of attendance as a criterion, and the challenge of ensuring consistency across modules and departments.</li> <li>• A specific case involving a physics student was discussed, highlighting the complexities of applying algorithms to unusual cases and the importance of defensible, consistent decision-making, especially in the context of appeals and external review.</li> <li>• Members raised the issue of difficulties communicating with large numbers of students, particularly in the period between marking and exam boards. Members agreed Tabula should allow for decisions to be communicated more easily.</li> <li>• It was noted that students who find themselves with Resit Without Residence or Temporary Withdrawal decisions were often the people who needed the most comprehensive support toward their final outcomes.</li> <li>• It was suggested that systems should be set up for part-time resit with residence, particularly for lab modules.</li> <li>• Resit with residence would be popular with students and part-time could be a good option as it would allow for a spread of reassessments. Members suggested it would be beneficial to those with reasonable adjustments or where their circumstances required a reduced load. It was noted though that there were financial implications for students to resit with residence.</li> <li>• Visa implications for overseas students were raised as some countries did not allow part-time study and so this meant part-time resits would not be an option for them. Much of the previous discussion had focused on home students but there was a need to consider whether a module was still running to permit residency and the resit to take place. If the module was not planned to re-run that presented issues for overseas students who needed to resit.</li> <li>• It was highlighted that a partner institution had 75% overseas students and allowed resit with residence.</li> <li>• Members were encouraged to provide any further feedback they had to the paper's author.</li> </ul>
023	<p><b>Student Wellbeing Strategy</b></p> <p>The Committee received the report (023-SEMSE040226, Confidential) and welcomed the Director of Wellbeing and Safeguarding, the Head of Disability Services, Wellbeing Support Service and the Project Support Lead, Warwick Wellbeing, who provided an overview of the strategy. The key points and discussions were as follows:</p>

- The new strategy aligned to national guidance and best available evidence, aimed to promote health, safety, and a supportive culture for students and staff. It centred on care and was being led by professional services staff in collaboration with departments and personal tutors.
- Members commented that the 2030 ambitions were good. However, the strategy lacked detail of how these ambitions would be achieved. There was also little detail about how the strategy would be communicated more widely.
- An implementation plan would be produced as an addendum to the strategy and some consultation, run by working groups, was underway. A Student Wellbeing Implementation Group (SWIG) was also planned.
- The Students' Union (SU) had been involved in the student wellbeing strategy for the last two years and there was now greater alignment between the new strategy and the SU strategy.
- The strategy had been shared with Council, an update had recently gone to UEB, and it would be presented to Senate in April for approval.
- The Chair highlighted the ongoing concern of under-18 year old students and the need to ensure that vulnerable groups were embedded into the strategy
- The *Start Well* approach of the strategy would include support for under-18s, ensuring a clearer duty of care for children and that appropriate safeguarding policies and procedures were in place.
- Concerns were raised about inconsistent communications around the release of accommodation. This led to vulnerable students missing out on securing suitable accommodation. Work was underway to address this to ensure a fair and consistent approach in future.
- Members were encouraged to share any further views or feedback on the Student Wellbeing Strategy with the paper's authors.

#### Strategic Item

024

#### Assessment and Feedback

The Chair introduced the item on Assessment and Feedback (024a-SEMSE040226, General) and invited members to discuss the draft Assessment Strategy (024b-SEMSE040226, General) submitted by the Deputy Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching), prior to them joining the meeting. The key points and discussions were as follows:

- The Chair highlighted that there were lots of examples of good practice across the Faculty that had been noted during the Education Priorities Dialogue discussions.
- NSS scores were not always reflective of the excellent work going on in departments. This was one of the reasons for the need for a new strategy on Assessment and Feedback.
- Systems used were identified as one of the key issues and often a limitation, with no unified point of engagement for assessment. For example, Tabula was used for some programmes and Moodle for others. There was a disconnect between systems, and whilst Tabula was considered better than Moodle in terms of assessment, it lacked some functionality. It was noted that there were other tools that were far superior to both Tabula and Moodle.
- Members commented that the draft Assessment Strategy referred to supplementary information, such as assessment templates and asked whether all departments would be required to use the same templates or rubrics. WMG used their own templates, as did Engineering.
- Workload sustainability was raised as an issue, and it was suggested that increased cohort sizes needed to be factored into an assessment strategy.
- Concern was raised around academic integrity. The example was given, in a Computer Science module, of shifting mark allocation away from coding assessments towards written reports to mitigate large language models (LLMs) writing code. This was done rather than redesigning the assessment of the module. More thought needed to be given to futureproofing of assessments.
- Concrete examples were needed to demonstrate why, or why not, a more standardised approach to assessment would work. Any approach would need to be defensible with regulatory bodies.
- It was noted that many other institutions had taken a standardised approach to assessment and that there was a value in consistency from the student perspective. Whilst the principles of standardisation were fine, implementation needed careful consideration.

- Tariffs mentioned in the draft Assessment Strategy were a concern to members and needed consideration.
- Members discussed the need for consistency in assessment, particularly at course level to support interdisciplinarity.
- It was suggested that the guidance should be focused on consistency in assessment types that departments could then customise, such as rubrics and templates.
- Expectation setting around assessments was an issue during the course of a degree and some level of standardisation would have potential value.

The Committee welcomed the Deputy Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) who gave a verbal update on the draft Assessment Strategy (024b-SEMESE040226, General) and responded to points raised by members. The key points and discussions were as follows:

- The vision for assessment templates and rubrics, in terms of consistency, was not to dictate how departments assess. The intention was to say that the University supported these types of assessments and provided resources to help departments deliver them.
- Marking schemes associated to assessment types were suggested, with assessment within a spectrum of assessment types supported by the University.
- There would need to be support for staff so they could understand different assessment types.
- Members asked how staff could be convinced that consistency was beneficial, both intellectually and for the student experience. Whilst templates had advantages, they could also restrict academic freedom and stifle creativity. The principles of assessment were important, and the conversation could focus on clear communication of expectations to students rather than consistency through templates.
- The Assessment Strategy was not seeking to change the principles. It was about implementing principles and strategies in assessment delivery. There needed to be universal understanding of what feedback was, what a rubric was, and what marking criteria were. Support was needed to help people visualise the standards and set expectations for students and staff.
- Members asked if it was a staff training and development issue rather than a strategy issue and commented on the need for consistency when new staff joined departments. The committee emphasised the importance of training and development for staff and students to implement the strategy effectively.
- Behind the strategy was an assessment framework which included templates, examples of marking schemes, a number of training opportunities and support for staff and students, systems and infrastructure, policy and regulation.
- The contracts for the current assessment platforms were approaching their end, with an option for limited extension. This created an opportunity to explore alternative platforms and suppliers that might offer stronger support and training. Clearly defining assessment types was essential to ensure that any new systems could handle the majority of assessment needs and provide useful analytics. Relevant teams were exploring potential options.
- Investment in software needed to be right so that staff time was not wasted learning to use the system. Resourcing and training were important to ensure full use of systems was possible. The full capability of WiseFlow was never enacted and this should not be repeated with any future system.
- The University Senior Leadership were expecting some indication of costs from the Assessment Strategy Group, along with a well-established business plan set over the next four or five years.
- Members commented that the strategic aim was a shift toward programme level assessment. However, this seemed to be at odds with the Lifelong Learning Entitlement (LLE) that was due in 2027 and would focus on micro-credentials rather than full programmes. There was a need for flexibility to accommodate future sector changes.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Flexible Futures Working Group had been established to provide insights on LLE. There was potential to incorporate these into the strategy.</li> <li>Undergraduate and Postgraduate provision could need different approaches in the strategy, but with commonality between them.</li> <li>An action group had been established and was due to meet from mid-February. The intention was to bring details of a framework and an update around systems to the SEM FESEC in Term 3.</li> <li>Members were encouraged to keep in contact with their departmental colleagues who were on the action group and send any further comments or feedback on the draft Assessment Strategy to the Deputy Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching).</li> </ul>
<b>Items below this line were for receipt and/or approval, without discussion</b>	
025	<b>Chair's Action of Approval of Variation to Assessment</b> The Committee received and noted the report (025-SEMESE040226, General).
026	<b>Updated Membership and Terms of Reference 2025-26</b> The Committee received and noted the report (026- SEMESE040226, Public).
027	<b>Reform of Academic Regulations and Policy Project Update</b> The Committee received and noted the report (027- SEMESE040226, Public).
028	<b>Compassionate Communication Project Update</b> The Committee received and noted the report (028- SEMESE040226, General).
029	<b>Widening Participation Update</b> The Committee received and noted the report (029- SEMESE040226, Public).
030	<b>Inclusive Education Update</b> The Committee received and noted the report (030- SEMESE040226, General).
<b>Other</b>	
031	<b>Any other business</b> There was no other business discussed.
<b>Next meeting: Tuesday 12<sup>th</sup> May 10:00-12:00, WMG IMC Boardroom 2</b>	

<b>DECISIONS AND ACTIONS</b>			
<b>ITEM</b>	<b>DECISION/ACTION</b>	<b>LEAD AND DUE DATE</b>	<b>STATUS</b>
<b>[2025-2026]</b>			
<b>From 06 November 2025</b>			
004 - Matters arising from last meeting on 01 May 2025 a. Academic Calendar Reform	<b>ACTION:</b> Secretariat to invite the Academic Registrar to Term 2 meeting.	Secretariat 02/2026	Closed (see Action below)
006 – Chair's Business and Actions	<b>ACTION:</b> Chair to raise at Faculty Steering Group the issue of support for departments with fully enrolled students who are under 18 years old.	Chair 02/2026	Ongoing

b. Under 18 UG students			
009 - Student Representatives Update	<b>ACTION:</b> Members to provide details of their SSLC Chairs to PGR student representative. Secretariat to support this by circulating details of this action to members.	Secretariat and Members 02/2026	Ongoing
015 – AOB b. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL) Leads	<b>ACTION:</b> Chair to send an email out to the Faculty to encourage participation in the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning (SOTL).	Chair 02/2026	Closed
015 – AOB c. Student Experience Management Group	<b>ACTION:</b> Chair to take a discussion to Faculty Steering Group to approach the issue of a lack of academic representation on the Student Experience Management Group.	Chair 02/2026	Closed
<b>From 04 February 2026</b>			
019 - Matters arising a. Academic Calendar Reform	<b>ACTION:</b> Secretariat to invite the Academic Registrar to Term 3 meeting.	Secretariat 05/2026	Ongoing