

UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK

Academic Quality and Standards Committee

Minutes of the meeting of the Academic Quality and Standards Committee held on 22 January 2018.

Present: Professor C Hughes (Chair), Professor A Clark (Academic Director, Undergraduate Studies), Professor G Cooke (co-opted member of academic staff in quality assurance role), Dr W Curtis (Academic Director, Partnerships), Dr D Davies (Representative of the Board of Faculty of Medicine), E Dunford (Postgraduate Officer, Students' Union), Dr M Gifford (Representative of the Board of Faculty of Science), Professor L Gracia (Dean of Students), Dr L Hammond (Representative of the Faculty of Medicine), Professor C Jenainati (Representative of the Board of Faculty of Arts), L Jackson (Education Officer, Students' Union), Dr J Lee (co-opted member of academic staff in quality assurance role), Dr M Leeke (Representative of the Board of Faculty of Science), Professor N Monk (Director of IATL), Professor C Sparrow (Academic Director, Graduate Studies), Professor P Tissington (Academic Director, Employability) and Professor G van der Velden (Chair of the Student Learning Experience and Engagement Committee).

Apologies: Professor D Lamburn (Deputy Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education)), Professor E Jones (Representative of the Faculty of Social Sciences), Professor P Roberts (Representative of the Board of Faculty of Arts) and Dr E Ushioda (Representative of the Board of Faculty of Social Sciences).

In Attendance: C Gray (Secretary), C Pearson (Assistant Secretary), A Higgins (Director of Academic Office) for item 51, Dr E Melia (Senior Assistant Registrar, Strategic Programme Delivery) for item 46, Dr J Taylor (Assistant Registrar, Examinations) for item 51 and S Waldron (Administrative Officer, Complaints Resolution) for item 50.

The Chair welcomed Professor Patrick Tissington to the first meeting.

41.17-18 Minutes of the last meeting

CONSIDERED:

Minutes of the meeting of the Academic Quality and Standards Committee on 23 November 2017;

RESOLVED:

That Professor van der Velden was listed as present at the meeting and also having sent apologies for the meeting, it was

confirmed that Professor van der Velden was not present at the meeting and the minutes would be corrected accordingly.

42.17-18 Conflicts of Interest

REPORTED:

That, should any members or attendees of the Academic Quality and Standards Committee have any conflicts of interest relating to agenda items for the meeting, they should be declared in accordance with the CUC Guide for Members of Higher Education Governing Bodies in the UK, available online from:

<http://www.universitychairs.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Code-Final.pdf>

43.17-18 Matters arising

- (a) Annual and termly Report on Complaints and Appeals (minute 26
(b) 17-18 refers)

REPORTED:

That at its meeting on 23 November 2017, the Academic Quality and Standards Committee considered the annual and termly report on student complaints and appeals (AQSC 04.17-18) and resolved (*inter alia*) that further possible reasons should be provided for the 50% decline in postgraduate appeals received in 2016/17; this issue was addressed in the paper AQSC 36/17-18 under item 50.

- (b) Compliance with Consumer Protection Legislation (Competition and Markets Authority) (minute AQSC.12/17-18 refers)

REPORTED:

- (i) That at its meeting on 31 October 2017, the Committee received a report from the Acting Academic Registrar on work undertaken to comply with requirements of Consumer Protection Law at the University of Warwick to date and members of the Committee were invited to consider how it would secure responsibility for oversight and institutional compliance with Consumer Protection Law (paper AQSC.10/17-18) in future;
- (ii) That the Committee resolved that the item needed further in-depth consideration and that the item be brought forward to the next meeting of the Committee;
- (iii) That it had not been possible to progress work on the item and as such it would be deferred to the second meeting of the Committee in the Spring Term on 14 February 2018.

(c) Outstanding ITLR responses (minutes AQSC.91/16-17 and 5(a) refer)

REPORTED:

- (i) That at its meeting on 23 November 2017, it was reported to the Committee that the responses to the ITLR reports for the Admissions Office and WMG were still outstanding at the time of the meeting and that they would be approved at a future meeting of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee;
 - (ii) That the Chair had taken action to approve the responses to the ITLR report from the Student Admissions and Recruitment Office;
 - (iii) That the Chair would resolve the WMG report and response in due course;
 - (iv) In response to a query raised by the Institute of Advanced Teaching and Learning relating to the minutes from the meeting on 12 June 2017; that both the response and report relating to the ITLR had been submitted and available for consideration at the meeting but, in addition to a few other departments, were approved by Chair's action following the meeting upon receipt and consideration of outstanding reviewer comments from committee members (paper AQSC 32.17/18 referenced)
- (d) Recommendations from the Institutional Teaching and Learning Review 2017 (minute 30/17-18 refers)

REPORTED:

- (i) That the Academic Quality and Standards Committee at its meeting on 23 November 2017 had considered a process flow chart for monitoring progress against recommendations by the ITLR Steering Group as set out in paper AQSC 25.17/18 and paper AQSC 26.17/18 listing University level recommendations with the Academic Quality and Standards Committee as "owner".
- (ii) That the Committee resolved (*inter alia*) that further guidance should be sought on the colour coding of the actions to understand if one colour merely grouped together the same theme or if the colours stood for something different than the themes;
- (iii) That it was also imperative to highlight any collaborative recommendations in the ITLR 2017 recommendations/actions separately;

RESOLVED:

- (iv) That the Chair reported that the colour coding indicated the thematic themes within the ITLR recommendations;

- (v) That collaborative recommendations/actions would be highlighted separately and would be sent to the Academic Director of Partnerships for information in due course by the ITLR project manager.
- (e) Consultation on the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (minute 31.17/18 refers)

REPORTED:

- (i) That at its meeting on the 23 November 2017, the Academic Standards and Quality Committee had considered (*inter-alia*) the University's draft response to the QAA UK Quality Code consultation and *resolved* that the final University response should be approved via Chair's action;
- (ii) That at its meeting on 4 December 2017, the Steering Committee *considered* and *approved* the draft response to the consultation as set out in paper AQSC 27.17-18 (revised) Appendix 3, available online.
- (f) PSRB Register (minute 18.17/18 refers)

REPORTED:

- (i) That at its meeting on the 31 October 2017, the Academic Standards and Quality Committee *resolved* that the current PSRB Register for the University of Warwick be updated to reflect the successful IMechE accreditation.

RECEIVED:

- (ii) An updated PSRB Register for the University of Warwick (AQSC 20.17/18 (revised), available online).

RESOLVED:

- (iii) That the MSc Polymer Chemistry was missing from the PSRB register although it had been accredited on appeal, this needed to be reflected on the PSRB register and Teaching Quality needed to carry out a check to ensure that the PSRB register was complete.
- (g) Credit and Module Framework (minute 34/17-18 refers)

REPORTED:

- (i) That at its meeting on 23 November 2017, the Academic Standards and Quality Committee resolved that (*inter alia*) some work needed to be carried out across the sector to understand what kind of modules were offered when considering module and credit sizes on degree programmes;

- (ii) That the Chair had approached the Strategic Planning and Analytics section with a view to carry out research across the UK HEI sector to start this work and updates on this issue would be reported to future meetings of the Committee.

(h) Fitness to Practise Operational Procedures

REPORTED:

- (i) That it was noted by the Academic Director of Graduate Studies that the Fitness to Practise Operational Procedures for Warwick Medical School cases had been revised to be aligned with Regulation 34 and were subsequently approved by the Chair of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee as set out in item 54 (b) below;
- (ii) That this development was welcomed and these Operational Procedures should be used as a model for further alignment of Regulation 34 for other subject areas subject to Fitness to Practise requirements such as Education and Social Work;

RESOLVED:

- (iii) That an audit should be conducted by Teaching Quality to establish what Operational Procedures were in place for all programmes subject to Fitness to Practise procedures and how these aligned to Regulation 34;
- (iv) That this audit should be considered by the Academic Standard and Quality Committee at a future meeting with a view to agree a way forward which might include a review of Regulation 34 and the establishment of harmonised Operational Procedures for all programmes subject to Fitness to Practise requirements.

44.17-18 Chair's Business

Office for Students Consultations

REPORTED:

- (i) That in 2017, the Department for Education launched a series of sector-wide consultations on the regulatory framework for higher education;
- (ii) That the University's Steering Committee considered a draft consultation response on behalf of the University at its meeting on 18 December 2017 and submitted a final response in advance of the deadline of 22 December 2017;

RECEIVED:

- (iii) The summary coversheet for the draft response considered by the Steering Committee on 18 December 2017 (AQSC.33.17-18, available online);

- (iv) The final response submitted on behalf of the University (paper SC.53.17-18{revised}, [available online](#));

45.17-18 Students' Union Update

RECEIVED:

- (a) An oral report from the Education and Postgraduate Officers of the Students' Union;

REPORTED:

- (i) That the Students' Union had submitted their own response to the QAA Quality Code and the OfS consultation, the general tone of the responses highlighted the transactional approach between students and Universities which was not welcomed by the Students' Union; the Students' Union responses would be circulated to members of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee after the meeting;
- (ii) That work on the liberated curriculum carried on with the aim to help liberating approved and assessed coursework; the first couple of lectures were now published online and members of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee were encouraged to look at the online lectures, e.g. the "queer history of the holocaust";
- (iii) That the Students' Union continued with the Academic Representation Transformation project, but the involvement of external consultants had ceased;
- (iv) That work on course costs continued and it was imperative that course costs were fair and equal across the University and a paper would be brought to a future meeting of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee to make proposals on fair course costs to ensure parity across departments;

(By Professor C Jenainati (Representative of the Faculty of Arts)):

- (v) That it needed to be borne in mind that the costs of mandated course texts by departments must be reasonably priced;

(By Professor G Cooke (co-opted member of academic staff in quality assurance role)):

- (vi) That a holistic look needed to be taken when considering course costs and the University needed to consider what students were already receiving in benefits, e.g. printer credits and what they are expected to pay;

CONSIDERED:

- (b) A proposal for revisions to the Staff Student Liaison Committee report form as set out in AQSC.34.17/18 (copy attached);

REPORTED:

- (i) That the Students' Union had worked together with Teaching Quality to revise the annual report form to ensure it was more fit for purpose for quality assurance and quality enhancement purposes;

RESOLVED:

- (ii) That members of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee endorsed the use of the revised Staff Student Liaison Committee report form subject to a few minor changes on the form, i.e. more flexible membership in section 2 to account for changing roles, to reconsider the wording for "wins" in section 4 to ensure a more positive tone and to include a section of ongoing issues from previous meetings to ensure such ongoing issues were not lost throughout the year;
- (iii) That the revised form should be published as soon as is practicable for students to see;
- (iv) That consolidated reports of these forms should be considered by the respective Faculty Education Committees and the Student Experience and Engagement Committee at the University level.

46.17-18

Update on the Student Personalised Information Project

RECEIVED:

An oral report from the Senior Assistant Registrar, Dr Emma Melia, on recent progress of the Student Personalised Information Project.

REPORTED:

- (i) That the work of the Student Personalised Information Project was closely aligned to the Review of Assessment and its four work streams; in particular the sub-groups dealing with examination board procedures and mitigating circumstances;
- (ii) That in particular, members of the Student Personalised Information Project worked on a more standardised way of managing component marks using an IT system, noting that there were some complex models in existence; it is expected that some changes will be made this year with further standardisation to follow in years to come;
- (iii) That the work on reading lists and Talis Aspire continued and a new project manager had been appointed to work with the

Library to collate an implementation plan for transition to the new workflow;

- (iv) That a revised process for the Module Approval Process was currently worked up into a business case, including a technical appraisal of which system would be best for this process, and would shortly be considered by the Steering Group for the Student Personalised Information Project;
- (v) Further updates and a paper on Student Personalised Information Project activities would follow for the next meeting of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee on 14 February 2018.

(In response to a question from Professor A Clark, (Academic Director of Undergraduate Studies), if the Student Personalised Information Project team had enough resources to develop its programme of work):

- (vi) That there was currently a concern that the SITS/IT teams were under-resourced to assist with proposed developments and these teams needed more resources which were currently being considered;
- (vii) The core Student Personalised Information Team would need to manage the trajectory of proposed developments within the academic year and was on course to deliver proposed developments during the current academic year, however, this may not be the case during the next academic year and the project team might have to make difficult decisions on how to prioritise its programme of work.

47.17-18 Review of Assessment

RECEIVED:

An oral report on the progress of the Review of Assessment from the Acting Chair of the Review of Assessment.

- (i) That two sub-groups of the Review of Assessment had met last week, namely the sub-group dealing with remedying failure and progression requirements as well as the sub-group dealing with mitigating circumstances and reasonable adjustments;
- (ii) That the sub-group dealing with Assessment Strategies would meet in early March 2018 and the sub-group dealing with examination board procedures would meet later in the spring to enable research to be carried out before the meeting;
- (iii) That the sub-group dealing with remedying failure and progression requirements was chaired by Dr Phil Young from the School of Life Sciences and had made the following proposals:

- a. That a minimum standard progression requirement of 90 CATS credits should be adopted for all years of study with an overall average mark of 40%; this proposal was in line with proposals put forward by the Quality Assurance Working Group in 2014, specifically in paper QAWG 19.13/14;
 - b. That some departments may want to offer a higher progression requirement than 90 CATS credits due to requirements from Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PRSBs);
 - c. That the sub-group debated if resits should be offered in all failed modules or just in modules required to achieve the progression requirements as resource implications for these two different approaches varied greatly;
 - d. That the sub-group agreed that students would be offered resits in any modules needing to be passed to achieve the required progression requirements; further discussions on details of resits offered, e.g. format and components to be passed, would be discussed at a future meeting of the group;
 - e. That the sub-group agreed that students should be offered the opportunity to remedy failure at the earliest possible opportunity, e.g. examination resits in the summer following the year of study, but further research would need to be carried out what competitor Universities did in order to determine most suitable timing of resits;
 - f. That PGT progression requirements would be discussed at the next meeting of the sub-group;
 - g. That complex issues, e.g. visiting students having failed the year abroad and needing to be offered resits at Warwick or students studying at Monash for credits or not, needed to be discussed further and Professor Clark would meet Professors Jenainati and Cooke to discuss these issues further.
- (iv) That the sub-group dealing with mitigating circumstances and reasonable adjustments was chaired by Professor Andy Clark and had reviewed mitigating circumstances processes at other institutions from the Russell Group and other TEF gold rated institutions;
 - (v) That the sub-group agreed that the mitigating circumstances procedures at Warwick were at best not clear and ambiguous to students and staff and that presentation of a good case of mitigating circumstances often depended on the intervention of an engaged and good personal tutor;
 - (vi) That currently students submitted post-hoc evidence to substantiate mitigating circumstances and that the University Health Centre was inundated with requests for medical

certificates at certain peak times and issued medical evidence post hoc which resembled a student self-certification rather than proper medical evidence, but that departments treated such evidence as proper medical evidence;

- (vii) That the sub-group decided the following:
 - a. That a proper definition of mitigating circumstances needed to be prepared to help students understand the difference between mitigating circumstances and reasonable adjustments and to prepare the best possible case for consideration by a mitigating circumstances panel;
 - b. That a central IT repository for the recording of mitigating circumstances needed to be introduced, which would link up with examination board procedures, help students to present a good case, also keep the history of mitigating circumstances to ensure mitigating circumstances were not lost and provided an oversight of mitigating circumstances recorded, but issues of confidentiality would need to be carefully considered;
 - c. That mitigating circumstances should be considered via a Faculty panel for intermediary students like already happens for first year students to ensure consistency of treatment;
 - d. That all students regardless of year of study should be given one attempt at self-certification without the need to provide evidence for mitigating circumstances for one non-examined piece of assessed piece of work, e.g. to obtain an extension;
 - e. That at the next meeting, the discussions would focus on the introduction of a Fit to Sit Policy;
- (viii) That the work carried out in relation to reasonable adjustments had focussed on setting the scene, difficulty of providing resources by the examination office and departments to implement reasonable adjustments in view of increasing numbers of students entitled to them, the current lack of enforcing a deadline for implementing reasonable adjustments raising expectations with student of offering reasonable adjustments in any case, the difficulty of providing sole venues in departments and the possible solution to offer a booth within an examination room to accommodate reasonable adjustments for the same conditions in one room;
- (ix) That further meetings with the mental health team would take place to ensure that all complexities within this area had been considered;

- (x) That a written report detailing progress with the Review of Assessment would be considered by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee at its next meeting on 14 February 2018;

48.17-18 Personal Tutoring Review

RECEIVED:

An update on the Personal Tutoring Review from the Dean of Students, Dr Louise Gracia as set out in paper AQSC.35.17-18 (copy attached).

REPORTED:

- i) That the report on the Review of Tutoring was currently being considered via the Committee cycle, starting with the Student Experience and Engagement Committee, the Faculty Education Committees and the Boards of Faculty before final approval of recommendations was expected by Senate and Council in time for introduction of the recommendations from the academic year 2018/19;
- ii) That most recommendations did not have resource implications apart from the recommendation that each personal tutor should have no more than 25 tutees and needed a dedicated space for tutoring meetings;

(By E Dunford, (Postgraduate Officer, Students' Union):

- iii) That these recommendations were welcomed especially in regards to PGR tutors and that bespoke training for mental health issues should be offered ideally involving external trainers;

(By Dr J Lee (co-opted member of academic staff in quality assurance role):

- iv) That it was important to recognise the value of good Personal Tutoring to students, although it was difficult to measure it and that especially junior staff may need training on the boundaries of the role of the Personal Tutor;

RESOLVED:

- v) That members of the Academic Quality and Standards Committee endorsed the proposals and recommendations in the Personal Tutoring Review report and that an update on the reception of the document through the Committee cycle would be considered at the next meeting of the Academic Quality and Standards Committee on 14 February 2018.

49.17-18 Course Approvals Project

RECEIVED:

An update from the Assistant Registrar (Teaching and Learning) on the course approvals project as set out in AQSC 31.17/18, (copy attached);

REPORTED:

- i) That testing of the course approvals workflow system had taken place in December 2017 involving academic departments and professional services departments resulting in further changes to the system and additional testing of fixes applied;
- ii) That it was anticipated that the workflow system would go live in February 2018 with four weeks of pilot testing;
- iii) That training of the course scrutiny panels had taken place in November 2017 with further sessions planned for February 2018;
- iv) That while the new workflow system was currently unavailable for course approval, interim arrangements continued and the course approvals panels were considering course approvals received on the old course approvals form in word format.

50.17-18 Termly report on appeals and complaints

CONSIDERED:

The termly report on appeals and complaints by the Administrative Officer (Complaints Resolution) as set out in paper AQSC.36.17-18 (copy attached);

REPORTED:

- i) That this was the second report during the current year on complaints and appeals;
- ii) That in comparison with last academic year, the number of stage 2 appeals had increased from 17 to 26 appeals, one complainant had submitted six complaints and it was therefore unclear if there had been a genuine increase or if it was an anomaly; most stage 2 complaints related to accommodation complaints and the time to deal with these had significantly decreased;
- iii) That currently seven ongoing stage 3 complaints were being dealt with and represented a comparable number in relation to last year;
- iv) That due to the time of the year, not much could be reported about appeals, two MBChB appeals had been received under the new appeals regulation, they had both been upheld and

there had been no request for a review as yet received in line with the revised Regulation 42;

- v) That in relation to a query at the last meeting of the Academic Quality and Standards Committee about the reasons as to why PGT appeals had decreased significantly from 45 in 2015/16 to 27 in 2016/17, it could be reported that the actual figure of PGT appeals reported for 2016/17 was 33, this was due to the census point and late submission of appeals during the cycle; there had however not been any obvious reasons for the decrease in PGT appeals received in 2016/17;

(By Professor C Sparrow, Academic Director, Graduate Studies):

- vi) That there had been a mistake in constituting the Preliminary Appeals Panel for PGT appeals in the revised Regulation 42.

(By Ms S Waldron, Administrative Officer, Complaints Resolution):

- vii) That Regulation 42 had been approved by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee during the last academic year and no anomalies had been highlighted during the approval process/discussions;

RESOLVED:

- viii) That the concern of the constitution of the Preliminary Review Panel would be further discussed in a meeting outside the Academic Standards and Quality Committee between the Academic Director, Graduate Studies and members of Teaching Quality Staff.

51.17-18

Rest Breaks and Use of digital devices in examinations

CONSIDERED:

A proposal from the Director of Academic Office/Assistant Registrar (Examinations) to rigorously enforce time allowed for rest breaks in examinations and to strengthen the policy on possession of digital devices in examinations and resulting changes to Regulation 10 as set out in AQSC.37.17-18 (copy attached).

REPORTED:

- i) That the current examination regulations already contained a statement that students should not leave the examination room in the first 30 minutes and last 15 minutes, but this was currently not rigorously enforced by invigilators, hence the need to strengthen Regulation 10 to prevent toilet visits in the first 30 minutes and last 15 minutes;
- ii) That the current examination regulations also contained a ban on mobile phones in the exam room, but recent evidence had

suggested that this ban was not effective without imposing a significant penalty;

- iii) That due to the cheating incidences observed, a significant deterrent was needed to stop students from bringing and potentially using digital devices in examinations and hence a penalty of 0% was proposed if a student was found in possession of a mobile phone in an examination room regardless of intention to use the device or not;
- iv) That the examinations office in conjunction with the Students' Union provided safe bag storage areas to enable students to keep their possessions safe while taking an examination;

(By Professor G Cooke (co-opted member of academic staff in quality assurance role)):

- v) That these changes and proposals were welcome and much needed to ensure the University could effectively prevent cheating in examinations;

(By L Jackson, (Education Officer, Students' Union)):

- vi) That students need to be consulted further on these proposals and amendments to examination regulations and any regulation changes needed to be written using gender neutral language;

(By Professor C Sparrow, Academic Director, Graduate Studies):

- vii) That the current practice of using academic members of staff as invigilators was not effective as they did not enforce the rules and professional invigilators needed to be employed to ensure rules were enforced appropriately;

(By Dr Jo Lee, (co-opted member of academic staff in quality assurance role)):

- viii) That the proposed penalty of 0% being awarded for an examination when a student was found in possession of a digital device in the examination room was draconian and would severely affect degree classifications and in an increase in appeals;

(By E Dunford, (Postgraduate Officer, Students' Union)):

- ix) That awarding 0% for bringing a phone into the room was a hardline approach and consequences of being awarded 0% for an examination were wide ranging for students;

(Professor G van der Velden (Chair of the Student Learning Experience and Engagement Committee)):

- x) That any cheating incidences in examinations should be punished using the same process, i.e. via consideration by the Investigative Committee of Senate;

(By Professor G Cooke (co-opted member of academic staff in quality assurance role)):

- xi) That if the University was not prepared to introduce a penalty for bringing in a phone, students would carry on cheating which was unacceptable for professional standards on professional degree programmes such as Engineering;

(By Professor Andy Clark, Academic Director of Undergraduate Studies):

- xii) That students who were awarded 0% in the examination due to possession of a phone, should be offered a resit without residence to redeem the 0% being awarded;

(By Professor C Sparrow, Academic Director, Graduate Studies):

- xiii) That any regulations to be implemented in relation to examination conduct, needed to be very simple;

RESOLVED:

- xiv) That more effective measures to prevent students from bringing and potentially using digital devices in the examination room were needed and these would need to be implemented for the main examination sessions held in summer 2018;
- xv) That as there had been no agreement on the proposals set out in paper AQSC 37.17-18, further discussions would take place in a sub-group of the Review of Assessment chaired by Professor Andy Clark and a revised proposal would be considered by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee at its next meeting on 14 February 2018.

52.17-18 Education Strategy

RECEIVED:

The draft University Education Strategy (paper AQSC.38.17-18, copy attached)

REPORTED:

- (a) That the draft Education Strategy had already been debated in many fora/groups across the University and was now well known and had been included on the agenda for information for members of the Academic Quality and Standards Committee;

(b) That it would be considered by Senate on 24 January 2018.

53.17-18 Digest of FEC minutes

RECEIVED:

A digest of the minutes of the autumn 2017-18 meetings of the Faculty Education Committees as set out in AQSC 30.17-18 (copy attached).

RESOLVED:

That this item would be considered at the next meeting of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee on 14 February 2018 as there was not enough time to consider it.

ITEMS TO REPORT AND APPROVE WITHOUT FURTHER DISCUSSION

The Chair and Secretary consider that the following items are non-controversial and/or can be accepted with a minimum of explanation. Members of the Committee may, however, ask for any of the following items to be transferred to the agenda for discussion, by contacting the Secretary in advance of the meeting, or by raising the item at the commencement of the meeting. These papers are available online at the Committee's file space here:

54.17-18 Chair's Action

(a) Advice on adaptation of University process on plagiarism/cheating for WMG

REPORTED:

- (i) That WMG had requested to have a number of variations to the plagiarism/cheating processes as published in Regulation 11 to take into account WMG internal processes and student volume;
- (ii) That the Chair, acting on behalf of the Committee, had approved the variations proposed as they were in line with the spirit of Regulation 11 and did not pose an institutional risk (AQSC 39.17-18, available online).

(b) WMS Fitness to Practise Operational Procedures

REPORTED:

- (i) That the Chair, acting on behalf of the Committee, had approved revised Fitness to Practise Operational Procedures for cases in the Warwick Medical School to ensure alignment with Regulation 34;
- (ii) That these revised procedures will be operated with immediate effect for any future Fitness to Practise cases considered by

the WMS Fitness to Practise Committee; (AQSC 40.17-18, [available online](#)).

(c) Marie Skłodowska-Curie Innovative Training Networks (MSCA-ITN-2018)

REPORTED:

- (i) That the call for MSCA-ITN 2018 proposals would close on 17 January 2018 for European Joint Doctorates and the Horizon 2020 Work Programme for 2017 - 2018 is published on the European Commission's website here:
<http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/topics/msca-itn-2018.html>
- (ii) That the annual panel for consideration of EJD proposals (Comprised of the Chairs of the Partnerships Committee, Academic Quality and Standards Committee, Board of Graduate Studies and Faculty of Science) had been supportive of the resubmission, noting that under the bid, only one student will be co-supervised and co-awarded (by cotutelle agreement) with Università degli Studi di Roma Tor Vergata, Rome;
- (iii) That since the last meeting of the Committee a proposal was brought forward from Professor M. Pollicott in Warwick Maths Institute for resubmission;
- (iv) The consortia and co-supervision arrangement had been vetted as per the panel process in 2017;
- (v) That the proposal could be made available upon request but would not be circulated prior to the call deadline.

55.17-18 Board of Graduate Studies

RECEIVED:

The minutes of the meeting of the Board of Graduate Studies on 7 November 2017 (published online:
<https://warwick.ac.uk/services/gov/committees/bgs/minutes/>);

56.17/18 Next meeting

REPORTED:

That the next meeting of the Committee is scheduled to be held on Wednesday 14 February 2018 at 10.00 am **in CMR 1.0, University House.**