UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK EDUCATION COMMITTEE OPEN MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD AT 2.00PM, TUESDAY 1 MARCH 2022, Via MS TEAMS			
Present	Professor Christopher Hughes	CH	Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education) [Chair]
	Professor Jo Angouri	JA	Academic Director (Education and Internationalisation)
	Isabelle Atkins	IA	Student Representative (Education Officer)
	Professor Daniel Branch	DB	Academic Director (Doctoral College)
	Professor Andrew Clark	AC	Deputy Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education and Policy)
	Professor Will Curtis	WC	Deputy Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education Quality and Standards)
	Professor David Davies	DD	Chair of the Faculty Education Committee of Science, Engineering and Medicine
	Professor Rebecca Freeman	RF	Dean of Students
	Professor Lorenzo Frigerio	LF	The Vice-Provost and Chair of the Board of the Faculty of Science, Engineering and Medicine
	Lee Griffin	LG	Academic Director (Postgraduate Taught)
	Professor Jonathan Heron	JH	Representative of IATL, WIHEA and ADC
	Professor Sarah Richardson	SR	Chair of the Faculty Education Committee of Arts
	Professor Lesley Roberts	LR	The Chair of the WMS Education Committee
	Professor Penny Roberts	PR	The Vice-Provost and Chair of the Board of the Faculty of Arts
	Professor Patrick Tissington	PT	Academic Director (Employability)
	Professor Gwen Van der Velden	GV	Deputy Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education)
	Professor Nick Vaughan-Williams	NV	The Vice-Provost and Chair of the Board of the Faculty of Social Sciences
	Dr Naomi Waltham-Smith	NW	Chair of the Faculty Education Committee of Social Sciences
Attending	Louise Hasler	LH	Senior Assistant Registrar (Teaching Quality), [Secretary]
	Craig Franklin	CF	Assistant Registrar (Teaching & Learning), [Assistant Secretary]
	Paul Blagburn	PB	Head of Widening Participation [item 043]
	Megan Caulfield	MC	Senior Projects Officer (Student Success) [item 039]
	Dan Derricott	DDe	Director of Education Policy & Quality
	Anna Dunkley	AD	Senior Policy Advisor (Education Strategy)
	Professor Caroline Elliott	CE	Economics
	Dr Letizia Gramaglia	LGr	Head of Academic Development (ADC) [item 035]
	Dominic Sheehy	DS	Academic Partnerships Officer
	Dr Chris Twine	CT	Academic Registrar
	Lisa Whiston	LW	Curriculum Coordination Project Manager [item 035]
Ref	**Item**		
030	**Apologies for absence** There were no apologies. The Chair welcomed Isabel Atkins to their first meeting, Caroline Elliott who was shadowing Andy Clark, and Anna Dunkley and Dominic Sheehy who were observing the meeting.		
031	**Declarations of interest** No new declarations were made.		

032	**Minutes of meeting held on 9 December 2021**
	The minutes of the meeting held on 9 December 2021 (032-EC010322 {public}) were received and approved.
033	**Matters arising from meeting held on 9 December 2021**
	There were no matters arising from the meeting held on 9 December 2021.

	Chair's Update

	Chair's Business and Actions
034	- The Chair confirmed they had taken Chair's action to approve the updated terms and reference of the Student Success Programme Board and the Academic Quality and Standards Committee (044-EC010322{public}). - The Chair noted Teaching Excellence Group meetings were ongoing and anticipated a midway briefing with Chairs to review approach. - The Chair introduced the Senior Policy Advisor (Education Strategy) and their work supporting the Education Executive in planning the implementation of the Education Strategy. The Education Policy and Quality (EPQ) division was undergoing a strategic refresh, this role represented new and additional support to the Education Executive.

	Strategic Item for Discussion

	Curriculum Review: Approval to Deliver
035	The Committee received the report (035-EC010322 {public}) and key points and discussions were as follows: - Work was underway to understand when and how curriculum review might take place through delivery of a coordination project to add value. This discussion was an opportunity to gauge support from the Education Committee for the proposed direction of travel. - There had been a discovery and initial development phase to understand the drivers for curriculum review within academic departments. This had informed a refocused curriculum review project, including the support needed and how this could support the delivery of the education strategy. - The refocused project aims included: an agreed framework for curricula, establishment of good quality support, the replacement of the course approval system and processes, a move to all undergraduate courses embedding the framework expectations alongside disciplinary distinctiveness within five years. - There were eight workstreams underway led by members of the project board. Approval was sought for the 'dimensions of a Warwick curriculum'. This would be a resource drawing together existing policies and strategies into a simple, unified view. This would provide a baseline from which to build a Toolkit, resources, and support, and ensure the course approval process assesses the right things. - There was recognition these requirements would sit alongside discipline-specific frameworks including Subject Benchmark Statements and Professional Statutory and Regulatory Board requirements. - The dimensions had been developed in a consultative approach, incorporating the wider views of departments. - Development of a 'curriculum development toolkit' was underway. This resource would enable holistic consideration of teaching and learning through the curriculum review process. The toolkit would be developed by colleagues across the University and supported by the ADC, IATL, and EPQ. - A three-tiered model of support for curriculum review was outlined, and encompassed: self-guided, open access, and partnered support levels. - There was a commitment to engage all undergraduate courses within the next five years, scheduling the approach in advance of the upcoming Institutional Teaching and Learning Review (ITLR). The project board welcomed view on approaches to scheduling reviews. - The project board sought approval of the 'dimensions of a Warwick curriculum,' and of the five-year timeframe. - The emphasis on support for departments within the proposed model was welcomed. It was recognised that different departments would benefit from varying approaches as outlined within the three-tier support model.

	• The proposed five-year timeframe for completion of undergraduate curriculum review was discussed. It was recognised that competing pressures of other ongoing activities at department level alongside existing system limitations in support of curriculum review, and the complexities of existing joint degrees were likely to present significant challenge. There would also be a need to consider how curriculum review would be connected other strategic and quality assurance processes. The Committee agreed that a five-year timeframe following the completion of the upcoming ITLR would be more feasible. • The 'dimensions of a Warwick curriculum' were welcomed in principle. The categorisation of dimensions as 'required' or 'recommended' as well as the emphasis and language used for particular dimensions was discussed. Members welcomed further opportunity following the meeting to support refinement of the dimensions prior to them being published. • The curriculum review process represented an opportunity to drive and embed positive change, and the importance of socialisation in support of departmental ownership was highlighted. The toolkit was intended to be a means of socialisation. It would be a web-based resource collating existing diverse approaches to curricula at Warwick. Members supported the idea of engagement events, including townhall style sessions to further socialise the proposed elements of curriculum review. • It was agreed that the curriculum review project team would work with Faculty Education Committee Chairs to refine the dimensions before seeking approval by Chair's action. A discussion concerning next steps would then be brought to the next meeting in June 2022. **ACTION:** The Committee **recommended** to the Senate that all undergraduate programmes be revised to embed the essential Dimensions, subject to their approval by Education Committee, within a revised timeline ahead of 2028/29 entrants applying to study.
	Substantive Items
036	**Students' Union Update** The Committee received a verbal report with key details and discussions, as below: • Students' Union elections had taken place in the previous week. Chih-Hsiang Lo would become the new Education Officer and representative on Education Committee in 2022/23. • There would be a review of lecture capture practice informed by focus groups. This work would take account of academic freedom and recommendations would be brought to the Committee. • The Students' Union was seeking a new CEO and interim support was planned to be put in place.
037	**Postgraduate Taught Update** The Committee received a verbal report with key details and discussions, as below: • The Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey would be launched on 14 March and staff briefings were underway. The Survey would close on 14 May, and it was expected that a report could be brought to the Committee in June. • Student focus groups had been used as an opportunity to ask postgraduate specific questions and to explore the postgraduate taught (PGT) community. • The PGT HEAR would be introduced at minimal cost.

038	**Postgraduate Research Update**
	
	The Committee received the report (038-EC010322 {public}) and key points and discussions were as follows:
	
	• A series of meetings with academic departments to discuss postgraduate research (PGR) provision had taken place in the preceding weeks. The meetings had included PGR students for the first time, and this had been well received. Key themes had emerged from these meetings and included:
	   - Funding - a desire to rethink the Chancellor's Scheme. Discussion was ongoing.
	   - Equality, Diversity and Inclusion initiatives within the Doctoral College and departments and whether funding could be attached to these.
	   - Training requirements for students, particularly those engaged in interdisciplinary projects. There was an increasing need to students to be able to access training from outside of their home departments.

	• Funded covid extensions had enabled nearly 700 students to complete PhDs that otherwise would have been difficult. The paper provided a summary of work to date to support students through the impact of the pandemic. • Thus far a single centralised programme bringing together all funding streams and allocating extensions had been in operation. It would not be possible to follow this model going forward owing to UKRI policy changes. There would be a move to a more devolved model of funding consideration. • A year ago, there was an expectation that the need for funding would taper away but there remained an ongoing need for extension funding due to impact of covid, particularly at early stages of PhDs. • It was noted that shape of the academic year could affect the timing for training requirements. • The Postgraduate Research Experience Survey had highlighted concern about communication of covid responses. There was a good news story to be told here, but care should be given to approach to ongoing communication.
039	**Inclusive Education** The Committee received a verbal report and presentation (039-EC010322 {public}) with key details and discussions, as below: • Focus had been on planning implementation of the inclusive education model, with the aim to join strands of work that link to support inclusive education and avoid duplication. The core purpose was to facilitate equitable access for students to educational opportunities. • The presentation outlined the goals and associated workstreams that had been established to progress various strands of work, many of these were ongoing. These encompassed training and support for students and staff, and piloting initiatives such as the 'say my name' campaign. • New roles had been established to lead aspects of this work, including two Social Inclusions Associates and a Senior Projects Officer in the Dean of Students Office. • A workstream structure had been established to organise the various strands, adding workstream leads to steer and progress project areas. • An attainment data dashboard had been developed and published as an available resource to support understanding and enhancement in departments and inclusion would be a theme within Teaching Excellence Group meetings in 2022. • A timeline to support action planning in departments. • The presentation outlined next steps including production of workstream project plans, TEG meetings, and a timeline to support action planning in departments. • Several departmental TEG meetings had reflected that access to attainment dashboard information earlier in the student lifecycle and at a more granular level would be beneficial. It was noted that the dashboard was one source of information supporting the wider picture, and that engagement with students and staff should compliment data resources. The importance of utilising the available data to begin targeting interventions sooner was highlighted. • The possibility of providing stronger direction to departments within the action planning was discussed, including for example common goals across departments. • The need to clearly distinguish between 'attainment gap' and 'awarding gap' and the resulting variance in emphasis of approach to tackling the underlying issues was highlighted. • The possibility of a dashboard focusing on PGT was discussed. A separate a tailored dashboard would be required, the requirements for which could be discussed with Strategic Planning and Analytics.
040	**Teaching Excellence Framework** The Committee received the report (040-EC010322 {protected}) and key points and discussions were as follows: • The Office for Students (OfS) consultation proposals set out a provider level exercise for the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) 2022. Subject level data would be published by the OfS and there would be a need to consider this within the institutional response. • Providers would be rated Gold, Silver, or Bronze as in previous iterations of TEF. A new outcome would be introduced where providers fall below Bronze and would indicate a provider 'requires improvement'.

	Two aspects rating for 'Student Outcomes' and 'Student Experience' would contribute equally to the overall provider rating.
	• Ratings would be awarded by a TEF panel who would consider benchmarked outcomes data, provider written submissions, and student written submissions. The benchmarked outcomes data would contribute no more than 50% to the overall award. • The consultation introduced the requirement for providers to define and evidence 'educational gain' for students within the submission. • The institutional response to the ongoing OfS consultation on the TEF was under review by the University Executive Board (UEB) and offered challenged in selected areas. • The TEF 2022 submission window would open in September and close in November. A TEF Coordination Group under the Education Executive would coordinate preparation of a draft institutional submission in advance of the submission window opening. This draft would then be refined in response to further published OfS data during the submission window ahead of the submission deadline.
041	**OfS Consultations on Regulating Student Outcomes** The Committee received the report (041-EC010322 {protected}) and key points and discussions were as follows: • The OfS consultations on regulating student outcomes through condition of registration B3 set out baseline requirements for student outcomes indicators of continuation, completion, and progression. • Institutions performing below the baseline indicators requirements would be flagged to the OfS for further investigation and possible regulatory intervention. • Indicator data supplied by the OfS as part of the consultation shows the majority of Warwick provision performing above the baseline requirements. There were a small number of provision areas that were potentially cause for concern and were being investigated further. • The institutional response to the ongoing OfS consultations was under review by the UEB and offered challenged in selected areas.

042	**Institutional Teaching & Learning Review**
	
	The Committee received the report (042-EC010322 {public}) and key points and discussions were as follows:
	• Senate had approved the concept for ITLR following the previous Education Committee meeting. This paper set out details for delivery of ITLR drawing together outcomes of wider conversations.
	• The ambition was to make ITLR more than the sum of its parts, bringing together thematic conversations across the institution to enable collaboration.
	• The paper included a draft evaluation framework representing the start of a conversation that would be brought back for approval in June 2022. There was suggestion that there be a move away from specific recommendations as outcomes of ITLR meetings and that the focus be on enhancement rather than suggestions for improvement.
	• Whether the ITLR panel should make a judgement on whether departments meet the University's expectations around quality and standards was also under consideration. Noting ITLR was an assurance and enhancement exercise, there would be a need to ensure areas where there was cause for concern could be identified.
	• Consultations to date had led to a focus on three key themes:
	  - interdisciplinarity,
	  - blended learning,
	  - flexible and lifelong learning or education for sustainable development.
	• The paper further detailed an outline review method, a timeline for delivery, and the departments in scope.
	• There was recognition that the positioning of ADC, WIHEA, and IATL as a professional culture within the paper was not appropriate, and that these departments would work with EPQ to address this.
	• The value in bringing together colleagues across traditional departmental structures to discuss the key themes was highlighted. It was expected that these institutional discussions would be held prior to the

	self-evaluation period, and during the ITLR exercise, and following completion. It was expected that academic theme leads would be appointed. • The importance of clear institutional communications and socialisation of the intended direction of travel was highlighted. • It was agreed that the third key theme would be education for sustainable development. • The Committee **approved** the evaluation framework, themes, review method, timeline, and scope for publication in a Draft Blueprint for ITLR 2023. Wider consultation would be sought on the draft prior to a final version returning to the Committee in June 2022.

043	**Widening Participation Committee Update**
	
	The Committee received the report (043-EC010322 {protected}) and key points and discussions were as follows:
	
	• There had been positive developments in terms of external recognition in Warwick being highly commended and shortlisted in UK Social Mobility awards.
	• Warwick had made the 'stand alone pledge' in supporting estranged students.
	• Partnership work with the 'Into University' charity in Coventry had been positive, including supporting increased progression rates into university education.
	• Progress had been made toward addressing access gaps for some groups, and deeper understanding could be developed through resources such as the attainment dashboard.
	• Changes in government and policy signalled a new direction of travel for access and participation. This included:
	  - the development of new national access and participation targets.
	  - Greater concentration on the role of universities in the pre-HE student journey and impactful partnerships with schools.
	  - Sharper focus on quality and the impact on student outcomes aligning with OfS priorities.
	  - Concentration on diversification of modes of study including apprenticeships and technical routes.
	• There was a stated intent from OfS to reduce complexity of access and participation plans to increase accessibility for wider audiences. There was an opportunity to enhance some areas and to articulate further others. New access and participation plans would be created for 2024 and would cover four years.

	Items below this line were for receipt and/or approval, without discussion
044	**Revised Membership and Terms of Reference of Subsidiary and Sub-Committees** The Committee received and approved revised sub-committee memberships (044-EC010322{public}).
	Subsidiary and Sub-Committee Reports
045	**Business for report from Academic Quality and Standards Committee (AQSC)** The Committee received and noted the agenda and minutes of meetings available online.
046	**Business for report from Board of Graduate Studies (BGS)** The Committee received and noted the agenda and minutes of meetings available online.
047	**Business for report from Student Learning Experience and Engagement Committee (SLEEC)** The Committee received and noted the agenda and minutes of meetings available online.
048	**Business for report from the Partnerships Committee** The Committee received and noted the agenda and minutes of meetings available online.
049	**Business for report from the Widening Participation Committee (WP)** The Committee received and noted the agenda and minutes of meetings available online.

Other	
050	**Any other business** There was no other business.

CLOSE BY 17:00
Next meeting: 14:00, Tuesday 14 June 2022, via MS TEAMS

DECISIONS AND ACTIONS			
ITEM	**DECISION/ACTION**	**LEAD AND DUE DATE**	**STATUS**
2020-2021			
063	Committee to review the consideration of PGT matters through governance structures at its June meeting of the 2021/22 cycle.	Academic Director (PGT), June 2022	Ongoing
2021-2022			
035	**ACTION:** The Committee **recommended** to the Senate that all undergraduate programmes be revised to embed the essential Dimensions, subject to their approval by Education Committee, within a revised timeline ahead of 2028/29 entrants applying to study.	Senate	
042	**DECISION:** The Committee **approved** the evaluation framework, themes, review method, timeline, and scope for publication in a Draft Blueprint for ITLR 2023.		