

UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

OPEN MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD AT 2.00PM, TUESDAY 15 JUNE 2021, Via MS TEAMS

Present			
	Professor Christopher Hughes	CH	Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education) [Chair]
	Professor Jo Angouri	JA	Academic Director (Education and Internationalisation)
	Christopher Bisping	CB	Academic Director (Postgraduate Taught)
	Professor Andrew Clark	AC	Deputy Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education and Policy)
	Professor David Davies	DD	Chair of the Faculty Education Committee of Science, Engineering and Medicine
	Shingai Dzumbira	SD	Student Representative (Postgraduate Officer)
	Professor Rebecca Freeman	RF	Dean of Students
	Professor Jonathan Heron	JH	Representative of IATL, WIHEA and ADC
	Professor Matthew Nudds	MN	Chair of the Faculty of Social Sciences (items 001 – 011 only)
	Professor Sarah Richardson	SR	Chair of the Faculty Education Committee of Arts
	Professor Colin Sparrow	CS	Academic Director (Graduate Studies)
	Professor Patrick Tissington	PT	Academic Director (Employability)
	Professor Gwen Van der Velden	GV	Deputy Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education)
	Dr Naomi Waltham-Smith	NW	Chair of the Faculty Education Committee of Social Sciences
Attending			
	Katharine Gray	KG	Senior Assistant Registrar (Teaching Quality), [Secretary]
	Craig Franklin	CF	Administrative Officer (Courses and Modules), [Assistant Secretary]
	Professor Gill Cooke	GC	Head of Teaching, Engineering
	Maureen McLaughlin	MM	Director of Education Policy & Quality
	Luke Mepham	LM	Student Representative (SU President)
	Dr Chris Twine	CT	Academic Registrar
	Roberta Wooldridge Smith	RWS	Director of Student Opportunity (item 060 only)
Ref	Item		
050	<p>Apologies for absence</p> <p>Apologies were received from Professor Will Curtis, Professor Caroline Meyer, Professor Lesley Roberts, Professor Penny Roberts.</p> <p>The Chair welcomed to Luke Mepham and Gill Cooke to the meeting.</p>		
051	<p>Declarations of interest</p> <p>No new declarations were made.</p>		
052	<p>Minutes of meeting held on 1 March 2021</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 1 March 2021 (052-EC150621) were received and approved.</p>		
053	<p>Matters arising from meeting held on 1 March 2021</p> <p>There were no matters arising from the meeting held on 1 March 2021.</p>		

Chair's Update	
054	<p>Chair's Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair thanked the student representatives for their service and collaboration in support of education and offered congratulations to the Postgraduate Officer who would be moving into the position of Students' Union President. • The Chair congratulated the Chair of the Faculty of Science, Engineering and Medicine on their appointment as Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) and thanked them for their service to the committee. • The Chair thanked the Chair of the Faculty of Social Sciences for their service to the committee and noted this would be their final meeting in post. • The Chair thanked the Academic Director (Postgraduate Taught) for their service and wished them luck in their new appointment outside of Warwick. • The Chair thanked the Academic Director (Graduate Studies) for their longstanding service to the Committee. • The Chair thanked the Director of Education Policy & Quality for their service and support of the Committee and Education Strategy and wished them luck as they take up their new role as Academic Registrar at Northumbria University. • The Chair thanked the Secretary, noting their exemplary service since the inception of the Education Committee and wished them luck as they move into their new role within Governance.
Substantive Items	
055	<p>Students' Union Update</p> <p>The Committee received a verbal report from the Student Representative (Postgraduate Officer) and the Student Representative (SU President). The key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The transforming education awards event had recently taken place, crediting teaching staff and students who had made a positive impact on the student experience. • Elections for student trustees course representatives had taken place. • The Students Union had formally released a new five-year strategy. The strategy sought to engage with non-traditional engagers and hard to reach groups. Work had been underway to engage with WMG, WBS and WMS to identify how to better engage with these students. • Work on a training schedule for incoming officers was underway with the Academic Registrar. • Work had been underway to have course representatives added to Tabula so that students can more easily identify them.
056	<p>Teaching Excellence Group Outcomes</p> <p>A paper (056-EC150621) and verbal report were received from the Director of Education Policy and Quality. The key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Director of Education Policy and Quality outlined a theme across items 055, 056, 057 of dovetailing quality assurance processes within the institution toward ensuring best use is made of collected data. Where possible, data should be utilised for several outputs to reduce burden on data providers including students and departments. • The process had been discussion based and less investigative than in previous years. There had been a reduced quality assurance aspect and specific focus on learning from the blended experience. • The revised meeting format opened discussion around lessons learned over the preceding 12 months. • The value of recorded asynchronous lectures as an aid to deeper learning was discussed it was noted that recorded seminars were typically comparatively less beneficial. • The move to online assessment had resulted in varied experiences for students and staff. Colleagues in some disciplines had welcomed the opportunity to rethink approaches to assessment, whilst others were eager to return to traditional assessment methods owing to pedagogical or academic integrity concerns. • There was a discussion concerning the need to avoid considering assessment simply in terms of online, offline, or blended. There was a need to consider assessment methods themselves and to move toward diversification, informed by student consultation.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-year adaptability in responding to student needs, particularly during the pandemic in response to surveys had been a positive theme during meetings. Thanks were noted to the Academic Development Centre and the Learning Design Consultancy Unit for their support. • The critical importance of campus life for students and staff had been a key theme of discussion. Students had appreciated all opportunities for face-to-face learning and on-campus experiences toward building student communities. Building and maintaining student engagement online remained a challenge. • The committee welcomed the strengthened student involvement in the TEG process with respect to previous years and agreed that this engagement had enriched the process, adding valued perspective and critical appraisal of the learning and teaching experience. • It was noted that the student engagement in TEG as a quality process varied with respect to the role of an SSLC representative and that training and support in preparation for meetings could be valuable. Such support was already present in some departments and the Committee discussed the possibility of extending this across the institution toward creating a community of quality engaged students.
057	<p>Curriculum Review</p> <p>A paper (057-EC150621) and verbal report were received from the Director of Education Policy and Quality. The key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointments had been made to the roles of Curriculum Coordination Project Manager and Curriculum Development Project Officer. The Curriculum Review project sponsor was the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education). • The project was seeking to develop a framework for curriculum review that would add value and continue to develop the quality of the student learning experience without being overly burdensome. There would be a focus on pedagogy and student and staff engagement. • The intended outcome of curriculum review would be to refresh, refocus, and enhance the attractiveness and competitiveness of provision at Warwick. • There was likely to be interesting and valuable data that could support the process and the project was looking at how to draw this together effectively to inform curriculum review. • A learning circle with WIHEA would explore the drivers, boundaries and challenges of this work going into new academic year. • Several individual departments had already engaged with the project and would take part in pilots, giving departments the opportunity to shape the process. • The committee discussed curriculum review as an opportunity to facilitate learning and collaboration across departments and the possibility of creating an 'internal-external' environment by including colleagues from elsewhere in the institution in the review of a departments' curricula. • The opportunity to engage through this process with departments and their students on strategic priorities including inclusive education, interdisciplinarity, and student research was discussed. Curriculum review could facilitate exchanging and embedding of good practice, and opportunities for innovation. • It was noted that there were some sensitivities to be considered in how curriculum review was presented to departments. Development of curricula in partnership with students was an ongoing process in many departments. Presenting curriculum review as a centrally driven process to embed university strategy risked alienation of departments. Consideration should be given to the process being driven from the ground up by colleagues in departments. • It was agreed that the curriculum review project would be an opportunity to create a supportive network and central resource of information from which all departments could benefit, rather than a separate an additional process. The ongoing collaboration between departments and ADC and WIHEA was designed to facilitate a bottom-up, rather than top-down process. • A discussion took place around potential drivers for curriculum review including the external landscape, funding, student feedback, strategy, and evolving disciplinary contexts. The possibility that a review could either encompass holistic consideration of curricula or focus on one aspect of a department's provision was discussed. There was a need to define the landscape in terms of triggers for review, format, and timescales.

058	<p>Institutional Teaching and Learning Review</p> <p>A presentation and verbal report were received from the Director of Education Policy and Quality. The key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presentation outlined the aim to join the dots between quality assurance and quality enhancement processes so that they were complimentary rather than duplicative activities. • There should be an aim to use data collection and information gathering and exploration through TEG to feed into other quality assurance and enhancement processes such as Curriculum Review and ITLR. • The anticipated Teaching Excellence Framework consultation was expected to confirm that the exercise would not be subject based. An institutional submission would be better supported however by understanding at the subject level. • The presentation outlined potential options for the format of ITLR including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - repeating the previous process. - building upon longitudinal TEG outcomes whilst maintaining a broad scope to cover all academic and professional services departments. - building upon longitudinal TEG outcomes and data and repurposing as a TEF mock exercise for academic departments and as Teaching, Learning and Assessment support for professional services. • Operational considerations should include an aim toward reducing burden, increasing student engagement, and maintaining externality. • The potential for processes including ITLR and TEG to support strategic planning within academic departments was discussed. • The committee discussed the importance of connecting processes such as ITLR to strategy renewal and the Academic Resourcing Committee process. There was a need for departments to be appropriately resourced to enable them to achieve education strategy aims. • The potential shape and focus of the next ITLR was discussed. It was suggested that curriculum review could cover departmental elements of the historic ITLR process, and that future ITLR could focus on institutional concerns including resources and facilities. Overlap between processes should be avoided and better alignment to ARC processes could be targeted. • It was noted that TEF is metric driven and that historically ITLR had been a more holistic process. Careful thought should be given to linking the two.
059	<p>Future Blended Learning Offer</p> <p>A verbal report was received from the Academic Director (Employability). The key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A report to be submitted to the Education Executive was under development at the time of the meeting. • There was evidence that departments were looking to apply learning from the past year in different ways. • Students had gained skills in online learning, though not necessarily a liking for it. There was a desire to return to face-to-face learning. • The report would present ideas that departments could use as they conduct future planning, rather than feeding into formal processes. The report would not set out a framework but would offer ideas and principles for central resource planning. • The report would consider student, staff, and external perspectives.
060	<p>Employability Strategy: update on delivery</p> <p>A paper (060-EC150621a/b) and verbal update were received from the Academic Director (Employability) and the Director of Student Opportunity. The key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work undertaken toward delivery of the strategy and summarised a RAG rating exercise and assessment of progress was outlined. • The labour market was difficult but not impossible: Warwick graduates were securing jobs within increased competition and the strategy remained on track despite the pandemic. • There was an intention to make use of the Student Opportunity Hub as the centre of activity for students on campus in the 2021/22 academic year.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There would be a focus on achieving a positive blend of online and face-to-face support, alongside a focus on employability skills. • Delivery on some areas of the strategy had been held in abeyance in 2020/21 in recognition of the pressures on academic departments. Student Opportunity would look to pick-up regular conversations with departments over the upcoming summer period with a view to providing resources and support for embedding core skills in 2021/22. • There had been investment in resource and a new project officer role created to support placement learning and to develop the placement toolkit resource for departments. • Collaboration with the Students' Union on leadership skills had taken place, but there had not been sufficient capacity to progress this work in 2020/21. This area would be on the agenda in 2021/22. • The Committee discussed the need to enhance support for postgraduate research (PGR) students, particularly those seeking employment outside of academia. It was noted that generic provision existed and that there was benefit for students to engage with resources aimed at taught students. Work was underway looking to enhance employability support within doctoral supervisor training. • The Committee discussed the importance of data to support enhancement, noting that Graduate Outcomes currently had limited utility for looking at PGR students. • The Committee discussed the observed reticence of PGR students to discuss employment outside of academia with supervisors or the Doctoral College. Students were more likely to approach Student Opportunity and more visible support could be provided. • The Committee discussed the perception within research culture that leaving academia following completion of a research degree was seen as failure. There was a need to address this culture and shift thinking. A report on research culture would be considered by the Research Committee and potentially could be usefully brought to the Education Committee in the future. • The Committee discussed mobility and the importance of maintaining diverse opportunities for students throughout a course of study. There was demand for study and work-based mobility experience of varied length and at different points within a student's curriculum journey. There was a need to develop central resource to support this. • The Committee discussed the inclusivity of employability and careers events and the positive impact the move to online delivery had for students less confident in attending in-person. • The Committee noted the ongoing work of the Placement Practice Group as a forum for knowledge sharing and partnership. The group was keen to work with departments to develop an enhanced model of placement provision.
061	<p>Dean of Students Office Update</p> <p>A paper (061-EC150621) and verbal update were received from the Dean of Students. The key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since 2019 the Dean of Students' office had taken on a wider remit. Work within the space of personal tutoring as one element supporting student success had focused on community values, mentoring, and engagement with directors of student experience. Positives had been observed in moving to online, including higher engagement, facilitated networking, and readily available training resources. • Development of the inclusive education model had been a key focus and the Dean of Students' Office would lead on its implementation. • Feedback from departments indicated that personal tutoring had played an important role in 2020/21, providing 1-2-1 contact for students during the pandemic. Students had valued this, but there was recognition that there had been an increased workload on tutors. There was a need to understand departmental challenges moving into the 2021/22 academic year to enable appropriate support. • There had been creativity within departments in engaging students through online induction, peer support, and department events. Students had been enabled to continue to make connections and engage with their departments despite the restrictions on face-to-face activity. • A recognised increase in complaints had been a challenge and had highlighted a need to enhance communication across professional services and institutional understanding of the role of the Dean of

	<p>Students Office. This had also highlighted a need to develop coherence across services to support students in navigating processes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The personal tutoring review had introduced training on a three-year cycle. The end of the first cycle had been reached and reflection of future need was underway. There was a need to think more broadly about training and support need. Tailored support sessions with specific departments had been successful and this would be developed further. • There had been significant progress in rolling out ‘introduction to active bystander training’, reaching over 1000 students in 2020/21. There was a commitment to timetabling training for every new student in 2021/22. • Work was underway with the Students’ Union to roll-out a longer active bystander programme for student sports and societies executives. Support was welcomed from departments for inclusion in timetabling, and highlighting importance to students, and the resources available. • The Committee discussed the observed increase in mitigation claims during the preceding academic year and the impact of tutors. It was recognised that the mitigating circumstances process must be inclusive, but consideration could be given to existing culture and how able students feel to seek help at different points leading into assessment periods. A focus on encouraging and enhancing student resilience could support this. • The Committee agreed that looking into this issue was worthwhile, and that links to curriculum wellbeing could be explored. Consideration could be given to reporting in terms of submissions and outcomes, and this could be compared with other institutions.
062	<p>Postgraduate Taught Strategy Update</p> <p>A paper (062-EC150621) and verbal update were received from the Academic Director (Postgraduate Taught). The key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The postgraduate taught (PGT) strategy group had considered business covering the breadth of its Terms of Reference. The group was still in a pandemic reaction mode, and there had not always been capacity within the membership to tackle issues in great depth. • The work conducted by the group in the current academic year would be a springboard to engage in planning for the coming academic year. • The group chair would draft a strategy over the summer period to be discussed by the group in the 2021/22 academic year. It was expected that the strategy would then be brought to committees.
063	<p>Governance and Management of Postgraduate Taught Provision</p> <p>A paper (063-EC150621) and verbal update were received from the Academic Director (Postgraduate Taught). The key points and discussions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board of Graduate Studies (BGS) had been retained to represent postgraduate students at the University level. The business of BGS over the preceding three years had considered very few PGT issues, with a small number of items mainly concerning space provision. • The paper made recommendation to amend the Terms of Reference of BGS to consider business relating only to postgraduate research students. PGT provision would be covered by the Education Committees rather than BGS. Management of scholarships would move to Student Recruitment, Outreach and Admissions Service (SROAS). • The Committee noted that Faculty Education Committees (FECs) did not discuss a great deal of PGT business at present as it was anticipated this would be channelled through BGS, though FECs did have responsibility for all levels of study. • The Committee discussed the need to carefully consider making space on FEC agendas for PGT business. It was noted that FEC agendas were already very busy. Thought should be given to the workload of FECs and their activity throughout the year. • It would be important that PGT matters did not become lost between committees. The Academic Director (Postgraduate Taught) post should help prevent this. • The Committee approved the recommendations made in the paper (063-EC150621) alongside a commitment to review in due course to ensure that PGT matters are covered within the governance structure.

	ACTION: Committee to review the consideration of PGT matters through governance structures at its June meeting of the 2021/22 cycle.
Items below this line were for receipt and/or approval, without discussion	
064	Inclusive Education Model The Committee received and recommended for approval to Senate, the Inclusive Education Model (064-EC150621).
065	Academic Integrity Policy and Revised Regulations The Committee received and noted the paper (065-EC150621) and associated recommendations to Senate
066	Remote Proctoring Policy The Committee received and noted the paper (066-EC150621).
067	Revised membership of the Internationalisation Steering Group The Committee received and approved the revised membership and terms of reference (067-EC150621).
Subsidiary and Sub-Committee Reports	
068	Business for report from Academic Quality and Standards Committee (AQSC) The Committee received and noted the agenda and minutes of meetings available online .
069	Business for report from Board of Graduate Studies (BGS) The Committee received and noted the agenda and minutes of meetings available online .
070	Business for report from Student Learning Experience and Engagement Committee (SLEEC) The Committee received and noted the agenda and minutes of meetings available online .
071	Business for report from the Partnerships Committee The Committee received and noted the agenda and minutes of meetings available online .
072	Business for report from the Widening Participation Committee (WP) The Committee received and noted the agenda and minutes of meetings available online .
Other	
073	Any other business There was no other business.
CLOSE BY 16:30 Next meeting: 14:00, Thursday 9 December 2021, 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