

17/M31 CHAIR'S BUSINESS

The Chair reported that:

- a) The University Distinguished Teaching Fellowship process had been launched. Key dates associated with the process for 2017 are appended to these minutes.
- b) The Chair reported that the Students' Union Executive Officers had been elected for the 2017/18 academic year. The Committee noted that they would formally commence the role on 3rd July but that ahead of this there would be a 2 week transition with the existing Sabbatical team.
- c) Response rates for 2017 NSS were strong and all departments were above the required reporting threshold, however the Committee noted that the University and departments should continue to encourage student uptake in order to meet the target of an 80% response rate.

17/M32 PLAGIARISM WORKING GROUP

The Committee considered the report of the Working Group which had been developing proposals for the enhancement of the training and guidance provided to staff and students in the area of avoiding plagiarism. The proposals were presented by Dr Kaduk.

The report proposed a number of actions, both immediate and longer term in order to support students and staff in this area. An academic development framework was proposed to ensure that training around plagiarism was embedded in assessment activities throughout programmes, including introductory material within pre-induction materials for students, then reinforced by activities at departmental level after arrival. The Working Group proposed that the institutional message around plagiarism avoidance should be strengthened, and that this should be supplemented through enhancement of online resources and revisions to the relevant Senate Regulations. Further staff training was proposed including the identification of a departmental Student Academic Development Lead and regular meetings of Departmental Plagiarism Officers.

The Committee welcomed the extensive work undertaken and endorsed the principles set out in the report. While acknowledging the range of potential activities identified, the Committee also noted that these varied between short and longer term, and agreed that it would be necessary to prioritise these in order to implement the overall programme.

The Committee agreed that the Working Group should become an Implementation Group for this purpose, and that it should seek to include greater student representation, particularly from the overseas and PGT student communities. The Committee agreed the following immediate priorities:

- Development of the pre-induction materials;
- Increased guidance for academic departments when following up instances of plagiarism;
- Bringing together the various resources already developed by the Library and LLI;
- Introduce a regular schedule of Plagiarism Officer meetings
- Share the existing data on numbers of plagiarism cases with the Academic Directors of the Colleges.

Following this, the Committee agreed that the Group should be invited to develop a more detailed schedule for the development and implementation of the other recommendations.

The Committee thanked Dr Kaduk and the Working Group for the work to date.

17/M33 **REVIEW OF SENATE REGULATION 5**

The Committee considered a document which set out a series of principles for the amendment of Senate Regulation 5 governing undergraduate programmes. The document had been informed by several meetings of a working group with cross-College academic representation, Professional Services and students.

The Committee considered the proposals in the document as follows:

a) Intermediate awards

The Committee considered and endorsed the proposal to introduce interim awards of Certificate of Higher Education and Diploma of Higher Education as exit awards for undergraduate programmes, and that these awards should not be classified.

b) Foundation Certificate

The Committee considered and endorsed the proposal to create a Foundation Certificate at level 3 of the FHEQ that could be awarded to students who completed a Foundation Year however chose not to progress to a full undergraduate programme at the University.

c) Progression requirements

The Committee considered the proposal that students should not be allowed to progress into the final year of their programme if they had failed to pass all first year modules. The Committee noted that while the first year did represent a foundational stage this requirement could also impact negatively on strong students whose second year performance would otherwise merit progression. The Committee did not accept this recommendation and agreed that this should be referred back to the Working Group with a proposal to consider whether, unless specified as a PSRB requirement or an academic prerequisite, failed first year credit could be allowed and instead be included within the overall failed credit allowance for the programme.

The Committee considered and endorsed the other components of the progression requirements as presented, including a minimum module mark and the credit threshold for eligibility to re-sit. The Committee requested further clarification of how the compensated module scheme would operate.

d) Degree Classification.

The Committee considered and endorsed the proposal to establish a weighting of 33/67% contribution towards the degree classification between years 2 and 3 across the University. The Committee also endorsed the reduction of the total allowance of failed credit for the award of an honours degree.

The Committee supported the proposal that the scheme of assessment retain a Credit Weighted Average (CWA) and a preponderance element. For the latter, the Committee endorsed the proposal that in order to be eligible for a higher classification students

should be required to have achieved a minimum number of credits at the higher threshold. The Committee agreed that there should also be a requirement for a proportion of the higher credits achieved to also be located in the final year, to ensure that the classification reflected student achievement at the highest level of the programme.

e) Borderlines

The Committee considered and endorsed the proposal to raise the CWA requirement to be considered in the borderline, and also the simplification of the factors that could be taken into account at this point to include only mitigating circumstances.

f) Integrated Masters Programmes

The Committee considered and endorsed the proposals regarding the progression and award requirements for an integrated Masters degree including a specific progression hurdle at the end of the second year and an overall CWA requirement of 50% for the award. The Committee recommended that the Working Group also consider the introduction of a specific progression requirement at level 6 in addition.

g) MBChB

The Committee considered and endorsed the proposal to incorporate the progression and award regulations for the MBChB within Senate Regulation 5.

h) Aegrotat and Posthumous awards

The Committee considered and endorsed the proposal to incorporate more detailed regulations and guidance for Boards of Examiners regarding the award of aegrotat and posthumous degrees.

The Committee noted that the points above would be referred back to the Working Group where required, and that they would inform the drafting of a revised Regulation which would be circulated for consultation.

17/M34 **MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES POLICY**

The Committee considered a draft Mitigating Circumstances Policy. The draft Policy had been developed as part of the Student Lifecycle Change Project and was designed to ensure that all students were treated equitably with regard to their mitigating circumstances, and to support a positive student experience in this area. The draft document had been developed on the basis of consultation with a range of stakeholders within the institution, and following a review of practice at a peer institutions.

The Committee welcomed the development of a clear policy in this area and endorsed many of the principles within the document. The Committee also identified a number of areas where clarification or further revision may be required as follows.

The Committee:

- Agreed that it would be helpful to expand and more clearly define both the list of acceptable mitigating circumstances and the list of acceptable evidence, and move these elements out of the full policy into associated guidance documentation;

- Welcomed the acknowledgement of pressures of work as a valid mitigating circumstances for DL students and agreed that this should also be the case for students studying any part-time programme;
- Recommended that the list of circumstances which would not be accepted be cross referenced against relevant policies for staff absence to ensure consistency of treatment;
- Noted the reference to ensuring that University staff had access to relevant information, and agreed that this should be clarified to demonstrate that this related to information for which student permission had been given to share, and not confidential information held by the Students' Union or other sources;
- Agreed that consideration should be given to how the policy might address students who had been victims of crime which may not have been reported;
- Agreed that the project team should consider how the policy and guidelines might account for cultural differences by supporting students in feeling sufficiently confident to share mitigating circumstances with the University;
- Noted that while the Policy did implicitly account for the potential impact of mitigating circumstances upon preparation for assessment, this could be further clarified within the document;
- Supported in principle the proposal to introduce a 'Fit to Sit' policy across the institution, however noted that the policy statement and guidance would need to be expanded and clarified with regard to those circumstances where a student may not have been in a position to judge their fitness to undertake an assessment.

The Committee considered the issue of self-certification for non-completion or absence from assessment. The policy proposed an expansion of the current position to allow for self-certification in the event of a long term recurring illness. It was noted that there was the potential to expand this further to allow self-certification for other assessment events. The Committee agreed that it was important to achieve the correct balance between supporting students to manage their own circumstances and ensuring that University policy did not create the potential to allow an unfair advantage in the assessment process. The Committee agreed that the further expansion of self-certification might conflict with this principle, and agreed that further consultation with stakeholders, including the Students' Union, was required on this point.

While supportive of the overall direction of travel, the Committee agreed that further work was required before the Policy could be submitted for approval. The Committee agreed that the policy document should be revised in further consultation with the Students' Union and other stakeholders, and that a further draft should be presented to future meeting of the Committee.

17/M35 **ANNUAL DEVELOPMENTAL REVIEW**

The Committee considered a summary report on the output of the Annual Developmental Review process for undergraduate programmes for 2015/16. The Committee noted that all ADRs had been reviewed at College level committees and a number of issues for consideration had been identified for action. The summary document set out areas of good practice which were highlighted for further dissemination. The document also set out a number of areas that had been referred to the Committee from the Colleges for further consideration and action as appropriate.

The Committee commended the following areas of good practice:

- The Continuous Improvement Handbook in the Department of Engineering;
- The growth of electronic marking, particularly in the College of Medicine, Biological Sciences and Psychology. The Committee noted that further work was required to embed this practice more widely across the institution.
- The 'Reflection on Feedback' exercise in the School of Neuroscience, Psychology and Behaviour, in which students were required to comment upon how an element of feedback on a previous assignment had informed their approach to a subsequent piece of work.
- The operation of the Student-Staff Committees in the Department of Sociology, now part of the School of Media, Communications and Sociology.

The Committee agreed that there was a significant amount of good practice contained within the summary report which could have wider application across the University. The Committee agreed that the Academic Directors of the Colleges should be invited to identify a specific element of good practice from their college which could then be presented to the Curriculum, Learning and Teaching Forum.

The Committee considered the issues raised for its attention and action where appropriate. The Committee agreed the following actions arising from the reports:

- The Committee noted comments from the College of Science and Engineering regarding a growing failure rate in year one of programmes. The Committee noted that several factors might contribute to this, including changes to the A-level syllabus. The Committee noted that the University had invited a number of A-level teachers to discuss these changes and agreed that this would be a useful opportunity to inform developments in the first year of University programmes.
- The Committee noted comments from two Colleges regarding increased pressure on laboratory and other teaching resources arising from higher student numbers. The Committee noted that this was in part as a result of recruitment planning at College level. The Committee agreed to feed the comments raised directly into the ongoing capital planning process.
- The Committee noted comments regarding the process and timing of ADR. The Committee noted that in light of the upcoming changes to the academic year and associated academic planning processes, there was an opportunity to review the process and timing of ADR. The Committee agreed that the review should consider whether ADR might be more effectively situated during the Spring term.
- The Committee noted comments regarding the timetabling and attendance monitoring processes. The Committee requested that specific instances of the issues raised be identified via College Academic Committees and fed into the relevant programme teams.

The Committee agreed that the good practice and actions identified above should be summarised and fed back to College Academic Committees, and that a summary of the process and the agreed outputs would also be presented to the next meeting of Senate.

17/M36 **COURSE REPRESENTATIVES**

The Committee considered a proposal from the Students' Union for reform of the Course Representative election and support mechanisms. The proposals sought to strengthen the system and enhance the collaboration between the University, academic departments and the Students' Union in this area.

The paper proposed standardisation of the process for the election of course representatives across departments and a much closer relationship between the Students' Union and departments within this process. This would be achieved partly via the nomination of a single point of contact in the SU and in each department for the co-ordination of course representation. It also proposed the creation of a Course Representative Board, co-chaired by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Student Experience) and the Students' Union Education Officer. Finally, it was proposed that all documentation and outputs of Student-Staff Committees should as standard be submitted to both the Students' Union and the relevant College Academic Committee.

The Committee noted that extensive consultation on the proposal had been undertaken and relevant feedback incorporated into the proposals. The Committee **approved** the proposals.

17/M37 CURRICULUM TRANSFORMATION

The Committee received an update on Curriculum Transformation. Professor Wynn highlighted that the project website had been redesigned and supplemented with further guidance for programme teams. The revised rationale and evaluation forms would be launched as part of this process. The project team had been working closely with programme teams, a number of whom were preparing to submit in May 2017.

The Committee received the Terms of Reference for the Assessment Strategy Task and Finish Group. The Committee noted the development of a series of assessment principles which were based on the HEA Key Principles and had been presented in a clear, user friendly manner for academic staff. The Committee welcomed the document, proposing minor amendments in order to make the theme of 'Digital by Default' more visible, and to clarify issues around assessment for and of learning.

The Committee received the Project Plan for the Task and Finish Group. The Committee noted that in the short term guidance documentation was under development for programme teams progressing through Curriculum Transformation in terms of appropriate, varied and authentic assessment design. A draft Assessment Strategy would be developed following this, for initial consideration by the Committee in May 2017.

17/M38 PROGRAMME DEVELOPMENT, APPROVAL AND WITHDRAWAL

The Committee considered the report of the Programme Approval Panel which considered the MSc Psychology by DL. The Committee noted that the Panel had approved the programme in principle subject some minor conditions. The Committee **approved** the report and **agreed** that the Chair of the Panel should be authorised to approve the introduction of the programme for October 2017, subject to receipt of a satisfactory response from the programme team.

The Committee considered the withdrawal of BSc Psychology with Sociology. The Committee noted that this proposal had been considered and endorsed by the Academic Committees of both contributing Colleges, and that there was a plan in place to ensure that students remaining on the programme would be fully supported. The Committee **approved** the withdrawal of the programme, with the final intake being October 2017.

17/M39 COLLABORATIVE PARTNERSHIPS MANAGEMENT GROUP

The Committee received a report of the meeting of the Collaborative Partnerships Management Group held on 21 February 2017.

The Committee **approved** the Terms of Reference for the Group for 2016/17 and **approved** the report.

17/M40 STUDENT EXPERIENCE ENHANCEMENT GROUP

The Committee received a report of the meeting of the Student Experience Enhancement Group held on 20 February 2017.

The Committee noted minor technical corrections to the list of those in attendance and **approved** the report.

17/M41 STUDENT RECRUITMENT, ADMISSIONS AND WIDENING PARTICIPATION COMMITTEE

The Committee received a report of the meeting of the Student Recruitment, Admissions and Widening Participation Committee held on 7 December 2016.

The Committee **approved** the report.

17/M42 COLLEGE ACADEMIC COMMITTEES

The Committee received the reports of the meetings of the College Academic Committees held on the following dates:

College of Medicine, Biological Sciences and Psychology, 14 February 2017

College of Science and Engineering, 22 February 2017

College of Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities, 7 March 2017

17/M42 APPOINTMENT OF EXTERNAL EXAMINERS

The Committee considered and **approved** the appointment of the following external examiners:

College of Medicine, Biological Sciences and Psychology

Department of Medical Education

Professor Laura Bowater, University of East Anglia
Period of Office: September 2017 to September 2021
Programme(s): MBChB Phase 1

Department of Molecular and Cell Biology

Dr Scott White, University of Birmingham
Period of Office: September 2017 to September 2021
Programme(s): B.Sc. Biological Sciences (Biochemistry), B.Sc. Medical Biochemistry

College of Science and Engineering

Department of Geography

Dr Avril Maddrell, University of Reading

Period of Office: September 2017 to September 2021

Programme(s): B.A. Geography, B.A. Human Geography, B.Sc. Geography,
B.Sc. Physical Geography (including year abroad variants for all
programmes)

Department of Geology

Dr Jenny Collier, Imperial College London

Period of Office: September 2017 to September 2021

Programme(s): B.Sc. Geology with Geophysics, M.Geol. Geology with Geophysics
(including year abroad variants for all programmes)

Department of Mathematics

Ms Alison Parker, University of Leeds

Period of Office: September 2017 to September 2021

Programme(s): B.Sc. Mathematics, M.Res. Mathematics (Pure Maths modules)

College of Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities

School of Arts

Dr Laura Rorato, University of Hull

Period of Office: September 2017 to September 2021

Programme(s): B.A. Translation and Interpreting Studies,
B.A. Modern Languages and Translation,
B.A. Modern Languages with Translation

School of Education

Dr Claire Stocks, University of Liverpool

Period of Office: December 2017 to November 2021

Programme(s): Postgraduate Certificate in Academic and Professional Practice

The Committee noted that Chair's action had been taken to approve the following external examiner appointment:

College of Social Science, Arts and Humanities

School of Arts

Dr Jason Harding, University of Durham

Period of Office: January 2017 to September 2020

Programme(s): B.A. English; B.A. English and History,
B.A. English and American Studies (including year abroad variants
for all programmes)

DURATION OF MEETING: Two hours and twenty minutes

Schedule for awards made in 2017

Feb and March Launch

Monday 24 April First round submission deadline.

Applicants submit *brief* statements (max 2,000 words) to the Secretary of the UDTF Panel

Wednesday 3 May UDTF Panel meets to consider first round submissions and select the applicants to invite to submit second round submissions.

Applicants receive feedback on their application following the Panel meeting.

References invited for shortlisted applicants

Wednesday 31 May Second round submission deadline (and reference deadline)

Invited applicants submit full submissions (max 5,000 words) to the Secretary of the UDTF Panel

Thursday 8 June UDTF Panel meets to consider full submissions and decide which applicants to recommend as University Distinguished Teaching Fellows

15 June UDTF Panel recommendations are confirmed by the Academic Policy Committee. Successful applicants are notified (award subject to Senate approval)

28 June The recommendations for the award of University Distinguished Teaching Fellowship status are ratified by Senate

11 – 14 July or
January 2018 Successful applicants are officially designated University Distinguished Teaching Fellows and receive their awards at the July 2017 or January 2018 degree congregations; the latter being if their award particularly recognises achievement in postgraduate teaching and learning.
