

E-ASEC Summary: 30 August - 6 September 2022

Summary of responses by the committee

Paper	Summary	Chair's View
Updates to the following ARPPs to clarify policy requirements for apprenticeship provision: 5B - Student Engagement & Feedback: Policy & Procedure 11A - Academic Appeals: Policy & Procedure for Taught Awards 11F – Student Complaints: Policy & Procedure 11H – Fitness to Practice: Procedure 11J – Support to Study: Policy & Procedure For Approval	The committee members who responded approved the paper, with comments listed below.	Confirmed
Comments		
Approved		Mandi Barron
Approved		Philip Sewell
Approved. Thanks		Sara White
Approved		Christa van Raalte
Approved		Carol Clarke
Approved		Jules Forrest
Approved		Shelley Thompson
Approved		Jacky Mack
Approved		Gelareh Roushan
Approved		Christos Gatzidis
Paper	Summary	Chair's View
6H Academic Offences: Policy & Procedure Update For Approval	The committee members who responded approved the paper, with comments listed below.	Confirmed
Comments		
Approved		Mandi Barron
Approved		Philip Sewell
Approved. Thanks		Sara White
Approved		Christa van Raalte
Approved		Carol Clark
Approved		Jules Forrest
Approved		Shelley Thompson

Approved	Jacky Mack
Approved	Gelareh Roushan
Approved, the majority of the changes/additions are welcome, some particularly so, for example, the removal of emphasis on the 30% threshold which has reportedly for us in FST caused quite a bit of confusion in the past (with the students). The changes are a step in the right direction and I do not hesitate to approve these. However, I do feel these do not go far enough, or as far as we require them in FST. Some historical context, in AY 2013-2014 FST had 17 AOPs whereas in AY 21-22 we have (just) had 170. This is an enormous increase; and there are many reasons for this, one being the rapid growth of PGT internal admissions in the last few years (most of the 170 fall under that category) combined with other factors such as the proliferation of essay mills etc. There are two issues we face; the first is resourcing this very high number of panels, it is hugely time consuming given how they are set up and with the number of people required for the AOPs (and also the fact they have to be in QAEG etc., these added requirements complicate matters further). The streamlined approach doesn't help much with this and most of AOs for us do not fall under that. An enormous amount of time is spent on setting up 170 panels (prelims included), resourcing them, running them etc., both for academic time and support staff too. With these numbers, in my view, it would be preferable to have a more automated issue of penalties on cases bar the more complicated cases, with the students then being able to challenge these if they wish in a panel (which we feel would happen very rarely) rather than having a full set of panels for each and every case. Beyond this, there are some (anticipated) quality issues too. It would be better to have a more clearly defined viva mechanism for essay mills cases; the current policy (and changes here) do not go far enough on this in order to provide the necessary framework in our view. What I would like to propose is approval of these but also a review of numbers of AOPs as well as effort invested in them in summer 2023. If numbers are similar and the effort is again very significant as part of that I strongly believe we should consider building on this proposal (with some of the ideas listed above). We will put renewed effort in prevention too (which will help) but it would be good to have a review of these at the end of this (current) AY. Response from James Eva Academic Quality: Thanks for these comments, Christos. I am very conscious of the rise in cases across the board but know that these have been particularly acute in FST. There will definitely be a limit to what we can do in terms of the regulations in terms of reducing cases, as they are very much directed towards the management of cases once they have been received, rather than how we stop them getting to that stage in the first place. As you know however, the Academic Integrity Group met this Monday (thank you to yourself, your FST colleagues and everyone else who made the time to attend and input as it was a very productive meeting I felt) where the focus of the meeting was what we can do to reduce cases, and a list of actions was circulated shortly after which should go some way to making steps in the right direction. The actions will be followed up by the group and I am looking to hold the meetings every other month to track progress on these, and on the changes that have been approved to the policy. I agree that the end of the academic year is a good time to review the impact of the changes to the policy and on the prevention measures. Regarding your preference for automated penalties, I think that this could certainly be looked at and we already do this for minor issues. As you indicate it wouldn't be appropriated for more serious/complicated cases but reviewing whether we have got this in the right place would be no bad thing. I can add this to the agenda for the working group. Regarding your comments on a process for cases of suspected contract cheating and a viva process, these amendments have been made to the policy in section 7.5 to make the viva an element of the preliminary meeting that can then be used to take forward to a panel.	Christos Gatzidis