

QUALITY ASSURANCE STANDING GROUP
Confirmed minutes of the meeting held on 6th June 2011

Present: J Taylor (Chair), R Chater, B Dyer, K Fisher, K Leech, A Main, C Symonds, N Silvennoinen (Secretary), G Willcocks, A Young

Apologies: M Barnard, A Diaz, J Edwards, A Ireland

1 Accuracy and matters arising from minutes of 9th March 2011

- 1.1 The minutes were accepted as an accurate record of the meeting subject to the following amendment: M Mabire to read M Barnard.
- 1.2 It was reported that a revised D6 which included enhanced guidance on discretion for Boards of Examiners and Assessment Boards had been published. It was also noted that the proposed changes to the Standard Assessment Regulations had been discussed at the May meeting of ASC. Those supported by the committee had been forwarded for Senate approval.

2 Academic Procedure B10 – proposed changes to School scrutiny of ARFMs

- 2.1 JT outlined the background to the proposed changes to the ARFM scrutiny process and key issues arising from the review of data from the 2009-10 monitoring cycle. Schools had adopted a varied approach to the new auditor role and members discussed how well the role had worked in their Schools. There had been a degree of confusion about the purpose of the auditor role and how it differed from the old reader role which had resulted in different approaches between Schools and also between auditors within Schools. Members agreed that the function should be made explicit and this could be achieved via an auditor report template. It was also noted that auditor reports for collaborative provision would need to be written with both BU and partner institution audiences in mind.
- 2.2 It was noted that the new process had resulted in varied SQAEC workloads. Where these had increased, this was attributed to the number of frameworks, and hence ARFMs, the committee received. This had prompted some SQAECs to move scrutiny of ARFMs to a sub-committee meeting. It was also noted that all Schools had moved, or intended to move, to a single point of submission for all ARFMs regardless of the monitoring cycle. This would help ensure consistent School oversight and reporting to ASC.

Action: CS to finalise B10 changes, including an auditor report template.

3 Moderation at partnerships

- 3.1 JT explained the background to the agenda item, noting that where partners worked with multiple Schools, they experienced different approaches to various University functions including moderation. Members argued that this was inevitable as the level of moderation required for individual frameworks/programmes depended on a number of variables and a 'one size fits all' approach was not appropriate. However, it was agreed that the next revision of Academic Procedure D1 should include more guidance on moderation at partnerships. Moderation arrangements should be included in independent marking plans so that partners would be aware from the beginning of the academic year when moderation is due to take place. It would also be helpful to clarify the definition to ensure that it is not confused with moderation undertaken by the Board of Examiners.

Action: EDQ to consider the current definition and to include enhanced guidance regarding moderation at partnerships in the next revision of D1. The independent marking plan template to include a column to identify who will undertake this function.

4 Assessment feedback

- 4.1 JT noted that it would be timely for the University to revisit assessment feedback principles and practice and reflect on progress made since the 2008-09 Assessment Feedback Project. The Group would reconvene to consider the item in July once the Student Voice Steering Group had had an opportunity to consider the Student Experience Survey results.

Action: NS to include the item on the July agenda.

5 Advice on assessment for resubmitting/repeating students

- 5.1 Schools had asked the Group to consider whether it would be helpful to provide guidance for staff on setting assessments for resubmissions and repeats. Members discussed whether it was appropriate for students to submit their original piece of assessment and whether new assignment briefs should be required year-on-year. It was agreed that where a reassessment was set, it might be acceptable for students to re-work their original submission to meet the threshold standard. This was often the case for instance where a student failed a dissertation. Where students had to repeat whole units, normally they should be asked to submit a new piece/s of work. The assignment brief could be the same as long as the student chose a different topic. EDQ would ensure that the next revision of Academic Procedure D1 would reflect the discussion. EDQ would also check that the Academic Offences Procedure makes it clear that where a student has been asked to resubmit their original piece of work this does not equate to self-plagiarism.

Action: EDQ to ensure that the next versions of D1 and the Academic Offences Procedure reflect the above.

6 Time limits on appeals

- 6.1 AM outlined the rationale for his proposal that the University reconsider the current time limits on appeals. KL supported this, noting that it can take students several days to find out what the appeals procedure entails. KL offered to seek feedback from the Student Advice Centre before the Group would discuss the item further.

Action: KL to seek feedback from the Student Advice Centre regarding the impact of time limits on appeals.

Action: NS to include the item on the July agenda.

7 Any other business

- 7.1 None.

8 Date of next meeting

- 8.1 The next meeting would be scheduled for July, date to be confirmed.

Action: NS to set up the next meeting.