

H/02/27/02

**e-Business Meeting of the Senatus Academic Policy and Regulations Committee
(APRC)
to be held Tuesday 25 October – Monday 31 October 2022**

UNCONFIRMED MINUTES

For approval		
1.	<p>Academic Misconduct Procedure & responses to queries raised by APRC For approval</p> <p>A query was raised regarding record keeping and sharing proven instances of academic misconduct between Schools and Colleges, particularly where students are taking courses or programmes across Colleges.</p> <p>It was confirmed that the SAMO in the School where the student had the proven case would contact the CAMO in the non-owning College to notify them. CAMO's have agreed that communications will include adequate information on procedural elements, such as this.</p> <p>The amendments to 3.3 and 3.4 of the Procedure were welcomed by some members.</p> <p>Some general comments on the proposed changes were received from a SAMO via a College representative. These general comments were shared with the paper author and will be taken forward by the College. Comments were also received from a Senate member, which were noted by the paper author and would be considered in relation to longer term changes.</p> <p>Some amendments to the procedure were proposed by Committee members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• With regard to 3.2, it was suggested that the wording be amended to note that the SAMO has the discretion to request either an electronic / in person meeting, or a written statement from students (i.e. if they decide to hold a meeting, there is no specific requirement that it be in person by default);• With regard to 3.3, it was suggested that the SAMO is able to apply a penalty of no more than 10 marks, except in cases where the component is worth 5% or less of the course mark. In these cases the SAMO may apply a penalty up to reducing the mark for the component to zero. It was noted that this amendment would prevent large numbers of referrals to CAMO of very low-stakes assessments, which are common in some Schools and was a proportionate change given the variable impact that a 10 mark penalty can have, depending on the size of the component being penalised.• With regard to the imposition of a penalty, it was noted that points 3.3 and 3.5 are conflicting and it would be preferable for a defined penalty of 10 marks would be appropriate and align with the lowest mark penalty relevant to the Common Marking Scheme.	APRC 22/23 1A

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With regard to 3.7, it was suggested that the wording be amended to state the 15 working days starts when the provisional marks for a cohort are released, as opposed to when the face value mark is released for the individual student. It was noted that this would prevent delay where a face value mark for an individual student under investigation for academic misconduct, and is not confirmed for some time (as can be the case), which means the clock would not yet have started ticking on the 15 working days. • It was suggested that the wording of 3.9 be amended to “the affected mark(s) must not be ratified...”. <p>These amendments were collated and shared with the paper author for discussion with CAMOs, who fed into the proposed changes.</p> <p>APRC agreed that further amendments to the Procedure were required prior to this item receiving formal approval. The Committee agreed to consider further revisions to the Procedure at its next meeting in November.</p>	
For comment		
2.	<p>Online exam arrangements for 2022/23</p> <p>For comment</p> <p>This item is closed business</p>	<p>APRC 22/23 1B</p> <p>CLOSED</p>