APPROVED

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

SENATE: ACADEMIC QUALITY AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE
TEACHING, LEARNING AND STUDENTS

6 MAY 2026

Present: Professor Jenn Hallam (Chair), Professor Rob Appleby (from minute 7), Professor Andrew Brass, Professor Naomi Chambers, Professor Hannah Cobb, Amrit Dhillon, Professor Sarah Dyer, Professor Scott Heath (from minute 6), Professor Rebecca Hodgeson, Dr Jen McBride, Professor Andrew Mawdsley, Dr Simon Merrywest (from minute 6), Dr Katie Moore (from minute 7), Professor George Moulton, Professor David Schultz, and Professor Fiona Smyth.

Apologies: Rhianna Patel and Alec Severs.

In Attendance for all items: Paul Brierley (Interim Director of Student and Academic Services), Dr John Marsh (Senior Governance Manager), and Jane Holland (Governance Manager) (minutes).
In Attendance for: Teaching Sustainability Project (TSP) and Course Unit Framework (CUF) in the School of Arts, Languages and Cultures (SALC) (minute 7): Dr Marco Biasioli (Lecturer in Russian and Eastern European Studies and UCU Executive Member), Dr J Michelle Coghlan (Senior Lecturer in American Studies and NEC Member for UCU), Professor Fiona Devine (Vice-President and Dean of Faculty of Humanities), Professor Thomas Schmidt (Head of SALC).
In Attendance for: Collaborative Provision Procedure (minute 9) and Normative Criteria Framework for Programme Development Update (minute 10): Sarah Williams (Teaching and Learning Manager).

1 Welcome and Declarations of Interest
Noted: that there were no declarations of interest in relation to the agenda.

2 Minutes of the Previous Meeting
Agreed: to approve the minutes of 11 March and 31 March 2026.

3 Action Log
Noted: the Senate AQSC TLS Action Log.

4 Matters Arising
Noted: the practical considerations for disseminating the new AI in Teaching and Learning Policy would be considered by TLSIG, prior to work taking place with the Comms Team to develop a plan for communicating the Policy more widely. It was confirmed that members could share the Policy with colleagues. A briefing note on how to implement the Policy would be developed and circulated to Committee members, Directors of Education and the School Board Chairs. **Action: Associate Vice-President (Teaching Excellence and Innovation)**

5 Forward Agenda: Schedule of Committee Business for 2025-26
Noted: the Academic Quality and Standards Committee (Teaching, Learning and Students) Forward Agenda.

6 University of Manchester Students' Union Report
Received: the University of Manchester Students' Union Report providing an update on the Educate MCR project.

Noted:

a) the report highlighted a number of recurring themes that had arisen year-on-year and how these were being addressed. A practical approach would be taken to address these themes together with corresponding items in the NSS Action Plan, as an integrated piece of work; **Action: Associate Vice-President (Students)**

b) a member raised the use of the term 'personalised learning' and the need for its definition. Work to define the personalised learning provision would be actioned as a collective and an update would be presented to a future meeting of the Committee. This would be undertaken as part of the M2035 curriculum workstream and Strategy Leap: flexible, personalised and digitally enabled learning; **Action: Associate Vice-President (Curriculum and Quality)**

c) a key insight from the Educate MCR 2025-26 survey included '… to ensure assessment instructions are transparent and easy to interpret across all modules…', which the Canvas standard had been introduced to address;

d) the student experience in respect of academic advising was varied, and was a recurring theme over more than one year of the surveys. This was associated with having an impact on students' feeling valued and sense of belonging at the University.

e) data by cohort indicated that there had been an increase in students feeling that they 'could influence decisions made by the University'. This was a positive outcome and would be highlighted to the Research and Insight Team for identifying this data in future reports; **Action: UMSU Faculty Officer (FSE)**

7 Teaching Sustainability Project and Course Unit Framework in SALC

Received: a report on the Teaching Sustainability Project and Course Unit Framework (CUF) in SALC, and the management response to the report.

Noted:

a) the report noted concern over the evidential base, consultation process and governance arrangements relating to the changes to the CUF and called for a temporary pause to allow further scrutiny of evidence to take place prior to curriculum changes being embedded;

b) the guidance stated that the CUF aimed to be flexible. However, it appeared prescriptive in terms of the maximum number of course units a programme team or discipline could offer each year. It was suggested that counting against the maximum number of units would introduce a structural constraint against cross-listing that could create conditions in which cross-listed modules could be cut;

c) the distinction between engagement and consultation was discussed, raising concern that staff may not have been provided with meaningful opportunities to contribute, or having consistent access to the guidelines;

d) the management response proposed ongoing consultation to be undertaken, rather than temporarily pausing the CUF. Thought had been given to the student experience in respect of choice of options over the years of study and consideration had been given to the possible impact and consequences of the changes. Engagement and consultation about the changes had been undertaken over 18 months and extensive discussions had taken place with different groups to ensure issues raised were integrated into the development of the framework;

e) it was recognised that there had been inconsistent consultation across the departments. There was a commitment to rectify this with further engagement and local dialogue. There was an opportunity to work through the issues by holding discussion and consultation with key stakeholders help resolve the issues;

f) colleagues were encouraged to become involved in co-designing the way forward. The report authors would be invited to the 24 June Committee meeting to contribute to further discussion on developments.

8 DAWS and Degree Regulation XVIII

Received: a summary of the review and update of i) the Dignity at Work and Study Policy and Procedure, and ii) Regulation XVIII: Student Complaints Procedure.

Noted: a member raised a scenario where action could commence against a student as a result of a

DAWS complaint in the same year as action taken against a different student under the DAR Policy, as a result of implementing the change mid-cycle. The scenario would be referred back to the Head of Advice and Response for consideration. **Action: Executive Director for the Student Experience**

9 Collaborative Provision Procedure
Received: the revised Procedure for the Quality Assurance of Taught Collaborative Provision for discussion, pending approval at a future meeting.

Noted:

a) that the revised Procedure had been developed collaboratively and was supported by standardised documents, including monitoring and re-approval forms, due diligence, flow diagrams, and template certificates;
b) the Associate Vice-President (Curriculum and Quality) would be kept updated about the progress of the revised Procedure; **Action: Teaching and Learning Manager**
c) a member raised the need for clarity in defining the terms 'study abroad' and 'student exchange'. There was also discussion about the distinction between 'Flying Faculty' and 'Branch Campus';
d) the International Office had been engaged in revising the Procedure and associated documentation, which would help to support consistent processes;
e) the collaborative partnerships had been mapped to the type of risk as defined by the QAA. High risk activity, including but not limited to joint awards, branch campus and dual awards, would be presented to Senate for approval;
f) support would be provided centrally to guide the faculties and schools on type of partnership provision and liaison with partnerships, along with support through the standardised due diligence process;
g) it was suggested that an operating guide would be required to help users navigate the information;
h) work was being undertaken with the Contracts Team to develop a standard MoA for dual and joint awards;
i) consideration would be given to developing forms in an electronic format once the new curriculum content management system had been implemented. **Action: Teaching and Learning Manager/Associate Vice-President (Curriculum and Quality)**

10 Normative Criteria Framework for Programme Development Update
Noted:

a) at 22 April Senate, a member had offered to support the work of developing clear examples to support the normative criteria framework progress, which would include examples to assist the resolution of disagreements. This work would be supported by TLD colleagues and would be presented to the 24 June Committee meeting for discussion. Members were invited to contact the Governance Manager if they wished to assist with the development of the examples; **Action: Committee Members**
b) a revised proposal on the Senate brake was being prepared, following discussion at the 11 March meeting and considering the feedback at 22 April Senate. Governance practices at other institutions regarding programme development would be considered. This update would be presented for discussion at the 24 June Committee meeting and would include the timeframes for programme development milestones and approval thresholds for academic year 2026-27;
c) several amendments from PGT programmes would miss the Senate deadline. Members agreed that these would be reported to the Committee's 24 June meeting instead;
d) reference to programme withdrawals would be extended to include all programme development.

11 Timing and Duration of the resit period for the 2026-27 academic year
Received: Timing and Duration of the resit period for the 2026-27 academic year report.

Noted:

a) Several options for alternative timing of resit results for FSE students were presented, with an aim to avoid release of results during Welcome, Introduction and Transition Week. The options for revising the timing and duration of the resits included 1) lengthening resits to three weeks, starting one week earlier, or 2) moving the two week resits period one week earlier;
b) a similar proposal had been considered previously. However, a number of obstacles had existed at that time which had prevented a revision of the timings;
c) consideration would be given to the amount of students taking resits, along with the significant number of assessments;
d) the Committee agreed to support a change to the timing and duration of resits as an interim fix. The timings for key milestones that shaped the academic year would be considered as a wider, longer-term project; **Action: Vice-President for Teaching, Learning and Students/Executive Director for the Student Experience**

12 Updates to Committee's Terms of Reference: Freedom of Speech and Academic Freedom

Received: proposed updates to the Committee's Terms of Reference.

Noted: a proposed minor amendment to the Committee's terms of reference to include reference to the University's responsibilities to Freedom of Speech and Academic Freedom.

Agreed: to recommend to Senate the update to the Committee's Terms of Reference.