FLTQC 29 April 2026

Wednesday, 29th April 2026 2:15pm

Teams | Faculty of Science Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee

Attendees

Attended

John Benardis
Yarden Brody (YB)
Zoe Burke
Andy Burrows (Chair)
Thomas Cottrell (TC)
Susan Crennell (SC)
James Foadi (JF)
Marguerite Hallett (Secretary)
Liz Haynes (Observer)
Nikki Hodgson (NH)
Penn Mackintosh (PM)
Barrie Marsh
Charareh Pourzand
Philip Rogers (PR)
Gan Shermer (GS)
Gitte Sparding (GSp)
Arya Wood (AW)

Did Not Attend

Florin Bisset
Sumukh Chaluvaraju
Momna Hejmadi
Tony Shardlow

Partial Attendance

Sarah Paine (Observer)

1.0 Proposed changes to Stage 2 new course approval process (3512)

The Committee considered proposed changes to Stage 2 (academic) new course approval process (Paper 78).
GSp, Deputy Head of Academic Quality and Standards, explained that this consultation is about the implementation of recommendations that EQSC made at the end of last year in response to a review of how the University is able to evidence compliance with the Office for Students' (OfS) condition of registration B1 on academic experience.
The paper sets out the specific areas that were reviewed, highlighting some gaps, not in the University's compliance with the condition itself, but in how effectively it is currently able to evidence that compliance. This includes areas such as ensuring courses provide an appropriate amount of contact time, remain up-to-date, and offer unit content with suitable breadth and depth. While the University is confident that these standards are being met, its audit trails do not always clearly demonstrate this, e.g. through committee documentation.
As a result, one of the key actions has been to clarify where in the course approval process these considerations should be addressed, and how they should be evidenced. This proposal, which is currently being finalised and due to go to EQSC in May, seeks to formalise the role of DLTQCs within course approval processes and provide clearer guidance on which committees are responsible for reviewing specific aspects of courses and assuring their quality. Science FLTQC and Management SLTQC are the final committees being consulted before the papers are finalised.
The paper provides guidance on how course approval discussions should be minuted, to ensure clear audit trails demonstrating that each committee has fulfilled its role throughout the process. Clarification has been provided on the definition of different teaching methods, as outlined in the teaching taxonomy (included as an appendix). Further clarification may be required regarding the definition of contact hours, proposed as scheduled delivery, as this can be reliably evidenced. The aim is to ensure that, when committees are asked to consider these matters, they do so with a consistent institutional understanding of what is being reviewed.
GSp welcomed the Committee's views on whether the guidance is clear and proportionate, and whether the proposed responsibilities for each committee feel appropriate. In particular, whether DLTQCs and FLTQC are being asked to consider the right aspects at the right level.
The Chair asked about related work on the process and governance for Stage 1 (strategic) course approval, being led by the PVC (Education) on behalf of the Portfolio Review TAFG.
GSp explained that a high-level proposal, focused on principles rather than detail, was presented to Senate on 15 April. One key outcome was the proposed shift in responsibility for strategic (business-focussed, including financial and risk) course decision-making from APC to a sub-group of Planning Board, acting under delegation from UEB. GSp also noted that, while the University is currently able to advertise new courses following Stage 1 approval, doing so requires an amount of academic detail to be agreed, bearing in mind CMA compliance. The intention is therefore to streamline Stage 1 so that it can be completed more quickly and with less complexity, without immediately moving to advertising. Instead, the process would enable a faster transition to Stage 2, with Stage 2 more clearly defined and with clearer roles and responsibilities across committees.
The Chair observed that, while the inclusion of DLTQC in the Stage 1 (academic) approval process may initially appear to add complexity, it is unlikely to have a material impact in practice. Consideration of new courses by DLTQC, prior to FLTQC, is already a necessary step, ensuring that subject specialists can confirm the adequacy of the academic content. As such, this change is chiefly concerned with evidencing those discussions, rather than introducing an additional layer to the process.
GSp commented that a recurring concern raised by colleagues about the current course approval process is that the same documentation is often submitted to multiple committees, with each reviewing it afresh and commenting on the same aspects, at a similar level of detail, which creates a sense of duplication and inefficiency. The proposed approach addresses this by

clarifying that not all documentation needs to be considered by every committee. Where some overlap remains, each committee would have a clearly defined role and focus in how it reviews the material, providing assurance on specific aspects rather than re-examining everything in full. Under this model, FLTQCs would retain their quality assurance remit and could confirm to CPAC that particular areas have been scrutinised, enabling CPAC to concentrate on institutional considerations, such as risk, without duplicating earlier review.
PM reported that he had identified several typographical errors and areas where the wording lacked clarity, which he would share with GSp outside the meeting.
The Chair noted that, in accordance with Appendix C, FLTQC is expected to assure that the course provides an appropriate level of contact time and a suitable balance of teaching methods, with the Course Specification identified as a key reference point. However, the Course Specification typically only sets out contact hours and teaching methods in broad terms, as it is intentionally high-level to avoid CMA compliance issues, given that it effectively forms part of the student contract. As a result, FLTQC would need to derive the necessary detail from individual unit descriptions and then extrapolate this into an overall course-level overview, ensuring consistency with the information provided in the Course Specification. This process would likely prove both challenging and resource intensive.
GSp acknowledged that the OfS is currently consulting on a new condition of registration, which may introduce requirements for more detailed publication of contact time. GS further noted that, as set out in Appendix A, FLTQC is expected to assure at unit level that contact time is sufficient to support students in achieving the UILOs. The Committee reiterated that the key difficulty lies in assembling this unit-level information into a coherent course-level overview of contact time and teaching methods, and in the absence of a clear University benchmark against which to assess whether courses offer an appropriate amount and balance of these.
The Committee noted that Appendix C states that "it is standard within the sector for course years at Levels 4, 5 and 6 to have approximately 360-480 hours of contact time and course years at Level 7 to [have] approximately 240-360 hours of contact time. These ranges are not a University requirement". GS queried whether any guiding principles might be developed to indicate what constitutes appropriate contact time. While this should not be dictated per credit or unit, it is unclear what amount or proportion of contact time might typically be expected, for example in relation to lecture-based delivery. GSp reported that EQSC had previously determined it would not be appropriate to prescribe either fixed amounts or bands of contact time for specific credit sizes, given the diversity of subjects across the University. EQSC's view was that subject experts are best placed to determine what is appropriate in context, e.g. for a lab-based unit. However, this position may need to be revisited in light of any changes to OfS requirements. GSp confirmed that the request for additional guidance or a clearer framework had been noted, and that similar requests had been received from other faculties. It may be possible to develop templates to support consideration of contact time, and to evidence discussions at FLTQC. EQSC may also explore how the University calibrates contact hours across faculties to assess whether there are broadly consistent interpretations. GS added that it would be helpful to understand the current baseline for contact hours across units, e.g. for predominantly lecture-based courses. Even a 'typical' expectation would be helpful, as without some form of benchmark there is a risk that faculties or departments may diverge over time as new courses are developed. This could lead to inconsistency where, for example, students in one faculty receive significantly fewer contact hours per credit than those in another. GSp noted that it is currently not possible to analyse scheduled delivery at course level, as data is held at unit level only, although this is an area that could be explored further.
GSp explained that a revised QA3, to include the new Stage 2 approval process, would be published in readiness for 2026/27. It would then be further updated once the Stage 1 approval changes had been finalised.
GSp clarified that Senate approval will no longer be required for most course approvals, except for doctoral taught programmes and new courses involving a partnership, a new award type (i.e. not currently provided for in the Ordinances) or in a completely new subject area. CPAC will retain the discretion to refer any proposal to Senate where it considers this appropriate, e.g. in cases of particular complexity.
The Chair asked whether, given that these changes are driven by compliance considerations,

there were any plans to verify that actual delivery aligns with what is set out in unit / course approval documentation, e.g. confirming that stated contact hours are delivered in practice. GSp noted that scheduled delivery is already monitored through timetabling for visa compliance purposes, and that it would therefore be feasible to undertake such checks if there were an institutional decision to do so. However, there are currently no plans to introduce monitoring on this basis. Instead, Degree Scheme Review will capture student feedback, via SSLCs and other mechanisms, as well as input from External Examiners, which may highlight any concerns relating to contact hours or other aspects of delivery.
GSp added that she would relay the Committee's feedback to EQSC and invited members to submit any further comments by the end of the week. The Chair reiterated that FLTQC is supportive of the proposed areas of scrutiny, provided it is supported by appropriate documentation to fulfil this role effectively.

2.0 Welcome and Quorum (3513)

The Chair welcomed members, noted apologies and observed that the meeting was quorate.

3.0 Declaration of Interest (3514)

There were no declarations of any potential conflicts of interest.

4.0 Minutes of the Previous Meeting (3515)

The Committee approved the minutes of the previous meeting held on 4 March 2026 (Paper 79).

5.0 Matters Arising (3516)

The Committee noted the following matters arising from the previous minutes:
Minutes 28 January 2026:
M3486 Online MSc Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence Major Change Proposal
The Chair approved updated PG Cert Course Specifications to include the possibility of progression to the PG Dip or MSc and PG Dip Course Specifications to include the possibility of progression to the MSc (Paper 80) (approved 2 March 2026).

Minutes 4 March 2026:
M3508 Education Annual Review and Enhancement (EARE) reports 2025/26
- The Centre of Excellence in Science Education (CESE) Steering Group had expressed support for establishing a Faculty-level group on Generative AI. Steering Group members were asked to nominate a representative from each department to join this group. As not all representatives have yet been identified, a meeting has not yet been convened. In the meantime, several departments have already formed their own GenAI groups. Where these exist, representatives have been drawn from them, ensuring that departmental activity and insights can be fed into the Faculty-level group.
- The Chair raised LOILs at the institutional EARE review meeting, where it was noted that it would be timely to have a review of LOILs. The Chair will follow this up with EQSC.
- The typographical error in the Department of Life Sciences EARE had been corrected.
- GS and SC are following up on representation of Natural Sciences at timetabling meetings.
- Good practice in group work had been shared with the Committee.

6.0 Chair's Business (3517)

To note an addition, regarding the scaling of year-long units, to the Faculty guidance on scaling (Paper 81). The Chair explained that this arose from an issue with an examination in the Department of Life Sciences. The amendment highlights that, for year-long units, it may not be appropriate to make scaling recommendations at the end of Semester 1, as the overall unit mark, only available after Semester 2, is what ultimately matters. Any necessary scaling can then be considered at the end of Semester 2, taking into account the full set of assessment data, including any issues identified in Semester 1. PM enquired as to whether a revised version of QA35 had now been approved.
Action: GSp to update the Committee on progress with the EQSC review of QA35.
Secretary's note: GSp informed the Committee that the revised scaling policy, to be integrated into QA35, would be considered by EQSC at its next meeting on 13 May.
PM suggested that paragraph 22 of the Faculty guidance should include a signpost to QA35, Appendix 4, Annex 3, which sets out the principles for communicating BEU decisions on scaling.
Action: Secretary to liaise with the Chair on amending the Faculty guidance accordingly.
Secretary's note: The guidance was updated accordingly and is available from the 'Assessment and Feedback in Science' Teams page.

- Registry will work with faculties to develop a template for monitoring academic misconduct which ensures that issues with specific areas of provision and units are explicitly addressed and mitigating actions agreed.
- Following the calculator amnesty, Registry have purchased new University calculators for use in the upcoming Semester 2 exams: the Casio FX-991CW+. The Chair welcomed this change, noting that it removes the need for departments to approve individual calculators and apply stickers, and should ensure an adequate supply of spares. Students will be informed via the weekly student email. AW asked that lecturers / DoSs highlight this update in any communications they are already sending about upcoming exams. A number of calculators will also be made available in the library for students to borrow and to familiarise themselves with. In addition, guidance has been published on how to manage late DAPs for exams.
- A draft Course Evaluation Document (CED) template, to be completed by course teams for Degree Scheme Review (DSR), was shared with DoTs last week. Please provide feedback on the DSR policy and the draft CED template using this link: Degree Scheme Review Consultation - Policy and Procedure (March 2026) by 5 May.

Chair's actions:

- Addition of optional units MA52133 Statistical Modelling and Data Analytics (S1, 10 credits) and MA52129 Fluid Dynamics (S1, 10 credits), and a new optional MA5 unit Statistical Modelling and Data Analytics B (S2, 10 credits) (Paper 82A) to the final year of MMath (Hons) Mathematics with Study Year Abroad (Paper 82B), for 2026/27 (approved 2 March 2026).
- New Introduction to Biological Chemistry for visiting students unit (S1, 5 credits), as the S1 half of All Year unit CH12001 Introduction to Biological Chemistry (10 credits), for 2025/26 (Paper 83) (approved 2 March 2026).
- Change from Semester 1 to Semester 2 for optional unit MA52091 Scientific Computing (5 credits) and to its requisites, for 2026/27 (Paper 84) (approved 4 March 2026).
- AP3T course changes for 2026/27 (Paper 85A): PG Cert & Dip Clinical Pharmacy Practice (Primary Care) and (Secondary Care), MSc Clinical Pharmacy Practice, MSc Advanced Clinical Pharmacy Practice and Postgraduate CPD Credit (Healthcare Practice):

1. Addition of a new optional (but compulsory for MSc ACPP) Foundations of Clinical Examination (15 CATS) unit (Paper 85B) (approved 11 March 2026) as a co-requisite with unit SL500136 Advanced Clinical Assessment (30 CATS) (Paper 85C).
2. Addition of 2 new 15 CATS optional units: Fundamentals in Advanced Clinical Pharmacy (Paper 85D) & Prescribing in Practice (Paper 85E) to replace the following 15 CATS suspended optional units (Paper 85F): SL500158 Professional Skills for Medicine Optimisation (15 CATS), SL500142 Evidence Based Pharmacy Practice (15 CATS), SL500143 Foundation Knowledge

(15 CATS) and SL500144 Foundation Skills (15 CATS) (approved 9 March 2026)

- UG Life Sciences course (& with placement variants) changes for 2026/27:

1. Addition to Year 3 of BSc & MBiol (Hons) Biology (Paper 86A) of a new optional 10 credit, All Year, Microbiomes and One Health unit (Paper 86B) and a new optional 5 credit, S2, Plant Biotechnology and Environment unit (Paper 86C).
2. Addition to Year 3 of BSc & MBiochem (Hons) Biochemistry, BSc & MBiomed (Hons) Biomedical Sciences and BSc (Hons) Pharmacology (Paper 86D) of a new optional 10 credit, All Year, Microbiomes and One Health unit (approved 10 March 2026).

- Change of designation of PH32020 Statistical Physics and Soft Matter (S1, 5 credits) from compulsory to optional in BSc & MPhys (Hons) Physics with Theoretical Physics courses (all variants) for 2026/27 (Paper 87) (approved 11 March 2026).
- Addition of BSc (Hons) Mathematical Sciences as an exit award for the pre-CT version of MMath (and placement & SYA variants) for 2025/26 (Paper 88) (approved 19 March 2026).
- Addition of a DoS approved unit option to both semesters in Years 3 and 4 (up to a maximum of 10 credits for the year overall) of BSc and MComp (Hons) Computer Science and BSc and MComp (Hons) Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence (and placement & SYA variants) for 2026/27 (Paper 89) (approved 8 April 2026).
- Replacement of the following optional units in Year 3 of BSc & MSci Natural Sciences Biology stream (+ placement and SYA variants) for 2026/27 (Paper 90) (approved 8 April 2026):

1. SL32071 Entrepreneurial Biotechnology (AY, 10 credits) with new SL32163 Microbiomes and One Health (AY, 10 credits).
2. SL32066 Current Topics (S2, 5 credits) with new SL32164 Plant Biotechnology and the Environment (S2, 5 credits).

- BSc (Hons) Natural Sciences Environmental Science stream course change for 2026/27:

1. Withdrawal of SC32005 Renewable Energy (S1, 5 credits).
2. For BSc (Hons) Natural Sciences (Physics with Environmental Science) and (Environmental Science with Physics) (and placement & SYA variants):
- Withdrawal of SC32005 Renewable Energy (S1, 5 credits) (optional for Physics with Environmental Science BUT compulsory for Environmental Science with Physics).
- Addition of PH32047 Environmental Physics (S1, 5 credits) & PH32057 Sustainable Energy Technologies (S2, 5 credits) as optional units.
- Addition of MA32060 Mathematics of Planet Earth (S2, 5 credits) as an optional unit.
- Addition of new unit Energy Materials for Natural Sciences (S1, 5 credits) (approved 16 April 2026) as an optional unit.
- Addition of new unit SL32164 Plant Biotechnology and the Environment (S2, 5 credits) as an optional unit.
3. For BSc (Hons) Natural Sciences (Environmental Science with Biochemistry), (Environmental Science with Biology) and (Environmental Science with Chemistry) (and placement & SYA variants):
- Withdrawal of SC32005 Renewable Energy (S1, 5 credits) (compulsory).
- Addition of MA32060 Mathematics of Planet Earth (S2, 5 credits) as an optional unit.
- Addition of new unit Energy Materials for Natural Sciences (S1, 5 credits) (approved 16 April 2026) as an optional unit.
- Addition of new unit SL32164 Plant Biotechnology and the Environment (S2, 5 credits) as an optional unit.

(Paper 91) (approved 13 April 2026).

- Royal Society of Biology (RSB) reaccreditation submission (Paper 92) (approved 20 April 2026).

7.0 Procedure for Adjustments to Learning, Teaching & Assessment (3518)

The Committee noted the following in preparation for implementation of the Procedure for Adjustments to Learning, Teaching & Assessment for 2026/27 (approved by Senate on 15

April), as part of the Inclusive Education initiative:

- Resource approved by UEB to support implementation of the procedure from September, including 1 year of 1.5 FTE Grade 7 (or possibly 2 years of Grade 6) Faculty Implementation Support for Level 1 (across 3 faculties).
- All Unit Convenors are expected to complete a Level 1 Reasonable Adjustments Adoption Readiness form (Paper 93) ahead of 2026/27.
- Level 1 Reasonable Adjustment checklist (circulated for comment on 22 April) and Level 2 Reasonable Adjustment list (of commonly recommended adjustments in DAPs) will be issued.
- FLTQC is to provide an annual summary to BoS on oversight of Level 1 and Level 2 implementation and progress.

The Chair reminded the Committee that universities have a legal duty to make anticipatory adjustments, taking steps to consider and implement reasonable adjustments in advance, rather than waiting for a student to disclose a disability. Accordingly, Level 1 adjustments (the baseline provisions incorporated into all DAPs) should be embedded within teaching for all students. Paper 93 outlines the initial phase of this work. It will be circulated to all Unit Convenors to assess the institution's readiness to implement Level 1 adjustments at unit level, e.g. the preparedness of Moodle pages and the extent to which staff can provide information in advance. The findings will also help identify training needs ahead of the 2026/27 academic year.

TC noted that this represented a positive step overall. Drawing on his experience as a DoS, he observed that there are often cases where Unit Convenors are not implementing the approaches the Department intends, and that this typically only becomes apparent partway through the semester. Paper 93 would therefore help to identify and address such issues at an earlier stage. However, he commented that some elements appear overly granular, such as course handbooks and additional supplementary materials such as glossaries and technical lists. He noted that the Department has a single handbook covering all undergraduate courses, rather than individual unit handbooks. TC therefore suggested adding a 'not applicable' column. He further proposed that the first four rows under "Provide digital versions of key teaching, learning and assessment materials in advance on Moodle" be consolidated into a single row, with the documents currently listed in rows 2-4 included as illustrative examples. The Chair agreed that the paper requires further revision to simplify it and make it easier to complete. PM noted that "suppose" in column 1 ("Not confident this will be in place") should be corrected to "support".

The Chair noted that it may be possible to engage interns next year to report on some of the non-subject-specific information from Moodle.

GS asked whether there were any plans to develop a Faculty-standardised assessment brief template. The Chair explained that, given the breadth of the Faculty, it is not practical to create a single template suitable for every department and type of assessment. Instead, each department should use a template that is clear and consistent within its own context. The Chair asked members to upload their department's assessment brief templates to the 'Department assessment brief templates' folder on the 'Assessment and Feedback in Science' Teams page to support the sharing of good practice. The Committee noted the Teaching Hub webpage on assessment brief templates, which includes an example from the Department of Computer Science.

YB noted that several staff do not record in-person problem classes to ensure students feel comfortable asking questions without being recorded and to encourage attendance. YB asked whether, in cases where no students attend a session, the lecturer should provide a recording. The Chair explained that a recording is not necessarily required; the priority is to provide materials that allow students to catch-up or review the content, such as a session summary. YB also highlighted the requirement to offer opportunities for students to contact staff for support with teaching and assessment, noting that this could be time-consuming. The Chair responded that, in most cases, staff are already providing such support. The readiness survey is intended to assess the extent to which these requirements are currently being met and to identify any gaps.

PR asked how departments can ensure compliance with requirements for units delivered by another department or Faculty. The Chair explained that each Faculty and department is

responsible for assuring compliance across the units they oversee. PR observed that, as it is at the discretion of individual academics to decide whether recording is pedagogically appropriate, approaches to enabling students to catch-up or review content may vary across and between courses. The Chair agreed cross-departmental and cross-Faculty working will need to be considered, noting that some variation may reflect differences in the nature of the content. The Chair added that it may be helpful for guidance to be provided on appropriate approaches where compliance is not being met.
Action: Secretary to relay the Committee's feedback on Paper 93 to Kate Awdry.
Secretary's note: This was actioned immediately following the meeting.

8.0 Educational Annual Review and Enhancement (EARE) reports 2025/26 (3519)

The Committee noted the Faculty EARE summary (Paper 94A), feedback from the institutional EARE review meeting (Paper 94B) and good practice identified (Paper 94C).
JF highlighted use of Crowdmark, particularly for coursework, as a way to streamline and partially automate marking, improving efficiency. The Faculty currently has access to the platform for one more year. If usage does not increase during this period, it is unlikely that the licence will be renewed for a further three years due to the associated costs. The Chair also noted other assessment tools, such as LearnSci.
The Chair asked members to review Paper 94A and flag any action points that may present challenges for their departments. While acknowledging that many of the listed actions reflect existing practice (e.g. consistent use of assessment brief templates by departments), the Chair emphasised their value in demonstrating the Faculty's commitment to enhancing student satisfaction with assessment and feedback.
JF encouraged the forthcoming Faculty-group on GenAI to take an innovative approach to embedding AI and related skills within the curriculum, e.g. from next year, all students at the University of Surrey will undertake a unit focussed on the use of generative AI.
NH reported that a version of the institutional summary paper will be considered by EQSC in May. Following approval of the institutional-level actions arising from the EARE process, these will be disseminated to ensure staff can see how their input has informed outcomes and what has been taken forward from their reports. As part of this exercise, the examples of good practice outlined in Paper 94C will be formally shared. In the meantime, members were encouraged to share Paper 94C with their DLTQCs. The intention has been to highlight good practice in areas where challenges have been identified, with the aim of providing practical and useful insights for colleagues.

9.0 Education Action Plans (EAPs): Faculty level concerns (standing agenda item) (3520)

The Committee noted that, in accordance with the published Schedule of Business for EAPs, UG completion data had been due to be released in March, UG continuation data in April and Course Level Survey data in May. GS asked whether staff are notified, e.g. by email, when such data is published. NH acknowledged that staff should receive such notifications and agreed to investigate.
Action: NH to confirm to the Committee when notifications will be issued and who is responsible for sending these.
Secretary's note: Links to UG completion and UG continuation data were circulated on 15 May.
The Chair encouraged members to review the aforementioned data in their EAPs in due course.

10.0 Monitoring of timeliness of feedback (standing agenda item) (3521)

The Committee noted that, at its meeting on 15 April, Senate approved deadlines for feedback on summative assessment and that an updated QA16 would be published in readiness for 2026/27. The Governance team will communicate these outcomes to colleagues in due course. The Chair reminded members to continue monitoring the timeliness of assessment feedback for the remainder of the semester.

11.0 Degree Apprenticeship Quarterly Monitoring Report (3522)

The Committee noted the MSc Computer Science Degree Apprenticeship Quarterly Monitoring Reports (November 2025 - January 2026) (Paper 95A) and (January - March 2026) (Paper 95B). The Chair explained that the slight overlap in reporting had arisen because the Apprenticeship Quality/Standards Committee had requested the Department to reschedule its quarterly reports, so they align with those of the University's other apprenticeship programmes.

12.0 Feedback from Committees (3523)

Education, Quality and Standards Committee (EQSC):
The Committee noted the minutes of the meeting held on 14 October 2025 (Paper 96).
Academic Programmes Committee (APC):
The Committee noted the minutes of the meeting held on 10 December 2025 (Paper 97).
Courses and Partnerships Approval Committee (CPAC):
The Committee noted the minutes of the meeting held on 14 January 2026 (Paper 98), in particular approval of:
a) GPhC reaccreditation submission for the Independent Prescribing unit.
b) MPharm + Year 0 at Plymouth GPhC annual monitoring submission.
Education Advisory Board (EAB):
The Committee noted the minutes of the meeting held on 23 March 2026 (Paper 99).
Student Experience Advisory Board (SEAB):
The Committee noted the minutes of the meeting held on 5 March 2026 (Paper 100).

13.0 Department Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee (DLTQC) Minutes (3524)

The Committee noted the minutes of the meetings held on:
Department of Life Sciences: 9 March 2026 (Paper 101).
Department of Chemistry: 25 February (Paper 102A) and 1 April (Paper 102B) 2026.
Department of Computer Science: 20 January (Paper 103A) and 24 March (Paper 103B) 2026.
Department of Mathematical Sciences: 25 February 2026 (Paper 104).
Department of Physics: 9 January (Paper 105A) and 11 March (Paper 105B) 2026.

14.0 Any Other Business (3525)

- PM reported that at recent Students' Union events, some students expressed reluctance to use GenAI on ethical grounds. There is also concern about a lack of transparency in how GenAI is used by staff. When students are not clearly informed, they may assume it has been used to generate their entire feedback, even when it has only been used for more limited purposes, such as checking grammar. JF noted that informal groups of students opposed to the use of GenAI do exist, so its use should not be made compulsory. However, students should still be given opportunities to engage with it to develop their employability skills.
- The Chair noted the Faculty's strong performance at the Education Awards, with awards going to members of staff in the Departments of Chemistry and Computer Science, as well as to PM and AW as Faculty Student Representatives. The Chair also congratulated those who were nominated. PM reported that he and AW had included congratulations to student award winners in emails sent to students in the Departments of Chemistry and Life Sciences on wider matters. It was noted that it is particularly valuable when DoTs also send congratulatory messages, as this encourages broader student engagement and helps to strengthen the staff-student partnership.