Standing Committee on Assessment

Minutes of the meeting held on Friday 2nd May at 10.00am in SLB/204 and via Zoom online video conferencing.

Attendance and apologies for absence:

Present:	Prof. Steve King	Computer Science (Sciences), APVC-TLS (Chair)
	Dr Alet Roux	Mathematics (Sciences)
	Dr Eytan Zweig	Language & Linguistic Science (Arts & Humanities)
	Prof. Jill Webb	AD-TLS Social Sciences
	Dr Jeremy Airey	Education (Social Sciences)
	Fenella Johnson	York SU, Academic Officer
	Dr Daniel Morgan	Philosophy (Arts & Humanities)
	Assoc. Prof. Anna Sotiriadou	CITY College
	Dr Patrick Gallimore	Law (Social Sciences)
	Dr Sue Faulds	Health Sciences (Sciences)
In attendance :	Aimée Yeoman	SCA Secretary & Policy Officer
	Dr Zara Burford	York Online
	Richard Andrew	York SU, Advice & Support Manager
	Richard Firth	Student Administration Manager for Progression and Awards
	Dr Adrian Lee	Policy Manager, Academic Quality & Development
	Jess Penn	Head of Inclusive Education
	Claire Wilkinson	Disability Services Manager
	Diane Atkinson	Student Services Manager, School for Business & Society
	Daisy Bowen	Special Cases
Apologies:	Prof. Paul Wakeling	Dean of YGRS
	Dr Juliet James	YGRS
	Jan Ball-Smith	Head of Student Success
	Dr Mathilde Péron	Economics (Social Sciences)
	Sarah Finch	Head of Faculty Operations - History, History of Art, Archaeology & Centre for Medieval Studies

Standing Committee on Assessment: Minutes 2 May 25

Standing Committee on Assessment

Jenny Matson	Deputy Head of Student Administration (Student Lifecycle)

m24-25/92 Welcome and apologies for absence

Committee members and those in attendance were welcomed and apologies noted.

Jen Wotherspoon and Nadine Waehning would be joining later in the meeting to present their respective items.

m24-25/93 Declarations of Interest

N/A

m24-25/94 Minutes of previous meeting (SCA 24-25/32)

Minutes of the previous meeting held on Friday 14th March were confirmed as correct.

m24-25/95 Matters arising from the previous minutes

Members noted items listed on the Matters Arising [log](#)

CLOSED

m24-25/57 Calculator policy student feedback (Oral), Survey departments that use calculators, and ask if it would be a problem to add A-Level calculators to the permitted list.

JM has shared the proposed list with SCA Chair and this will be approved via Chair's action for implementation in the 25-26 academic year. See Chair's Report: m24-25/96.

m24-25/74 Chair's Report (Oral), SCA Secretary to circulate CBoE Forum summary notes to SCA members.

Completed, circulated 21/03.

m24-25/74 Chair's Report (Oral), SCA Chair to flag to Tom Banham about department concerns with time pressures.

Completed.

m24-25/75 Report from Students (Oral), SCA to issue a reminder on AM process to relevant people - CBoEs, SSMs, StAMP members etc.

Completed, circulated 21/03.

Standing Committee on Assessment: Minutes 2 May 25

Standing Committee on Assessment

m24-25/77 SCA Priority Group - Academic Integrity Tutorial- Oral update, AIT Priority group to discuss at their next meeting whether it is appropriate to stop students progressing if they do not complete the AIT.

Complete, update on this in Item 2.2.

m24-25/82 Update on Calculator Policy (Oral), Exams & graduation to continue to loan calculators for Sem 2.

Confirmed at March SCA meeting.

m24-25/84 UG External Examiners (EE) report, SCA Secretary to circulate the link to log of UG EE report summaries & UTC to have this also.

Completed, circulated 21/03.

ONGOING

m24-25/39 Academic Misconduct from YorkSU Perspective, AR to lead work on StAMP guidance with other members of the committee (including an SU rep)

m24-25/52 Matters arising from the previous minutes, SCA Secretary to support the set-up of a StAMP guidance working group.

The above two actions are to be incorporated into an AQ/SCA project over the summer period, which will be looking at StAMP processes, email templates etc.

m24-25/54 Report from Students, SCA Chair and Digital Education Team to discuss issues reported by York SU.

Previously, SCA Chair was awaiting a report from the Computer Science CBoE to inform discussions.
SK has now received this report from Computer Science and will discuss concerns further with the Digital Education team.

m24-25/60 Update to acceptable assistance in assessment policy (to incorporate PSRBs), SCA Chair to revise the definition of professional programme to cover all courses which have PSRB requirements, via Chair's action.

Ongoing.

m24-25/75 Report from Students (Oral), SCA Secretary to build review of AM and StAMP

Standing Committee on Assessment: Minutes 2 May 25

Standing Committee on Assessment

processes into StAMP Summer project.

To be incorporated into an AQ/SCA project over the summer period, which will be looking at StAMP processes, email templates etc.

m24-25/77 SCA Priority Group - Academic Integrity Tutorial- Oral update, EZ & YorkSU to work together to go through the various AITs & identify areas for change etc.

Ongoing.

m24-25/79 SCA Priority Group - Exceptional Circumstances Policy- Oral update, SCA Chair to discuss with JB-S about support for students with caring responsibilities on a wider level. York SU to be involved in discussions.

Ongoing.

m24-25/84 UG External Examiners (EE) report, SCA Chair to speak to Claire Hughes about joining up with NSS steering group to reflect on the EE feedback around feedback to students.

Ongoing.

m24-25/84 UG External Examiners (EE) report, JW/SK to flag a more robust approach to actions that depts are taking to address issues, working via FLTGs.

Ongoing.
JW queried how we could systematically feed this through into annual review process - JW and SK to continue discussion

NO LONGER NEEDED

N/A

m24-25/96 Chair's Report (Oral)

SCA **considered** the Chair's oral report. It was noted that:

- JM had sent SCA Chair a proposed expanded list of calculators alongside feedback from departments on the proposed changes. It was noted that one department was concerned about making a change for this academic year's Sem2 CAP due to assessment already being set, however they were supportive of an updated list for the 25-26 academic year.
- SCA Chair noted that this allows time to arrange a method of authorising calculators such as tamper proof stickers.
- A concern had been raised regarding equity for students who had not studied A-Level Maths, for example, and would therefore have to pay for an A-Level calculator on the

Standing Committee on Assessment

proposed list.
- SCA Chair noted that the UTC Generative AI group has been working on a draft institutional statement on AI (to be approved by UTC) alongside a 'one-stop shop' for all AI guidance on the University website.
- SCA Chair also noted that Russell Group is revisiting its AI principles, which he will be involved with.

m24-25/97 Report from Students (Oral)

York SU **noted** that:

- Feedback has been received from students that the School of ACT has scheduled in- person assessments for the Roses Sporting Tournament Friday & weekend competition days. YorkSU noted that according to the student who gave this feedback, this has apparently happened 'for the last 3 years and affects 20% of students in the School of ACT'.
- The Committee discussed that there needs to be clarification on whether the purported 20% figure covers the whole school/levels of study within the school.
- The Committee also discussed the value of considering how scheduling of assessments over the Roses main weekend and surrounding days impacts other departments/schools across the University.
- The Committee noted that those heavily involved in the media coverage of Roses can already access ECs, but recognised that this does not mitigate for in-person assessments
- The Committee discussed that it must be taken into account that departments have constraints with timings for when in-person assessment can occur.

ACTION: SCA Chair to discuss these concerns with the School of ACT for future years.

- YorkSU noted that they have been monitoring whether StAMPs have continued to give out poor practice caps in academic misconduct cases, despite this no longer being in policy. YorkSU noted that they have not heard of this happening since SCA sent out a firm instruction to StAMPs, CBoEs and SSMs.
- YorkSU noted that they had recently seen an increase in the number of withdrawals of international students due to non attendance/engagement, which they flagged as unusual due to the closeness of this occurring to the CAP. YorkSU noted that students are coming to them for advice/support, but only once the final decision has been made by the Academic Registrar.
- The Committee discussed how some students have had several warnings about their non-attendance/engagement, noting examples of this within SBS, and that potential remedies to this are LoAs, re-admission points etc.
- The Committee noted that this is a distressing situation for international students, however the wellbeing of students needs to be balanced with UKVI rules/external compliance regulations.

ACTION: SCA Chair to discuss this situation

Standing Committee on Assessment: Minutes 2 May 25

Standing Committee on Assessment

with the Academic Registrar.

m24-25/98 SCA Priority Group - Condonation - Oral update

The Committee **noted** the report:

- The priority group discussed that they had looked at a number of other universities' policies on condonation as published online and discovered that, at a surface level, what is generally referred to as condonation in other institutions, coincides with what is referred to as compensation at University of York. The priority group is planning to look deeper into the insights gained from this sector policy review.
- The Committee discussed that it is important to consider the minimum credit requirements for an award when carrying out this work.

m24-25/99 SCA Priority Group - Academic Integrity Tutorial- Oral update

The Committee **noted** the report:

- The priority group discussed at their last meeting whether it was appropriate to prevent students who did not complete the AIT from progressing (to year 2 or dissertation stage as relevant).
- The group discussed that the intention behind the AIT being a progression requirement is not designed to be punitive, but rather to provide a basic understanding of academic integrity as an essential aspect of every student's education in their first year. However, it was also discussed that students may perceive this differently, and that they may view prevention of progression as a punitive measure.
- The priority group discussed that for students who have no intention to commit misconduct, they may think the AIT is unnecessary, as they may not understand that the AIT can help them avoid unintentionally violating the rules.
- The priority group noted a lack of clear data linking AIT completion to reduced academic misconduct (AM). Anecdotal evidence from LLS suggests no difference in AM rates between completers and non-completers.
- The priority group considered that mandating the AIT for progression might be counterproductive, encouraging a "tick-box" approach rather than genuine engagement. They suggested providing departments with guidelines for deploying the AIT with relevant context instead.
- The priority group also noted the inconsistent timing of AIT introduction across departments, ranging from very early to very late in the academic year.

Standing Committee on Assessment: Minutes 2 May 25

Standing Committee on Assessment

- The Committee recommended removing the AIT as a compulsory progression requirement due to its current limitations. While students should be expected to take it, completion will not be mandatory for graduation.
- The Committee discussed that a revised AIT, if further developed, could potentially become a compulsory requirement in the future. They also emphasized the need to integrate the AIT into programme design principles.
- The feasibility of incorporating the AIT into a first-year module assessment was discussed but deemed inequitable across different programmes and concerns were raised regarding significant workload implications.
- An alternative suggestion was to devolve the responsibility for delivering academic integrity training to individual departments.
- The group considered the potential perception from an external audience if the AIT is no longer a mandatory requirement for students.
- The discussion then focused on whether the AIT needs greater disciplinary context and integration within assessment approaches.
- The group agreed to revisit the original purpose of the AIT, which was to provide baseline training. It was suggested that departments should further contextualise this baseline training and there was the consensus that academic integrity needs to be integrated throughout the entire student journey, not just at the point of AIT completion.

ACTION: AIT priority group needs to look at a revised tutorial to be incorporated into programmes, linked to departmental contexts

m24-25/100 SCA Priority Group - FREPEAT- Oral update

The Committee **noted** the report:

- The priority group discussed the scope of the FREPEAT policy review: whether an analysis of data and identification of key issues is sufficient, or if proposals for SCA are expected.
- The priority group discussed the need to gather and analyse internal data on FREPEAT offers, uptake, and outcomes from the 2018-19 UG1 cohort onwards. Clarity is required within the data regarding the number of students accepting FREPEAT versus later withdrawals.
- The priority group deemed the inclusion of student views on the current FREPEAT policy and their recommendations for development important.
- The priority group highlighted that a shift from a centralised "Back on Track" scheme in the initial year to a department-led approach raised concerns about sustainability and consistency.

Standing Committee on Assessment: Minutes 2 May 25

Standing Committee on Assessment

- The priority group emphasised the importance of strong UG1 monitoring and intervention to prevent students from needing FREPEAT, suggesting this should be re-emphasised in the policy.
- The priority group discussed the significant support needs of students accepting FREPEAT and the associated workload implications were discussed, cautioning against widening the scheme's scope.
- Despite this, the priority group did note that some departments are in favour of extending FREPEAT to UG2.
- The Committee discussed that if the scheme is to continue, there needs to be emphasis on students receiving advice and guidance on whether they should accept FREPEAT offer etc.

ACTIONS: DA to share with JA competitor HEI data on the offer of FREPEAT for UG2s.

JA to work with SCA Secretary on accessing student FREPEAT data.

The FREPEAT priority group is to review the FREPEAT policy, with any proposals for changes to come to SCA.

m24-25/101 SCA Priority Group - Exceptional Circumstances Policy- Oral update

The Committee **noted** the report:

- The priority group discussed whether they need to look at other student groups in addition to students with caring responsibilities in their work. The Committee noted how discussion in Item 2.9 would influence the next directions for the group.

m24-25/102 SCA Priority Group - Progression at Risk (PaR) - Oral update

The Committee **noted** the report:

- The priority group noted that a sector benchmarking exercise revealed that a widespread PaR policy is not common in other institutions, with limited examples found at Bristol and Swansea, where it applies only to optional modules.
- The priority group raised concerns about implementing a generic PaR policy applicable to all students due to significant financial and academic risks associated with allowing underperforming students to progress. The group noted the risks of a general PaR policy, suggesting a more specific approach for particular student groups may be necessary.

Standing Committee on Assessment: Minutes 2 May 25

Standing Committee on Assessment

- The priority group is scheduling a third meeting with SF to specifically discuss the case of Health Sciences Nursing and Midwifery students, where PSRB constraints cause particular problems.

m24-25/103 SCA Priority Group - Policy on Acceptable Assistance in Assessment - Oral update

The Committee **noted** the report:

- The priority group discussed their ongoing actions including confirming the status of the policy for professional programmes (HYMS, etc.), liaising with Chemistry regarding AI use in coding etc.
- The priority group will be updating the policy based on suggestions from their March 18th meeting, and proposed amendments to the policy will be identified for presentation to SCA in June.
- The priority group acknowledged the need for the policy to align with the UTC AI group's broader work on pedagogy but agreed to update the policy in the interim.

> **ACTION: Priority group to update the policy for presentation at June SCA.**

- The priority group raised concerns about multiple sources of student guidance. The webpage "Student guidance on using AI and translation tools" will be the single source of current information, and access to the associated Google document will be removed. Ownership and responsibility for the webpage content need to be determined.

> **ACTION: SCA Secretary to look into ownership of this webpage and remove Google document.**

- Appendix 10 of PORD contains relevant guidance in relation to PGR students. Whilst currently considered to be well-developed at present, PW will review the content.

> **ACTION: PW to review Appendix 10 of the PORD.**

m24-25/104 A&F project update (Oral)

The Committee **noted** the report:

Standing Committee on Assessment: Minutes 2 May 25

Standing Committee on Assessment

- March UTC received and gave qualified approval to 9 proposals and was invited to comment on two draft proposals for future consideration. UTC and SCA members had access to the proposals and a comments spreadsheet.
- UTC's approval was qualified as the Committee felt challenged to take definite decisions on policies in isolation from procedures and without sight of the full set of documentation to ensure links between policies were properly accounted for, policy was implementable etc.
- UTC requested a consistency check on boilerplate clauses and further consultation to ensure inclusivity across diverse provision. The UTC Chair will give final approval to the full documentation set.
- Work is continuing on the priority policies needed for 2025/26 and it is hoped further proposals will go to UTC on 15th May covering the scheduling of assessments, delivery of exams and defining assessment vocabulary.
- Attention is also turning to the development of priority procedures for 25/26 over additional policy. This will again be a collaborative activity and seek to collaborate with the most relevant PSS and academic staff.
- Regular discussions with the web team are ongoing to plan accessible and user-friendly presentation of assessment journey information.
- The Committee also noted that the updated policy on reasonable adjustments in assessment will go to May UTC. The link to Student Support Plans (SSPs) was queried. An interim policy and guidance document on reasonable adjustments outside SSPs will also be circulated.
- The Committee discussed the future of the feedback turnaround policy. Concerns were raised that "timely" is not a sufficient definition and that other institutions have tighter limits. Given the timeframe for 2025/26 and the current context, the Committee acknowledged that no changes will be made for 2025/26, but that a review would take place for changes to be implemented for 2026/27. Feedback received from SCA will be fed into UTC's discussion on the 15th May.
- The Committee noted that the current turnaround time creates a significant workload for staff, potentially impacting on the quality of feedback given to students. Support was voiced for a firm turnaround deadline to ensure equity of experience, particularly for online students.
- The Committee noted the importance of consultation with CBoEs and PSS on the practical implications of a revised turnaround time.

m24-25/105 PGT External Examiners (EE) report (SCA 24-25/33)

The Committee **noted** the report and was asked to consider the issues and recommendations highlighted in the report and agree on appropriate actions. UTC and FLTGs will also review this report.

Standing Committee on Assessment: Minutes 2 May 25

Standing Committee on Assessment

- The report was prepared by Policy Officer/SCA Secretary, Aimee Yeoman, and the report was a review of all 159 PGT EE reports (including CITY College) which had been reviewed by the Academic Quality & Development team
- The Committee noted that the reports indicate that the University's quality and standards are being upheld. External examiners praised various aspects, including innovative assessments, constructive feedback, high-quality teaching, and efficient administrative support.
- The Committee noted that the University Vision principles, especially EDI, are well-embedded in many programs. Administrative and procedural aspects generally received praise.
- The Committee noted that CITY College's reports were also positive, with examiners noting appropriate standards, diverse modules, innovative assessments, and good AI guidance.
- The Committee discussed that the threshold for use of artificial intelligence which constitutes academic misconduct is not clear within policy.
- The Committee noted that this is the first year after semesterisation and the first year using Turnitin Feedback Studio (TFS) which had impacts on departments' feedback practices.
- The Committee noted that the Assessment and Feedback (A&F) project intends to review policies, procedures, and guidance on moderation for clarity and transparency for EEs. Discrepancies in marks may stem from a lack of clear moderation policy.
- The Committee noted that some departments award borderline marks to students, whilst some departments have adopted stepped marking which avoids borderline marks. Clarity is needed for students on how to use feedback to improve borderline marks. It was also highlighted that when borderline marks are awarded, students are probably more likely to appeal their mark as opposed to when stepped marking is used (anecdotal evidence).
- The Committee discussed the need to revisit appropriate stepped scaling at an institutional level, questioning if a policy is needed beyond the existing Additional Guidance on Assessment section 4.
- The Committee recommended the following actions from this report:
    - SCA is to issue guidance on the use of borderline or just below the pass threshold marks, particularly as an outcome of moderation and when resolving differences between first and second markers.
    - JW and SCA Chair to review the need for revised policy/guidance on stepped marking and to consider the desirability of specifying a single institution-wide stepped scale or if departmental discretion should be retained.
    - SCA is to strengthen policy on the content of marking criteria to encourage more standardised and consistent application across all schools and departments.
    - SCA is to develop guidance on how markers can align marks with qualitative descriptors and incorporate comments into feedback which are aligned with mark bands.

Standing Committee on Assessment: Minutes 2 May 25

Standing Committee on Assessment

- SCA is to ask the UTC GenAI working group to prioritise developing proactive strategies to adapt assessment design in response to the emergence of AI tools, ensuring assessments evaluate students' genuine learning and skills.
- SCA is to ask the SCA Priority group focusing on the Policy of Acceptable Assistance in Assessment to develop guidance for departments in identifying and addressing the use of AI in assessment.
- In the context of the current University changes, SCA is to monitor EEs' future reports for any references to processes or cycles of work that are providing insufficient time for EEs to fulfil their responsibilities.

- This report will go to UTC on the 15th May with the proposed actions above.

m24-25/106 Academic Misconduct Data Analysis Report 2023/24 (SCA 24-25/34)

The Committee **noted** the report:

- The report was prepared by Policy Officer/SCA Secretary, Aimee Yeoman and is an analysis of academic misconduct data for the 2023/24 academic year, compared with the previous year, to identify trends and areas for intervention.
- The Committee noted that overall there was a positive trend in that case numbers fell despite a small increase in the total student population.
- The Committee noted that there was a decrease in cases among UG, PGT, and IPC students, whilst online cases slightly increased in the context of increased online student numbers. The Committee debated whether a reduction in the number of cases should necessarily be perceived as a good trend or whether this is an unfortunate by-product of the difficulty of detecting AI use in assessment.
- The Committee noted that a key area of concern remains the disproportionate number of cases involving overseas students, representing nearly 73% of total cases. They also considered a notable rise in AI-related misconduct cases, which nearly doubled from the previous year, with a high proportion involving overseas students. The Committee discussed whether the increased number of cases involving AI could be linked to the increase in the number of PGT cases.
- The Committee also discussed how it is difficult to prove that AI has been used, though cases are determined on the balance of probabilities.
- Plagiarism remains the most common offence, with a significant number of false authorship cases, including those involving AI.
- Departmental data showed notable misconduct percentages in Music, Sociology, Health Sciences, and Education (though Health Sciences and Education showed improvement). IPC cases significantly decreased. Natural Sciences, PPE, and Chemistry reported no cases.

Standing Committee on Assessment: Minutes 2 May 25

Standing Committee on Assessment

- The Committee noted that the most common penalty was a marks cap (39/49) and that, in the small number of repeat offences, it was clear that there was a need for structured interventions.
- The Committee discussed that when deciding upon penalties for misconduct, the current policy does not offer leniency for honesty in admitting academic misconduct, which resulted in the Committee considering whether the policy should be seen as punitive or developmental.
- The Committee recommended the following actions from this report:
    - SCA is to further investigate overseas student academic misconduct data for the academic year 2024/25 as a priority for the next report, in order to identify degrees/departments that are of concern, to identify potential areas for targeted intervention and support, and to examine the influence of factors such as curriculum design, assessment methods, and the level of academic support provided within these programmes.
    - SCA is to investigate whether a reduction in the number of cases should necessarily be perceived as a good trend or whether this is an unfortunate by-product of undetected AI use in assessment. SCA is to consider how to promote honesty amongst students regarding their use of AI.
    - SCA is to action the SCA priority group on the Academic Integrity Tutorial (AIT) to consider how more structured interventions could be put into place for students who commit second/third offences for any type of misconduct.
    - SCA Chair is to discuss academic misconduct with CBoEs in each identified department with zero cases/those with the highest number of cases.
    - SCA is to carry out work over the summer period on a StAMP Review Project and within this, SCA is to further develop and promote guidance surrounding the different types of misconduct to raise understanding of the differences. This guidance will be used for both the StAMP start of year briefing and StAMP inductions.
    - For the 24-25 data analysis of academic misconduct, SCA is to closely monitor the number of cases that are unsubstantiated at the end of investigations against the previous years' data, as a result of the update to the initial 'case to answer' process.
    - SCA is to ask the Academic Quality Team and the Exams & Graduation team to work together during the summer to review the data recording system to identify data recording issues and also areas of data which would be beneficial to record in the future, such as demographic data, protected characteristics data, enrolment/tariff data etc.

Standing Committee on Assessment: Minutes 2 May 25

Standing Committee on Assessment

m24-25/107 A Review of Unlimited Self-Certification for Targeted Groups (SCA 24-25/35)

The Committee **noted** the report:

- The report noted that when the evidentiary requirements of Exceptional Circumstances were reinstated at the end of the Covid crisis in 2023/4, the University responded to concerns from the Students' Union about the impacts on disadvantaged students, by offering unlimited self-certifications to certain groups of students for whom the University already had evidence of their circumstances.

- Two years after implementation, SCA was asked to review the categories, as well as the data used to identify the groups, in order to determine if they remain fit for purpose. The committee was also asked to consider whether financial hardship in response to the cost of living crisis should remain on the list.

- The Committee considered the recommendation for the removal of the University Bursary as an indicator of financial hardship, to be replaced with the indicators of receipt of assistance funding or being in the lowest household income bracket, as these are considered better indicators of financial hardship. This is collected directly by UCAS or the University as part of the application process, and this would therefore avoid any issues in using SLC data for EC purposes. Additionally, University Bursaries are not available to PGT students, and thus this group is omitted from consideration on financial hardship.

- The Committee was also asked to include Refugee and Asylum seeking students, as identified by self-report at application, and support from the welfare advisors, to the list of students who receive this.

- YorkSU supported the proposed approach, noting that it is important that all parties (reporter/reported) in Conduct & Respect investigations are on this list. YorkSU aso noted the important of not requiring evidence from students dealing with Sexual Violence Liaison Officers, due to the distress this may cause.

- The Committee discussed caring responsibilities as ongoing circumstances, not typically being regarded as exceptional. In relation to this, concerns were raised about whether students are being supported to seek appropriate help or through virtue of receiving automatic ECs, whether they are delaying seeking alternative help.

- The Committee discussed the equity in this process for international students, discussing whether overseas students declared household income and therefore be in scope for this scheme. This was confirmed to be provided.

- The Committee discussed the application of the system in the context of the Abrahart case, particularly regarding students who do not present the letter and thus do not receive adjustments, even if the University is aware of mitigating circumstances. It was noted that the majority of eligibility criteria are not disability-related, so Abrahart principles may not fully apply.

Standing Committee on Assessment: Minutes 2 May 25

Standing Committee on Assessment

ACTION: JWo, JP, AL & CW TO discuss this further outside the meeting.

- The Committee questioned the wording of the eligibility criterion "Students with caring responsibilities, including those with young children", regarding the definition of "young children" and whether it provides an automatic entitlement without further qualification, potentially encompassing general life circumstances.
- The Committee also discussed that the term "vulnerable students" needs review for consistency in wording.
- The Committee noted that the system relies on students declaring circumstances and engaging with support services. Consideration was given to including information on staff-facing pages for personal supervisors to support non-engaging students.
- SCA supported both the change to financial information and the inclusion of Refugee and Asylum Seekers.

ACTION: JWo and SCA Chair to discuss this further.

m24-25/108 Gen AI Pilot Project - Presentation (SCA 24-25/36)

The Committee **noted** the presentation:

- Nadine Waehning presented the Gen AI Assessment Integration Pilot Project presentation, which detailed the framework that has been developed to help module leaders communicate to students the allowed levels of Generative AI use in assessments, aiming to increase transparency. The framework does not encourage or discourage AI use but rather provides information to students about what GenAI usage is acceptable in each assessment.
- The framework addresses the increasing use of Generative AI by students and the confusion among students regarding acceptable practices, which was uncovered through collection of feedback through a Mentimeter of MSc Global Marketing students.
- The Committee noted that SBS will pilot this initiative across their modules next year.
- SCA Chair noted that he would like to explore further pilot opportunities across the University

ACTION: SCA Chair to discuss this with Associate Deans about taking it to FLTGs.

Standing Committee on Assessment: Minutes 2 May 25

Standing Committee on Assessment

- The Committee noted that for pilot departments, it would be useful for them to receive guidance on what evidence would need to be gathered to support with measuring project success.
- It was noted that SBS had run a successful series of workshops for staff on AI Literacy: similar workshops would be valuable for pilot departments (and more widely).
- The Committee discussed the flexibility of the framework and it was confirmed that pilot departments would be given the flexibility to adapt the final column to their subject disciplines.
- The Committee noted that consistent messaging is crucial ensuring that the framework fully aligns with the Policy on Acceptable Assistance.

ACTION: SCA Chair & NW to have a further discussion outside of the meeting to discuss next steps.

ACTION: SCA Chair to discuss with ADs (TLS)

m24-25/109 Any other Business

- SCA Chair noted that this was FJ's final SCA meeting before she ends her term of office as YorkSU Academic Officer. SCA Chair thanked FJ for her valuable contributions to the committee.

CATEGORY II

m23-24/110 Date of the next meeting

The date of the next meeting was **noted** as Friday 27th June 2025 at 10:00am via Zoom online video conferencing, and in person in tbc.

RESERVED BUSINESS

m24-25/111 Individual Examination Arrangements

It was **noted** that individual examination arrangements for students have been approved on behalf of the Committee since its last meeting.

m24-25/112 Appointment of External Examiners

It was **noted** that various new appointments (or extension to appointments) of external examiners (UG and PGT) have been approved on behalf of the Committee since its last meeting.

m24-25/113 Results Lists

Notification was **received** of recommendations for the award of degrees approved on behalf of the Committee since its last meeting.

Standing Committee on Assessment: Minutes 2 May 25