

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Thursday 21 May 2015

Clarification of Attendance Requirements Policy

Lesley Fielding, Senate Office

At the meeting of Academic Standards Committee (ASC) of 14 February 2014, the Academic Regulations Sub-Committee (ARSC) report requested that ASC endorse the view that 'it is not appropriate to introduce academic penalties for non-attendance except where the absence can demonstrably be linked to Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) associated with assessment (e.g. student presentation of work to a group).' ASC agreed with this proposal as detailed in the attached extract from the ASC Minute (**Appendix 1**).

The issue of Attendance Requirements was further discussed at the Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) of 27 March 2015. Further to clarification that courses which included Attendance Requirement were no longer permitted, the Dean of Learning & Teaching for the College of Arts noted that the guidance pertaining to Attendance Requirement and ILOs appeared not to be clearly defined within University policy. LTC concurred that this required to be documented more explicitly. It is understood that the specific issue on which clarification was sought was whether this policy limited the permissibility of imposing an attendance requirement linked to the award of credit.

ASC is asked to review the policy on Attendance Requirement to ensure that the conditions pertaining to Attendance Requirement and ILOs are clearly documented and to consider whether the policy extends or should extend to refusal of credit.

Extract from Minute of Academic Standards Committee on 14 February 2014

ASC/2013/44.1 Report from the Meeting of Academic Regulations Sub-Committee held on 27 January 2014

Attendance Requirements/Academic Penalties for non-attendance

It was reported that some areas of the University had expressed a desire to find a way to encourage attendance on courses. It was accepted that stipulating a minimum attendance requirement for the award of credit could lead to very severe consequences if students failed to meet these and therefore had Credit Refused; and that this could be particularly severe in cases where all or some of the failure to attend was due to mitigating circumstances accepted as Good Cause because only 25% of the attendance requirement could be waived where Good Cause was established. As an alternative, ARSC had been asked to consider whether academic penalties (e.g. grade reduction of assessments) could be applied for poor attendance (without Good Cause).

ASC was broadly in agreement with the position of ARSC which did not support the use of academic penalties for poor attendance. As noted by ARSC, academic penalties were currently applied for the late submission of coursework, but there was clear justification for this as students benefited from having more time in which to complete the piece of work. In contrast, the rationale for an academic penalty arising from non-attendance was not clear. Once a student demonstrated a particular level of achievement of the ILOs in assessed work (with or without an appropriate level of attendance), it did not seem justifiable to impose a penalty on that assessment performance.

ASC therefore **agreed** that it was not appropriate to introduce academic penalties for non-attendance except where the absence could demonstrably be linked to ILOs associated with assessment (e.g. student presentation of work to a group).