

**Meeting to be held on Thursday 3 September 2015 at 2pm in the Torridon Room,
Charles Stewart House, Chambers Street**

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Apologies
2. Minutes of previous meeting held 28 May 2015 QAC 15/16 1 A
- 3. Matters Arising**
- 3.1 Matters arising from the Minutes of the meeting held on 28 May 2015 QAC 15/16 1 B
- 4. Convener's Business**
- 5. For discussion**
- 5.1 EUSA Priorities 2015-16 QAC 15/16 1 C
- 5.2 National Quality Frameworks Reviews QAC 15/16 1 D
- 5.3 University Quality Framework Review QAC 15/16 1 E
- 5.4 Internal Review Themes 2014-15 QAC 15/16 1 F
- 5.5 External Examiner Project Update Oral
- 6. For approval**
- 6.1 Annual Report to Scottish Funding Council QAC 15/16 1 G
- 6.2 Draft Principles for Student Staff Liaison Committees QAC 15/16 1 H
- 6.3 Draft Guidance for Students – External Examiner Summary Reports at Student Staff Liaison Committees QAC 15/16 1 I
- 6.4 Baseline Statement on Quality Arrangements QAC 15/16 1 J
- 6.5 Proposal to change process for Lead Readers' Reporting on College Annual QAE Reports QAC 15/16 1 K
- 6.6 Quality Assurance Committee Terms of Reference 2015-16 QAC 15/16 1 T
- 7. For information**
- 7.1 Annual Report on MOOC Provision QAC 15/16 1 L
- 7.2 Student Representation for Distance Learners Task Group – Progress Report QAC 15/16 1 M
- 7.3 ELIR Update Oral
- 7.4 Internal Review – summary report of recommendations remitted to the University and other areas QAC 15/16 1 N
- 7.5 Annual Report of the Senate Committees QAC 15/16 1 O

7.6 Guidance for Senate Committee members on authoring papers and other aspects of Committee business QAC 15/16 1 U

8. Electronic Business

8.1 Student Support Service Quality Assurance Framework Revised Annual Report Template QAC 15/16 1 P

8.2 Summary of Committee Comments on Internal Review reports QAC 15/16 1 Q

8.3 Allocation of Annual Committee Business QAC 15/16 1 R

8.4 UK Quality Code for Higher Education: Revised Mapping QAC 15/16 1 S
[Chapter B1: Programme Design, Development and Approval](#)
[Chapter B2: Recruitment, selection and admission to higher education](#)

9. Date of Next Meeting

9.1 Thursday 29 October 2015 at 2pm in the Raeburn Room, Old College

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

**Minutes of the meeting held on
Thursday 28 May 2015 at 2pm in the Hodgson Room, Weir Building, Kings
Buildings**

Minutes are draft until approved by the next meeting of the Committee

Present	
Dr Shereen Benjamin	College of Humanities & Social Science, (School of Education)
Dr Linda Bruce	Academic Services Manager
Professor Karen Chapman	CMVM (Centre for Cardiovascular Science)
Dr Tina Harrison (Convener)	Assistant Principal, Academic Standards and Quality Assurance
Ms Erin Jackson	Co-opted Member: Distance Learning & E-learning
Ms Tanya Lubicz-Nawrocka	EUSA Academic Engagement Co-ordinator
Dr Robert Mason	Associate Dean (Quality Assurance) College of Humanities and Social Science
Dr Gordon McDougall	Dean (Quality Assurance), College of Science and Engineering
Mr Ronnie Millar	Director, Student Counselling Service, Representative of Student Services
Mr Barry Neilson	Director, Student Systems
Professor Ian Pirie	Assistant Principal, Learning and Development
Professor John Sawkins	External Representative. Deputy Principal (Learning and Teaching), Heriot Watt University
Mr Dash Sekhar	Vice President (Academic Affairs) EUSA (VPAA)
Professor Michael Summerfield	College of Science and Engineering (School of GeoSciences)
Mr Tom Ward	Director of Academic Services
In attendance	
Ms Marion Judge	Secretary to Senatus Quality Assurance Committee
Dr Sheila Lodge	CMVM Head of Academic Administration
Ms Imogen Wilson	In-coming Vice President (Academic Affairs) EUSA (VPAA)
Apologies	
Professor Jeremy Bradshaw	Director of Quality Assurance, CMVM, Assistant Principal Researcher Development
Dr Jon Turner	Director, Institute for Academic Development

	<p>The Convener expressed thanks to those demitting office from the Committee: Dr Shereen Benjamin, Professor Karen Chapman, Mr Dash Sekhar and Mrs Marion Judge.</p> <p>Thanks were also expressed to outgoing School Directors of Quality: Dr Sheeren Benjamin (School of Education), Mr Brian Stanley (School of Divinity), Professor Karen Chapman (PGT Director of Quality, College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine), Mr Scott Wortley (School of Law) and Dr Soledad Garcia-Ferrari (Edinburgh College of Art).</p> <p>Ms Erin Jackson will continue serving on the committee as Co-opted Member with expertise in Distance Learning and eLearning for one further year.</p>	
1	Minutes of previous meeting	QAC 13/14 6 A
	The Minutes of the meeting of 22nd April 2015 were approved as an accurate record of the meeting.	
2	Matters arising from the minutes of 22nd April 2015	QAC 13/14 6 B
	<p>i. <i>Item 11:</i> Student Support Services: Report from the Sub-Committee on the Review of Student Support Services Annual Quality Assurance and Enhancement Reports 2013-14. Following up on recommendations from the previous meeting on developments in relation to Student Support Service review, the Convener noted that an update would be given to the Committee electronically over the summer, with a paper coming to SQAC's September meeting.</p> <p>ii. <i>Item 15:</i> Undergraduate Degree Classification Analysis. Tom Ward advised the Committee that work was being undertaken on developing management information on student data. Senate Committee oversight in relation to this data would be agreed.</p>	
3	Conveners Business	
	There was none.	
	For discussion/Approval	
4	ELIR Reflective Analysis and Case Studies Approval	QAC 14/15 6 C QAC 14/15 6 Ci
	There being no comments from the Committee, the ELIR Reflective Analysis and Case Studies were approved by the Committee. It was noted that the Reflective Analysis and Case Studies would be considered by Senate at its meeting on 3 rd June. The Convener formally expressed thanks to all those who had contributed towards the Reflective Analysis and Case Studies.	
5	ELIR Update	Oral
	Dr Linda Bruce updated the Committee on preparation work being undertaken for the ELIR. It was agreed that the ELIR team membership would be circulated to SQAC members. Action: ELIR Project Officer	
6	Personal Tutor Governance, and Quality Assurance and Enhancement	QAC 14/15 6 D

	<p>Professor Pirie introduced the paper which set out transitional governance and reporting arrangements for the Personal Tutor system, due to take effect following the end of the Enhancing Student Support (ESS) project at 31st July 2015.</p> <p>The Committee agreed the proposal set out in the paper that Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC) establish an interim group with responsibility for quality assurance oversight of the Personal Tutor system during the transition from the conclusion of the ESS project to full mainstreaming within School quality assurance processes, with the group providing a summary to SQAC's May 2016 meeting. The Committee agreed that it would have oversight of the work of the group which would operate initially for one year, after which it would be reviewed.</p> <p>The Committee discussed the scheduling and recording of meetings between Personal Tutor and student in relation to School oversight and agreed that the subgroup would discuss recording mechanisms and timing further.</p> <p>Actions: Project Manager ESS to communicate the forthcoming arrangements via the ESS project, and to note for the meeting of the subgroup the issue of scheduling and recording meetings.</p> <p>Committee Secretary: Note summary report to SQAC for May 2016 agenda</p> <p>The Committee approved the paper.</p>	
7 & 8	<p>School and College Annual Report Templates</p> <p>In addition to the arrangements proposed in paper QAC 14/15 6 D, the Committee also approved the revised templates for School and College annual quality assurance and enhancement reporting for use in 2015/16.</p> <p>Paper E proposed the following revisions for reporting by Schools in 2015/16: reporting against a KPI for student satisfaction with their experience of the Personal Tutor system and on management of variations in Personal Tutor performance, as part of embedding Personal Tutor governance and monitoring following the end of the Enhancing Student Support project; clarification that reporting covers all credit-bearing provision, to include Student-Led Individually Created Courses and credit-bearing summer school provision; and inclusion of reporting on plans for enhancing students' Personal Tutor experience.</p> <p>In addition, enhancements had been made to data supporting the reports in response to school feedback, which would be outlined alongside the revised guidance.</p> <p>Following discussion it was agreed that guidance for schools would clarify that reflection on Personal Tutor performance should draw on currently available information pending further development of measures, and school reflections should include issues such as personal tutor load and potential correlation with student satisfaction. Reflections should be based on trends rather than a single year's results. The guidance would also clarify that credit-bearing summer school provision running over summer 2015 should be included in reports on 2014/15 activity.</p> <p>It was also agreed that school reflection on student engagement should include specific mention of student-staff liaison committees.</p>	<p>QAC 14/15 6 E QAC 14/15 6 F</p>

	<p>Paper F proposed the following revisions for reporting by Colleges in 2015/16: addition of a table for action tracking from previous year; identification for university action issues identified from school reporting on the Personal Tutor system; reporting on all credit-bearing provision to include Student-Led Individually Created Courses (SLICCs) and credit-bearing Summer School provision; and identification for university attention of school plans to enhance the personal tutoring experience.</p> <p>The Committee approved the templates with these amendments. Action: Linda Bruce</p>	
9	<p>Discussion on: Review of Governance</p> <p>As part of the light-touch governance review of Senate and its committees, in preparation for the external Governance Review taking place next academic year, focus group discussions are being held with the Senate Committees.</p> <p>The discussion, introduced by Anne-Marie O'Mullane of Academic Services, focussed on committee members' perspectives on the committee's overall operation, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance structures • Roles and responsibilities of the committee and committee members • Composition • Support for the committees • Participation of members • Stakeholder engagement • Making an impact <p>Output from the discussions would be communicated back to Committees.</p>	
10	<p>Revised University Standard Remit for Internal Subject Review</p> <p>The Committee approved the paper which proposed a revision to the previous University standard remit for Teaching Programme Reviews and Postgraduate Programme Reviews. As part of ongoing enhancements to the Internal Review process, the University standard remit has been reviewed, restructured and streamlined to provide further clarity for Schools/subject areas and has been developed in line with key themes as reflected through the Enhancement Led Institutional Review (ELIR). Detailed guidance notes will be provided for Schools. The Convener emphasized that in addition the remit meeting provided Schools, Colleges and students with an opportunity to input into the remit and that it was essential that schools continued to promote student engagement with reviews.</p>	QAC 14/15 6 G
11	<p>EUSA and University of Edinburgh Student Engagement Statement</p> <p>The Committee approved the student engagement statement which was reviewed annually within the remit of the Committee. Discussions had taken place with colleagues in EUSA, and some minor updates had been made to the statement, ensuring that current initiatives and practices were reflected in the statement, including references to societies and activities and including SLICCs.</p>	QAC 14/15 6 H

	<p>It was noted that a joint communication from EUSA and the university would be sent out in the next academic session to raise the profile of student representation.</p> <p>Action: Reference to Path (*Mathematics*) to be removed.</p>	
12	<p>Work Based and Placement Learning Policy</p> <p>The Committee approved the paper which provided an updated version of the Work-based and Placement Learning Policy, which merged and updated the previous Work-based and Placement Learning policy with the related Code of Practice. No substantial amendments had been made to the policy and consultation had taken place with relevant areas of the University. It was noted that the revised policy would take effect from next academic year, and that a standard communication would be sent out.</p> <p>Action: Academic Services</p>	QAC 14/15 6 J
	FOR INFORMATION	
13	<p>Update from Knowledge Strategy Committee</p> <p>An update would be provided at SQAC's next meeting.</p>	Oral
14	<p>Accreditations Update</p> <p>Marion Judge updated the Committee on work that has been taking place over the past year by Academic Services and Student Systems to develop an enhanced system and process for recording information and data on Accreditation by Professional Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs). The Committee was informed that Student Systems has created a new data recording system which will streamline and merge related data collection done by Academic Services and Student Systems, providing a centralised area for management of accreditation data within EUCLID. Student Systems will agree a process for roll-out of the new system with Academic Services, with roll-out completed this semester (June 2015), and full implementation for the start of the new academic year 2015-16.</p> <p>Action: Marion Judge</p>	QAC 14/15 6 K
15	<p>Complaints Report (Quarterly update)</p> <p>The Committee noted the report. It was agreed that with the Complaints process now embedded, an annual report to SQAC would be sufficient, with no further need for quarterly reporting to SQAC. The annual report, to be submitted to SQAC's December meeting, would be considered as a package with annual reports on Student Appeals and Student Conduct. The report would be thematic, providing quarterly breakdowns, as well as an annual overview, and highlighting any trends. It was agreed that it would be helpful for the report's data to identify and compare across Schools and Colleges where there were differences, and for Colleges to be able to glean more detail beyond the annual report in order to learn from cases.</p> <p>It was noted that the University Investigations Manager ran briefings for schools on complaint handling, and the Committee should encourage Schools and student services to make use of these.</p> <p>Action: Committee / University Investigations Manager</p>	QAC 14/15 6 L CLOSED
16	Update on Collaborative Provision Guidance Project	QAC 14/15 6 M

	<p>Tom Ward updated the Committee on work that had taken place over the past year by Governance and Strategic Planning (GASP), Academic Services (AS) and the International Office (IO) on developing an enhanced framework of guidance on collaborative provision. Key work included: new approval processes had been developed, designed to strengthen the University's approach to managing collaborative provision; a Wiki containing all relevant guidance to assist staff in developing collaborative programmes; a suite of template Memoranda of Agreement and Understanding; updating of the digital repository listing the University's collaborative arrangements; a 'taxonomy' document setting out the categories of collaborative programme. Central advice would be available, with Colleges having contact points.</p> <p>Roadshows would be held during Summer 2015 to raise awareness of the project work to staff with responsibilities for collaborative programmes.</p> <p>It was noted that SQAC would be provided with an annual report on new agreements.</p> <p>The Committee endorsed the project's outputs as very valuable.</p> <p>Action: Tom Ward</p>	
17	<p>Researcher Experience Committee Update</p> <p>The Committee noted the paper which provided an update on the status of and progress with items remitted to Senatus Researcher Experience Committee by SQAC (in December 2014) from themes emerging from internal review. This included updates on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Postgraduate Research Progression milestones • Enhancement of training for postgraduate tutors and demonstrators • PhD Model • Interaction of Academic and Social Community and Space Allocation <p>The Convener noted that while the update suggested that many of the issues were already taken account of by regulations or codes of practice, similar issues continued to emerge through Postgraduate Programme Reviews. The Convener would therefore take the issue of postgraduate research student progression milestones to the Senate Committees Conveners' Forum for discussion in light of its relevance to Senate Researcher Experience Committee, Senate Quality Assurance Committee and Senate Curriculum and Student Progression Committee</p> <p>Action: Convener</p>	QAC 14/15 6 N
18	<p>Update on CHSS Annual Programme Review</p> <p>Dr Mason informed the Committee that during the academic year all Schools in the College of Humanities and Social Science had carried out programme reviews. The scope of the review covered undergraduate programmes. The process had been positively received, and had encouraged the sharing of good practice. The review had been particularly useful in relation to joint programmes, encouraging reflection on these programmes. A full report, including views on interactions with existing processes, would be provided to SQAC at its September 2015 meeting.</p>	Oral

	Action: Dr Mason/ Committee Secretary	
	ELECTRONIC BUSINESS	
19	<p>Internal Review Reports and Responses</p> <p>TPR Archaeology Final Report TPR Architecture and Landscape Architecture Final Report PPR of Education – 14wk response PPR of PPLS – Year on response TPR Chemistry 1-yr on response TPR Politics and International Relations 1-yr on response TPR Social Policy 1-yr on response Periodic Review Year-on Response: Information Services</p> <p>The Committee approved the Final Reports: TPR of Archaeology and TPR of Architecture and Landscape Architecture.</p> <p>A further suite of reports would be submitted to the Committee in the week of 8th June, to be handled under electronic business.</p> <p>Action: Committee Secretary</p>	QAC 14/15 6 O
20	<p>Summary of Committee Comments on Internal Review reports</p> <p>The Convener thanked the Committee for their comments on internal review reports and responses. Comments would be fed back to Schools/Support Service.</p> <p>Action: Committee Secretary</p>	QAC 14/15 6 P
21	<p>Any other Business</p> <p>There was none.</p>	

The next meeting of the committee is on **Thursday 3rd September 2015** in the Torridon Room, Charles Stewart House, Chambers Street

Marion Judge
Secretary to the Senatus Quality Assurance Committee
29 May 2015

The University of Edinburgh
 Senatus Quality Assurance Committee
 3 September 2015

Matters Arising from the Minutes of the meeting held on 28 May 2015

Item/Paper Reference	Action	Timeframe/process for action to be implemented
1. Minutes of previous meeting held 22 nd April 2015 QAC 14/15 6 A	None	
2. Matters arising from the Minutes of 22 nd April 2015 QAC 14/15 6 B	None	
5. ELIR Update	ELIR team membership to be circulated to SQAC members. Action: ELIR Project Officer	Complete
6. Personal Tutor Governance, and Quality Assurance and Enhancement QAC 14/15 6 D	Actions: Project Manager ESS to communicate the forthcoming arrangements via the ESS project, and to note for the meeting of the subgroup the issue of scheduling and recording meetings. Committee Secretary: Note summary report to SQAC for May 2016 agenda	Complete
7. School and College Annual Report Templates	Amendments to templates	Complete

QAC 14/15 6 E QAC 14/15 6 F	Action: Linda Bruce	
11. EUSA and University of Edinburgh Student Engagement Statement QAC 14/15 6 H	Action: Committee Secretary Reference to Path (*Mathematics*) to be removed.	Complete
12. Work Based & Placement Learning Policy QAC 14/15 6 J	It was noted that the revised policy would take effect from next academic year, and that a standard communication would be sent out. Action: Academic Services	Medium
14. Accreditations Update QAC 14/15 6 K	Student Systems to agree a process for roll-out of new system with Academic Services, due to complete this semester (June 2015); full implementation for start of new academic year 2015-16. Action: Marion Judge	Ongoing
15. Complaints Report (Quarterly update) QAC 14/15 6 L CLOSED	Action: Committee to communicate to colleagues availability of briefings for Schools on complaints handling. University Investigations Manager for enhancements to report.	Immediate

<p>16. Update on Collaborative Provision Guidance Project QAC 14/15 6 M</p>	<p>Roadshows to raise awareness of the project work to staff with responsibilities for collaborative programmes would be arranged (by start of academic year).</p> <p>SQAC to be provided with an annual report on new collaborative agreements.</p> <p>Action: Tom Ward, Academic Services</p>	<p>By start of next academic year</p>
<p>17. Researcher Experience Committee Update QAC 14/15 6 N</p>	<p>Convener to take the issue of postgraduate research student progression milestones to the Senate Committees Conveners' Forum for discussion</p> <p>Action: Convener</p>	<p>For next Conveners' forum (arranged)</p>
<p>18. Update on CHSS Annual Programme Review</p>	<p>A full report on CHSS Annual Programme Review to be provided to SQAC's September 2015 meeting.</p> <p>Action: Dr Mason/ Committee Secretary</p>	<p>Postponed to the October meeting.</p>
<p>19. Internal Review Reports and Responses QAC 14/15 6 O</p>	<p>A further suite of reports would be submitted to the Committee</p> <p>Action: Committee Secretary</p>	<p>Complete</p>
<p>20. Summary of Committee Comments on Internal Review reports</p>	<p>Comments would be fed back to Schools/Support Service.</p>	<p>Complete</p>

QAC 14/15 6 P	Action: Committee Secretary	
---------------	-----------------------------	--

QAC: 03.09.15
H/02/28/02

QAC 15/16 1 C

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee
3 September 2015

EUSA Priorities 2015-16

Brief description of the paper, including statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities where relevant

This paper seeks to provide an introduction to EUSA's new sabbatical officers and their priorities for 2015-16.

Action requested

This paper is for information

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? No

Risk Assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? No

Equality and Diversity

Has due consideration been given to the equality impact of this paper? Yes

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Any Other Relevant Information

Originators of the paper

Imogen Wilson, EUSA Vice President Academic Affairs

The sabbatical officers elected for 2015-16 are:

Jonny Ross-Tatam, EUSA President

Imogen Wilson, EUSA Vice President Academic Affairs (VPAA)

Andy Peel, EUSA Vice President Societies & Activities (VPSA)

Urte Macikene, EUSA Vice President Services (VPS)

VPAA Objectives for 2015-16:**1. Addressing Assessment issues**

The aim is to ensure assessment is varied and challenging while meeting modern expectation of a world-class institution, and to put students' interests ahead of traditional practice. Every student learns in a different way, and our assessment options should reflect this. We should always aim to promote a culture of community where students feel that they can approach academic staff with questions.

- End the physical hand-in – students should not have to hand in work on paper if they are handing in assessment online already. If staff want to read and mark the work on paper, they should be responsible for printing it. Turning in work on paper adds stress and additional financial costs for students, and is not environmentally friendly.
- Examine courses taught in semester 1 in the December exam diet, and have exam boards meet shortly thereafter and not months later to confirm marks.
- Diversify assessment away from exams – this could mean: more take-home/open book exams, more informal in-class assessment, tests during the semester rather than at the end, a greater reliance on coursework, etc. We encourage staff to include Reps or all students in a cohort in discussions about different forms of assessment for learning.
- Have a semester structure to aid assessment and re-sit issues – we need to somehow address the problem of our asymmetric semesters and stop using it as an excuse.

2. Progressive and flexible learning

The aim is to promote innovative ways of learning and teaching by putting an emphasis on student/staff collaboration, on open access learning, making the most of vast online opportunities, and making those opportunities available for students outside of Edinburgh too.

- Continue and hopefully expand SLICCs after the pilot.
- Promote the new 'introduction to Gender Studies' course which will be formally co-created by students and staff as part of the 'SPS in Practice' course in semester 2 this year.
- Promote innovative ways of giving students feedback, including audio-recorded feedback, Feedback Days or Meet the Marker events that encourage all students (no matter if they have done well or struggled with the assessment) to meet with staff and discuss how they can improve
- Challenge tradition by prioritising liberation issues in the curriculum and across the university

- Design an introductory section of the Holyrood Elections MOOC which can be used as an educational resource for first time voters at Edinburgh University, other universities and colleges, and secondary schools in the wider community

3. To protect the rights of students and staff.

The aim is to prevent the negative impacts of government cuts, and always have the highest-possible quality of education as our number 1 priority.

- Campaign against any proposed fee rises.
- Bring back the post-study work visa, or failing this, reverse the cruel new financial demands around extending a tier 4 visa.
- Expose and then cover extra course costs
- Ensure tutors are on contracts that they want, that they are adequately trained (and paid for their training), that they have clear marking criteria provided when marking students' work, and that their pay adequately takes into account the time needed to mark work and provide high-quality feedback.

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee
3 September 2015

National Quality Frameworks Reviews

Brief description of the paper, including a statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities

The paper presents an overview of the current reviews by the Scottish Funding Council of the Quality Enhancement Framework in Scotland, and by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) of the future shape of Quality Assessment in the rest of the UK. The outcomes of the reviews will have a significant influence on the University's quality framework. The paper also notes the proposal to introduce a Teaching Excellence Framework in England. The paper is relevant to the University's Strategic Plan Strategic Goal of 'Excellence in Education'.

Action requested

For information.

Communication/Implementation

College Deans are asked to communicate the paper to College quality committees and other interested stakeholders for information.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? Not known at present.

Risk Assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? No, however failure to align University quality processes with the relevant outcomes of the consultations would constitute a risk.

Equality and Diversity

Has due consideration been given to the equality impact of this paper? Quality assurance processes are subject to Equality Impact Assessment.

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes.

Originator of the paper

Tom Ward, Academic Services, August 2015.

Any other relevant information, including keywords

Quality framework, quality assurance, Quality Assurance Agency Scotland, Quality Assurance Agency, QAAS, QAA, Higher Education Funding Council for England, HEFCE, Teaching Excellence Framework, TEF

National Quality Frameworks Reviews

Scottish Funding Council

The Scottish Funding Council (SFC) is currently reviewing the Quality Enhancement Framework (QEF). The QEF has five elements and sets a significant part of the context for the University's quality framework:

- Enhancement-Led Institutional Review (ELIR) conducted by Quality Assurance Agency Scotland (QAAS)
- A national programme of Enhancement Themes selected by the Scottish higher education sector and supported by QAAS.
- Institution-led quality review
- An agreed set of public information
- Student engagement in quality, supported nationally by Sparqs

The SFC review was launched in December 2014 with the aim of publishing new guidance for institutions by the start of AY 2015/16, and developing a new external review method by April 2016 for introduction in AY 2016/17. The University submitted its response to the consultation in February 2015. A series of national consultation events was held in June 2015. The outcome of the review is currently awaited.

The review of the QEF starts from the premise that an enhancement approach with a collaborative, collegiate ethos is the norm across the Scottish sector. The consultation asked institutions to respond to a list of questions but also to propose for consideration "potentially radical ideas about the governance, ownership and operating paradigm of quality assurance and enhancement in Scotland". The consultation questions were:

1. What is valued about the current arrangements? What do you consider works well? Does the current QEF remain a valid and useful framework? Would there be benefit in changing it, to include other elements or to redevelop it in other ways?
2. How could the system be developed and/or made more effective? Specifically, are there ways in which the current approach could be re-engineered to the benefit of learners and institutions considering the need for a resilient system over a timeframe of ten or more years and in the context of a changing environment in the UK and overseas? What factors should we take into account?
3. How might institutions/QAAS/SFC better evidence in concrete ways that quality assurance and enhancement arrangements actually make a difference – at student, institutional and sectoral level?

Responses by Scottish institutions to the consultation have emphasised the following points:

1. Aspects of the current arrangements which are valued and work well are: the enhancement focus; the student-centred ethos; the collaborative peer-based approach; the ELIR method; the Enhancement Themes.
2. Aspects which could be changed: extension of the ELIR cycle; review dual annual reporting to SFC and QAAS; clarify roles and responsibilities of agencies e.g. QAA and HEA, SFC and HEFCE; maximise benefit from student engagement in quality arrangements; differentiate the ELIR outcomes to acknowledge different

institutional academic contexts and aims; make better use of annual discussion between QAAS and individual institutions.

3. Evidencing impact of quality assurance and enhancement arrangements: thematic enhancement-based case studies to demonstrate impact; build on the ELIR case studies to learn and share good practice; ensure feedback to institutions from annual reporting to QAAS/SFC; impact can be demonstrated by the outcome of graduating students who go into graduate employment or further study; focus on the quality of the learning experience; a move towards measurement should be resisted – it will not promote enhancement and is likely to lead to spurious league tables.

Funding Bodies for England, Wales and Northern Ireland

The funding bodies in England, Wales and Northern Ireland initiated a joint review of quality assessment in October 2014. The stated purpose of the review is to ensure that quality assessment arrangements can remain fit for purpose through to 2025 – for providers and for students and other stakeholders – in a rapidly changing global environment. While this is common to all four UK nations, England has a more marketised context with the introduction of higher tuition fees and the lifting of student number controls on undergraduate students. Following dialogue with stakeholders a set of principles was issued for consultation in January 2015 with a closing date of mid-September 2015. The consultation document is available at

http://www.hefce.ac.uk/media/HEFCE,2014/Content/Pubs/2015/201511/2015_11_.pdf

The main strands of the proposals are:

1. An emphasis on data-driven continuous improvement in learning and teaching, with a focus on trend data on student academic output. Data would be collected once but used many times.
2. A baseline requirement for the quality of the student academic experience.
3. Student engagement and partnership would be essential components of the arrangements.
4. An enhanced role for institutions' own assurance systems, with governing bodies confirming to the funding bodies that the institution had appropriate review of academic standards, including the data outlined in point 1, and the student experience, and action plans to improve or maintain quality. Internal reviews would subsume PSRB accreditation reviews, thus reducing duplication of effort and cost.
5. A significantly reduced requirement for "cyclical external review of baseline compliance conducted by an external agency" i.e. the current Higher Education Review method conducted by the QAA, and a move away from the current "one size fits all" reviews. The funding bodies would vary the extent of external oversight for those institutions able to demonstrate a strong quality assurance methodology and mature internal governance arrangements.
6. Established providers in England would not be repeatedly reviewed against the baseline requirements unless evidence arose to the contrary. Instead they would determine for themselves what a good and improving student academic experience looks like within the context of their mission and student body, with market pressures sufficient to ensure that they continued to deliver a high quality student academic experience. In Northern Ireland institutions would provide an annual assurance of meeting baseline requirements.

7. Modification of the external examiner system to achieve “further modernisation and professionalization”, to include a national register to support externally-delivered training and appointment of external examiners.
8. A role for “one or more organisations external to the funding bodies”, working in a co-regulation relationship with the funding bodies. The functions of this/these organisations would include delivery of external peer review of institutions, development and delivery of training for external examiners and maintenance of an external register of external examiners, and awarding of an accreditation kite mark for providers who wish to operate internationally and feel this would be beneficial.
9. Adoption of a risk and evidence based approach to ensure that scrutiny focuses on areas where the risk to academic standards/ and or the academic experience of students or the system is greatest.
10. A strengthened mechanism to investigate concerns.
11. The proposals would apply to provision delivered internationally as well as that delivered within the UK.

The UK QAA has responded to the review. The response highlights desirable features of the current Scottish system which could be extended to the rest of the UK to meet the aims of some of the proposals. These include the partnership working between QAA Scotland, Universities Scotland, NUS Scotland and the Scottish Funding Council, a focus on enhancement rather than assurance, the ELIR approach and the Enhancement Themes.

The QAA response is available at:

<http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/QAA-Response-to-Quality-Assessment-Review-15.pdf>

While the funding bodies’ proposals relate directly to England, Wales and Northern Ireland, their adoption could change the UK-wide quality assurance landscape with direct implications for higher education institutions in Scotland, for example in relation to external examining.

Teaching Excellence Framework

Separately from the proposals for the quality assessment framework, the Westminster government is proposing to introduce a Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) in England and is planning to issue a green paper on the topic in autumn 2015. See:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/teaching-at-the-heart-of-the-system>

The Senate Learning and Teaching Committee will be briefed on the potential implications of the proposed TEF at its meeting in September 2015.

Tom Ward

August 2015

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee
3 September 2015

University Quality Framework Review

Brief description of the paper, including a statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities

The paper presents plans for review of the University's academic quality framework and includes a set of consultation questions. The paper is relevant to the University's Strategic Plan Goal of Excellence in Education.

Action requested

College Deans for Quality Assurance or equivalent to consult with College quality committees and other stakeholders and report to the December 2015 meeting of Senate Quality Assurance Committee.

Communication/Implementation

Via College Deans for Quality Assurance or equivalent.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? The review aims to streamline processes to the benefit of staff time.

Risk Assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? No, however failure to align University quality processes with the relevant outcomes of the national quality framework consultations would constitute a risk.

Equality and Diversity

Has due consideration been given to the equality impact of this paper? Quality assurance processes are subject to Equality Impact Assessment.

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes.

Originator of the paper

Linda Bruce, Academic Services, August 2015.

Any other relevant information, including keywords

Quality framework, quality assurance, Quality Assurance Agency, Quality Assurance Agency Scotland, QAA, QAAS, Scottish Funding Council, SFC, Higher Education Funding Council HEFCE

University Quality Framework Review

Introduction

It is timely to review the University's academic quality framework. The current framework has been in place since the 1990s and has been modified incrementally to take account of the external context both in Scotland and in the wider UK, most significantly the requirements of the Quality Assurance Agency nationally and in Scotland, the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) and the Higher Education Funding Council for England. The funding bodies are currently reviewing the national frameworks for quality: the SFC through its review of the Quality Enhancement Framework in Scotland, and the other UK funding bodies through their review of quality arrangements in the rest of the UK. Although the impact of the latter will be greatest in the other UK nations, the outcome in relation to the external examiner system and the future of the UK Quality Code will be directly relevant to the University's quality framework. In addition, an internal audit of the University's quality framework is planned for the current academic year. The ELIR in Semester 1 2015/16 may make recommendations for enhancement of the University's quality framework. Beyond this, there is a general wish at all levels of the institution to streamline processes and reduce the burden on colleagues, while deriving maximum benefit from quality activity, and to develop further the enhancement focus of the University's framework.

It is therefore intended to carry out an initial consultation with stakeholders in colleges and schools to inform the development of the framework that will take place once the outcome of the external reviews and the internal audit are known. It is intended that development will take place during 2015/16, with implementation of the revised framework taking effect from 2016/17. **College Deans for Quality are asked to gather initial views from stakeholders on the consultation questions below, in particular through discussion with college quality committees, and to report to the December 2015 meeting of Senate Quality Assurance Committee.** The current consultation focuses on the academic quality framework; the student support service quality assurance framework gathered views from services during 2014/15 and revisions to the annual and periodic review processes have been introduced with effect from the current academic year.

Consultation questions

For all levels of provision, i.e. undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research:

1. Identify strengths, weaknesses, gaps and areas for further development in processes at school, college and institutional level. In particular, identify where there is potential duplication, where there is the potential for streamlining processes, and where there is the opportunity to drive impact.
2. Identify where schools and colleges would benefit from further support at institutional level.
3. For schools: how do schools perceive their current role in the quality framework and those of the college and institution, and what should they be?
4. For colleges: how do colleges perceive their current role in the quality framework, and those of schools and the institution, and what should they be?

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee
3 September 2015

Internal Review Themes 2014/15

Brief description of the paper, including a statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities

The paper identifies good practice and key themes for development arising from internal subject reviews held in AY 2014/15, and proposes appropriate responsibility for action in response. The paper is relevant to the University's Strategic Plan Goal of Excellence in Education.

Action requested

For discussion and approval of proposals for routing of action.

Communication/Implementation

Actions arising from the paper will be remitted to relevant Senate committees to take forward. College Dean/Associate Dean/Director of Quality Assurance are asked to communicate the themes and the outcome of the discussion to relevant college committees and to promote further Academic Services will communicate the themes and responsibility for further action at University level to Schools which have had provision reviewed during the academic year in question. A sharing good practice event will take place during the year, and material will be identified for the IAD case studies wiki.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? No specific resource implications are identified at this point.

Risk Assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? No. Failure to respond to areas for development identified through quality assurance processes would constitute an institutional risk.

Equality and Diversity

Has due consideration been given to the equality impact of this paper? The paper itself does not require an Equality Impact Assessment.

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes.

Originator of the paper

Dr Linda Bruce, Academic Services, 17 August 2015

Any other relevant information, including keywords

Internal review, TPR, PPR, good practice.

Internal Review Themes 2014/15

This paper identifies where themes from internal reviews in 2014/15 converged around particular issues and thus highlight the need for consideration at University level as instances of good practice for wider dissemination, or as areas requiring further development. The paper aligns with Indicator 2 of the UK Quality Code, Chapter B8, which states, "Higher education providers take deliberate steps to use the outcomes of [...] review processes for enhancement purposes."

1. Good practice

A very wide range of good practice was identified during reviews, and a summary of themes of interest is given here. Further instances are identified in the individual review reports available at <http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/academic-services/quality-unit/quality-assurance/internal-review/teaching-programme-review/reports>.

1.1 Graduate attributes

Reviews found ample evidence of graduate attributes embedded in the curriculum. Activity includes exposure of students to professionals in the discipline, including internships with professional archaeology companies, visits to schools to promote Archaeology (Archaeology); clear mapping of graduate attributes in the curriculum (Biological Sciences); engagement in professional practice through the Free Legal Advice Centre (Law), the Music in the Community course (Music) and outreach placements (Oral Health Sciences).

1.2 Student support

Ongoing enhancement of the Personal Tutor system includes matching Personal Tutors' research interests with the Honours programme choice of tutees, and expertise of Student Support staff in handling special circumstances and student mental health issues (Biological Sciences); good tailoring of the Personal Tutor system to the needs of taught postgraduate students (Law); creation of a PhD Adviser role as an independent pastoral contact for postgraduate research students (Mathematics).

1.3 Transitions

Reviews identified evidence of tailored support for the needs of specific student cohorts, including weekly meetings between new PhD students and the School Director of Postgraduate Research in the first semester (Law); robust, efficient and well-established progression review process for all PhD students at the end of their first year of study which is highly valued by students as supporting their transition from first to second year (Law); Induction and Induction Extra processes for on-campus taught postgraduate students, including pre-commencement activities (Law); a model of pre-engagement and managing the transition to online distance learning where students have access to induction materials 6-8 weeks before the programme start date (Law); the provision of large amounts of teaching material on the web with no requirement to be registered on the course. Material includes slides, lecture videos, course notes, coursework assignments, tutorial exercises and past exam papers. Open access to this material is especially helpful to students making course choices (Informatics).

1.4 Postgraduate tutors

Review teams were again impressed by the quality of postgraduate tutors whom they met. All showed evidence of commitment to their teaching role, of creative teaching and of reflection on

their professional development. Schools' training and support for postgraduate tutors was noted as good practice in terms of a comprehensive tutors' handbook, commended as suitable for sharing more widely (History); appropriate training and support (Biological Sciences); use of a wide variety of teaching methods, which the review team suggested should be documented in order to share methods more widely (Archaeology); commitment to providing feedback to tutors on their teaching and the use of peer observation; a formalised training and support programme for postgraduate tutors (Mathematics).

1.5 Community

Academic and social community-building was evident through activity such as the Edinburgh Law Connections and the Edinburgh Postgraduate Hub for taught postgraduate students, encompassing both on-campus and online distance learning students (Law); a postgraduate research student board with responsibility for allocating funding for events and managing office space (Law); a World Café where students are involved in identifying the strengths of the school's current learning and teaching and approaches to enhance the student experience (Health in Social Science).

1.6 Student engagement

In terms of engagement of students with their programme of study, good practice was noted in the use of online tools to monitor participation and engagement, and to facilitate identifying and quickly following up with students who are not participating as expected (Online Distance Learning, College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine). In the sense of engagement of students in representative structures, weekly meetings are held involving student representatives for each year and the Director and Deputy Director of Teaching, Teaching Organisation staff, Year Organisers and computing support staff. The meetings are supported by an online blog. This supports real-time responsiveness to issues raised by students, in contrast to the retrospective tempo of the standard student-staff liaison committee (Informatics). Good channels of communication and an open door policy help support an effective student representation and engagement system (Music).

1.7 Online distance learning

Two reviews this year had substantial online distance learning provision content. The School of Law has well established taught postgraduate online distance provision through its LLM degrees, for-credit courses and continuing professional development courses, and the College of Medicine offers both online degree programmes and short online courses aimed at working professionals. The School of Law's online distance provision was found to be well managed across both the curriculum and the student experience. In particular, the eScript system used to deliver online distance programmes is user-friendly and allows students with learning difficulties and those who use assistive technologies the means and time for reflective learning. The College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine provision was found to offer a high level of student support, encouragement of peer engagement among students, creative use of the VLE, and approaches to engaging students with their dissertation and with progression milestones associated with it.

2. Areas for further development

2.1 Training and support for postgraduate tutors and demonstrators and external tutors

As in the 2013/14 cycle of reviews, all Postgraduate Programme Reviews held in 2014/15 identified scope for enhanced training and support for postgraduate tutors and demonstrators. The theme was also evident in the Teaching Programme Reviews held in 2014/15. Recommendations aimed at developing this area covered increased peer mentoring by more experienced postgraduate tutors, particularly for PhD students from different higher education systems who lack experience of the

tutorial system; the introduction of structured training and review of the workload allocation model, including allocation of set hours within tutors' contracts for engagement with students and more widely in the school; recognition within the pay structure that preparation time is required for some demonstrating work; annual reporting on performance of postgraduate tutors, based on tutor-specific evaluation forms; training for tutors on administrative processes and clarity on tutors' rights and responsibilities as staff members. Some postgraduate tutors were of the view that systematic feedback to tutors could encourage more PhD students to become involved in teaching; consistency of induction and training for postgraduate tutors within each school.

Senate Quality Assurance Committee has already received a report on the School of Mathematic's progress with recommendations in this area, where from 2015/16 training will be provided for postgraduate tutors leading to the Edinburgh Teaching Award Level 1. This is accredited by the Higher Education Academy and gives the holder Associate Fellow status.

Remit to: Senate Researcher Experience Committee

Some schools employ external tutors who are specialists within professional fields. These tutors were also identified as requiring training and guidance in some instances. Schools where this need was identified in 2014/15 have been put in touch with a school commended for good practice in this area so that good practice can be shared directly.

This issue is also remitted to Senate Researcher Experience Committee for consideration along with training and support for postgraduate tutors and demonstrators.

2.2 Postgraduate research student progression milestones

Postgraduate Programme Reviews which covered PhD provision identified formal milestones for monitoring PhD student progression as requiring further development in some schools. It is proposed that the School of Law is asked to share its good practice in this area identified in its review directly with these schools and more widely through Senate Researcher Experience Committee.

Remit to: Senate Researcher Experience Committee

2.3 Student Support

Recommendations highlighted the importance of support for specific groups of students and of ongoing development of the Personal Tutor system. Where students are on placement, employers' expectations should be determined and made explicit to students, feedback to students should underpin the experience, and close links should be maintained with employers to the benefit of both parties.

The attention of all schools where the curriculum involves placements is drawn to the University's Policy on Work-based and Placement Learning:

http://www.docs.sasg.ed.ac.uk/AcademicServices/Policies/Work-based_Placement_Learning.pdf

Where there are cohorts of students from one nationality, Schools should consider the need for specialist technical and general ongoing language support for non-native speakers of English. Recommendations about the Personal Tutor system focused on the need for clarity about the role and remit of Personal Tutors and associated support staff, and for effective communication of these to students and staff. In relation to future development of online distance learning provision, good practice from established areas reviewed this year emphasises the importance of building online distance-centric models rather than adapting existing on-campus models.

Remit to: Senate Quality Assurance Committee Personal Tutor Sub Group

2.4 Interdisciplinary teaching

Several Teaching Programme Reviews identified potential to develop interdisciplinary teaching, both within the University in terms of interdisciplinary provision and joint degrees at undergraduate level and at postgraduate level through PhD studentships in areas of overlap, and through exploring appropriate external links.

Remit to: Senate Learning and Teaching Committee

2.5 Programme sustainability

Several Teaching Programme Reviews identified the need for schools and subject areas to put procedures in place to assess the sustainability of their current range of programmes and to withdraw programmes where necessary.

Remit to: Colleges in relation to specific review recommendations

2.6 Workload allocation models

Several reviews made recommendations aimed at helping workload allocation models reflect changing demands on role holders, increased recognition of teaching, and plans to expand student numbers, including in online distance learning with its specific demands on staff time.

Remit to: College Registrars

Linda Bruce
17 August 2015

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee
3 September 2015

Annual Report to the Scottish Funding Council on Institution-led Review and Enhancement Activity 2014/15

Brief description of the paper, including a statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities

The paper is the University's annual statement on institution-led review and enhancement activity to the Scottish Funding Council, as required by the Council's guidance to higher education institutions on quality from August 2012 (SFC/14/2012). The paper is relevant to the Strategic Plan Strategic Goals of Excellence in Education, Excellence in Research, and Strategic Theme of Outstanding Student Experience.

Action requested

For approval.

Communication/Implementation

Following approval, the paper will be presented to the Electronic Senate for noting and comment and to Court for endorsement. Court will be asked to return a statement of assurance to the Funding Council confirming that the University's academic standards and quality of learning provision continue to meet the requirements set by the Council.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? No.

Risk Assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? No, however failure in effectiveness of quality assurance framework constitutes an institutional risk.

Equality and Diversity

Has due consideration been given to the equality impact of this paper? Quality assurance policies and processes are subject to Equality Impact Assessment.

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Originator of the paper

Linda Bruce, Academic Services, August 2015

Any other relevant information, including keywords

Quality assurance, Scottish Funding Council, statement of assurance, annual review



The University of Edinburgh

Annual Report to the Scottish Funding Council on Institution-led Review and Enhancement Activity 2014/15

1. Summary of principal quality assurance and enhancement activities, including self-evaluation processes undertaken in preceding academic year

The University's quality assurance and enhancement activity operates in alignment with the devolved structure of the institution. The University's statement on quality arrangements is published on the University website and reviewed annually.

<http://www.docs.sasg.ed.ac.uk/GaSP/Governance/QualityReport2014.pdf>

The University continues to operate annual monitoring and periodic internal subject review aligned with the Council's guidance and the framework set by the UK Quality Code. The periodic internal review process is evaluated annually on the basis of feedback from areas which have undergone review and from review teams, and enhancements are made in response. Promising practice identified in internal review is the focus of an annual 'Learning from Internal Review' event. The 2014/15 event focused on 'The Student Voice', and in particular communication of actions in response to student feedback, and 'Diverse and Interactive Assessment'. Both topics generated considerable discussion and exchange of practice based on the presentations.

Ongoing review of data to support quality reporting and action has led to further enhancements during 2014/15 to the suite of standard data reports available to schools and colleges.

The Student Support Service Quality Assurance Framework sub-committee of Senate Quality Assurance Committee undertook a review of its annual reporting format. A streamlined template with an increased focus on key issues has been introduced for reporting in 2015/16. Following two periodic reviews of student support services in 2013/14 and 2014/15, Senate Quality Assurance Committee agreed that future periodic reviews would be conducted on a thematic rather than a service basis. This is intended to strengthen the University's approach to managing the holistic student experience and ensures student support is evaluated from the student perspective.

Following the conclusion of the Enhancing Student Support project in July 2015, governance and reporting arrangements for the Personal Tutor system are being embedded within existing processes and structures to ensure alignment with the Expectation of Chapter B4 of the UK Quality Code (Enabling Student Development and Achievement). Senate Quality Assurance Committee has

established an interim group with responsibility for quality assurance oversight of the Personal Tutor system. The group will operate for one year initially after which it will be reviewed. Revised templates for School and College annual quality assurance and enhancement reporting have been introduced with effect from academic year 2015/16. These include reporting against a baseline Key Performance Indicator (KPI) for student satisfaction with their Personal Tutor experience and actions planned to improve student satisfaction further. Schools and subject areas will reflect on their performance against the KPI as part of the periodic internal subject review process.

2. List of subject areas/programmes reviewed by PSRBs etc

A list of subject areas/programmes reviewed by professional, statutory and regulatory bodies and the review outcomes is attached as an appendix.

3. Ways in which support services were reviewed

Student-facing support services are reviewed annually by a sub-committee of Senate Quality Assurance Committee. The reporting framework is designed to:

- Facilitate reflection on the strategic and operational role of services in relation to their impact on the student experience;
- Promote reflection on the ways in which services engage with students and other stakeholders to monitor and improve the quality of services;
- Support reflection on the ways in which the services promote high quality learning and continuous quality enhancement;
- Take account of the requirements of professional, statutory and regulatory bodies where appropriate;
- Provide a forum for the sharing and dissemination of good practice.

The sub-committee reports annually to the meeting of Senate Quality Assurance Committee which also considers the annual college reports. Senate Quality Assurance Committee approves commendations and recommendations for each support service. Following reorganisation of the former Registry, Student Administration and Student Systems were included in annual reporting as separate services for the first time, bringing the total number of services reviewed to 14. A periodic review of the Student Disability Service was carried out in 2014/15.

4. Key messages derived from monitoring and analysis of performance indicators and other data and from feedback from students and action taken

All periodic internal subject reviews consider a data suite which forms the basis for reflection on student performance, progression and attainment. The University remit for all reviews includes consideration of 'key features of the student population and implications for the learning and teaching/research experience'. School and college annual quality monitoring includes reflection on data covered by this heading. Analysis of progression data showed that the University outperformed the Scottish sector average and the UK sector averages for the relevant HESA Performance Indicators (non-continuation and projected outcomes).

Senate Curriculum and Student Progression Committee and Senate Quality Assurance Committee consider data annually on the degree classification outcomes of the University's undergraduate students, in the context of recent trends in the University's outcomes and HESA data on Russell Group research-intensive institutions. Consideration will be given in 2015/16 to clarifying the focus of

each committee's scrutiny of the data as part of broader work to develop a dashboard of data to support strategic and operational management of courses and programmes.

The University's internal student survey, the Edinburgh Student Experience Survey, gathers feedback from all pre-final year undergraduate students on a range of satisfaction indicators. The 2015 results show that satisfaction with the overall student experience is stable, with most other results being within 2% of the previous year. The survey results point to students becoming more satisfied with the quality of learning and teaching over the course of their degree, more satisfied with the academic advice they are receiving, and more satisfied with the provision of learning resources. They become more confident in their skills and better prepared for future employment. However the surveys shows a decline in satisfaction with assessment and feedback as students progress through their degree. Satisfaction also declines with the organisation of courses and with provision of information. Sustained work is underway to deliver improvements to the student experience through the Student Experience Project <http://www.ed.ac.uk/staff-students/staff/enhancing-student-experience/initiatives/sep>.

The National Student Survey results for 2015 have very recently been received at the time of preparing this report. Initial analysis shows that the overall satisfaction score has risen, and University level scores have either gone up or remained constant. The largest improvement has been in the area of assessment and feedback, which saw the biggest improvement. This shows the impact of University-wide initiatives in this area. Areas that had declined in 2013 and 2014 are returning to levels achieved in previous years, and the majority of indicators have noticeably improved when compared to the 2012 results. Another key factor in the improvement has been the close and productive partnership with EUSA. The response rate has been our highest ever, thus helping to ensure that the survey reflects the views of a representative sample of respondents. Overall the positive trends are encouraging and consideration is now being given to actions to take advantage of this positive momentum to enhance our students' experience further.

The Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey results for 2015 show overall satisfaction at the same level as the previous year. As for the NSS, with the very recent receipt of results, consideration will now be given to actions in response.

The Postgraduate Research Experience Survey 2015 results show increased student satisfaction across all themes, with the largest increase being in satisfaction with supervision and closely followed by research culture, research skills and professional development. All are areas which have seen targeted action since the last ELIR.

5. Any significant issues relating to development needs or good practice identified as a result of these review processes

Annual review processes have identified the following areas for development.

- The need for ongoing enhancement to data to support school annual quality reporting, in particular postgraduate research progression monitoring. This is being addressed through the current Business Intelligence project and through scoping of a data dashboard which will support a range of strategic and operational information needs.
- The need to enhance PhD completion rates in some areas, especially in the context of the University's target to increase the ratio of students: eligible supervisors to 2.5:1. Senate Researcher Experience Committee continues to oversee developments in the postgraduate research student experience.

- Further development of training and induction for external examiners. This has been addressed through the External Examiner project which introduced on-line reporting for external examiners and enhancements to training and induction including online resources for external examiners.
- Enhancements to processes supporting collaborative activity. These have been delivered through a project in 2014/15 and include a revised suite of standard Memoranda of Understanding and Agreement for collaborative activities, updated guidance for academic and non-academic approval processes for new collaborative programmes, an enhanced digital repository for recording all types of learning and teaching-based collaborative agreements and improvements to existing arrangements for recording collaborative programmes on the student record system.
- The need to undertake a review of the University's quality framework, with a view to streamlining and deriving maximum benefit from activity. This will be undertaken following the outcome of ELIR and the outcome of the SFC review of quality arrangements in the sector.

6. Role and nature of student involvement in review processes and in student engagement more broadly

All periodic internal reviews, both of academic disciplines and student support services, include student members in review teams. Student members are drawn both from student representatives and students in the wider student body. The student member of a review team will typically convene one or more meetings during the review. Membership of a review team is included in the student's HEAR. Engagement of students within academic disciplines under review is regarded as an essential part of the review method. Briefing material aimed at students outlines ways in which they can engage with reviews and actions taken in response. Parallel briefings guide schools on how to engage their students with reviews. The remits for all reviews include items proposed by students.

Edinburgh University Students' Association (EUSA) and the University work in partnership to ensure that students are central to academic governance, decision-making and quality assurance and enhancement. The joint EUSA-University Student Engagement Statement is regularly reviewed to reflect ongoing developments. The current version was reviewed during 2014/15 and is published on the University's website at

<http://www.docs.sasg.ed.ac.uk/AcademicServices/Quality/studentengagement/StudentEngagementStatement.pdf>.

7. Reflective overview of key findings from previous year's reviews, including areas of strength and issues for further development across whole institution or in specific areas or aspects of provision, and comments on 'distance travelled' and the impact of previous enhancement measures

Areas of strength

- Embedding graduate attributes in the curriculum
- Ongoing enhancement of student support provision, including the Personal Tutor system
- Supporting student transitions through tailored support for the needs of specific student cohorts

- Training and support for postgraduate tutors
- Activity to build academic and social community
- Tracking student engagement in the curriculum with a view to early intervention in case of problems
- Student engagement in representative structures
- Online distance learning provision, including student support for distance students

Issues for further development

- Training and support for postgraduate tutors
- Embedding postgraduate student progression milestones
- Student support for specific groups of students and ongoing development of the Personal Tutor system
- Exploring the scope for interdisciplinary teaching
- Reviewing programme sustainability
- Workload allocation models

Previous enhancement measures, including work on graduate attributes, student support, the Personal Tutor system, and training and support for postgraduate tutors have led to enhancements in provision which are now providing evidence of good practice. The Personal Tutor system in particular continues to be refined in response to student and staff feedback. Attention continues to be devoted to areas which have been identified for further development.

A pilot periodic review of a sample of taught postgraduate online distance learning provision in the College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine took place in 2014/15. This had the dual aim of reviewing the academic provision and assessing the appropriateness of the review process for the online distance student experience. The review is currently being evaluated with a view to informing the development of the review method.

Senate Quality Assurance Committee receives an annual report on good practice and areas for development from annual reviews, and remits actions as necessary.

<http://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/committees/quality-assurance/agendas-papers>

The report from review activity in 2014/15 will be considered at the meeting of 3 September 2015 and papers will be available at the link above from that date.

8. Alignment of University and PSRB quality assurance processes

Alignment of University and relevant external quality assurance processes is considered systematically in the University's quality assurance framework. Annual reporting by schools and student support services includes outcomes of PSRB reviews. During 2014/15 the School of Law Teaching Programme Review and Postgraduate Programme Review aligned with PSRB processes through membership of the review team by the Accreditation Officer for the Law Society of Scotland, and through inclusion of PSRB review and review outcome material in the documentation for the University's review. Material for the periodic review of the Student Disability Service included the Needs Assessor Validation submission to the Scottish Government.

9. Student Support Services Quality Assurance Framework: reviews of student support services

The University provides a comprehensive and high quality range of services to students. The services are well used by students, with the consistent theme across several years of reporting being

increased demand for services. Many services noted the need to connect with other Student Support Services and evidence of good practice in partnership working was noted. The use of staff secondments was identified as an area of good practice in partnership working and is extending to include a wider range of services with a number expressing interest in engaging further. With structures in place for pastoral support for students expanded to include both academic and support staff in schools it is clear that training in student mental health awareness is equally relevant to staff in student support services. This is currently being progressed through the Student Mental Health Strategy Group.

Indicators of quality include several external indicators:

- Finance achieved the Investors in People (IIP) Silver Award at initial application in November 2014; it is unusual to receive Silver at initial award and this reflects the hard work of the Finance Transformation Programme (FTP).
- Student Systems achieved recognition as “Tribal University of the Year” based on improvements to the student experience, innovative use of technology and improvements in efficiency and effectiveness.
- The Advice Place was accredited to the matrix Standard during 2013/14.
- The Careers Service was successfully re-accredited to the matrix Standard in February 2014 following a two day visit and input from key stakeholders.
- The Centre for Sport and Exercise gained the IIP Bronze Award. The swimming pool operation is managed according to criteria laid down by the Royal Life Saving Society which requires annual accreditation by external RLSS examiners and compliance to exacting industry standards. The Firbush Outdoor Centre is required to comply with statutory quality measures dictated by the ‘adventure activities licensing authority.’
- Student Administration has recently gained the IIP Bronze award.
- The Student Counselling Service is an organisational member of the British Association for Counselling and Psychotherapy (BACP). Since 2006 the service has been a BACP Accredited Service. It is currently the only student counselling service of any Scottish university and one of four Russell group university counselling services to have BACP accreditation.
- The Student Disability Service was re-validated by the Scottish Government in January 2015.
- All services receive good ratings in external and internal surveys.

Services were asked to report on the mini-theme of ‘Use of Technology’ as a means of identifying and sharing good practice in this area. A number of the services noted technology improvement and its increased use and role in service enhancement as a key priority moving forward. It is clear that technology is being used in a variety of ways to drive efficiencies, to widen access and reach, and to enhance support to students. Developments in many cases respond to the impact of the increase in online distance learning student numbers on student support service provision noted in last year’s report to the Funding Council. Use of technology is also proving effective in some cases in managing numbers and smoothing out supply and demand and making more effective use of limited resources. Specific examples of good practice included:

- Use of online tools to increase process efficiency, used by the Careers Service, the Student Counselling Service, International Office, Student Recruitment and Admissions, Accommodation Services and Finance. In addition to streamlined processes, users have benefited from increased access and availability.
- Increased engagement through use of social media, building and maintaining contact and client relationships and building communities. Tools used include Facebook, Twitter, You Tube, Pinterest and blogs. Social media have also been used to support personalisation of accounts for various activities.

- Supporting remote/online service delivery. A number of services are delivering their service remotely to students, some of this specifically catering to distance students. Examples include email counselling (Student Counselling Service) email, Skype and telephone pastoral support (Chaplaincy) and Skype consultations (Student Disability Service) and appointments (Career Service). Virtual classroom sessions are being used for Open Days (Careers Service). An online version of the Student Information Points (i-SIPs) has been developed. Student Administration's Electronic Document Service enables students and graduates to view and send key documents such as transcripts (HEAR), council tax exemption letters, academic statements and certificates of matriculation, securely and easily online.
- Increased use of data management, analysis and reporting systems.
- Increased use of online learning resources for staff supporting the student experience, using tools such as Learn, Collaborate and Camtasia.
- Provision of self-help/self-service. Examples include the use of eBooks by the Student Counselling Service and Careers Service, the use of online spiritual resources (Chaplaincy) and the Big White Wall (Student Counselling Service).

The periodic review of the Student Disability Service took place in 2014/15, the second such review of a student support service. The review resulted in a very wide range of commendations, including:

- The high standards that are set and attained
- The inclusive and open approach of the Service
- Partnership work between the Service, Student Systems and Information Services in developing a service road map focused on process improvement, and with services and academic disciplines in general
- Implementation of the University's Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy
- Skilled front-line staff, and a strong staff training and performance management framework
- Work to maximise the usefulness of KPIs
- Initiatives around student mental health
- Contribution to the development of a thematic website for student experience services
- Service self-reflection, resulting in restructuring and development
- Improvements to internal administrative systems

Recommendations aimed at further enhancement of provision included:

- Further work on implementing and embedding the Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy across the University
- The need to ensure effective communication by all stakeholders to ensure that the Service, EUSA disability societies and disability access specialists are able to contribute effectively to estates developments
- Further engagement by schools with the timetabling service in relation to accessibility of buildings by disabled students
- Enhancement of student engagement on disability issues, through existing student-staff liaison committees and other relevant committees and groups
- Clarification of lines of responsibility for ensuring adjustments are implemented
- Consistent uptake of training sessions by staff in schools
- Addressing resource issues around peak pressure times and mental health mentoring.

A year-on response on progress with recommendations will be made to Senate Quality Assurance Committee.

Following reflection on the mechanism for periodic review of student support services, from 2015/16 reviews will be conducted on a thematic basis rather than a service by service basis. This will ensure a focus on the student experience and need for support and allow the quality of the service experience to be evaluated holistically, especially where support is shared across service units and academic departments.

Reviews of learning provision in 2014/15

Teaching Programme Review (undergraduate unless otherwise stated)

- Archaeology
- Architecture
- Biological Sciences (undergraduate and taught postgraduate provision)
- History
- Informatics (undergraduate and taught postgraduate provision)
- Music
- Oral Health Sciences

Postgraduate Programme Review

- Health in Social Science (taught postgraduate and research postgraduate provision)
- Mathematics (research postgraduate Provision)
- Pilot review of Online Distance Learning taught postgraduate programmes (College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine)

Combined Teaching and Postgraduate Programme Review

- Law (undergraduate, taught and research postgraduate provision)

Periodic student support service review in 2014/15

- Student Disability Service

Reviews of learning provision scheduled for 2015/16

Teaching Programme Review (undergraduate unless otherwise stated)

- Celtic and Scottish Studies
- Mathematics (Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate Provision)
- Veterinary Studies
- Psychology
- Applied Sport Science and Sport and Recreation Management

Postgraduate Programme Review

- Biological Sciences (Postgraduate Research Provision)
- Divinity (Taught Postgraduate and Postgraduate Research Provision)
- Veterinary Medicine (Taught Postgraduate Provision)

The Teaching Programme Review of Initial Teacher Education was due to take place in 2015/16. Because of major internal and external reviews in the area, together with a wish to hold a single combined review of Initial Teacher Education, Community Education and Childhood Practice in order to maximise the holistic benefit of the review, a request was made to the Scottish Funding Council to hold the review in 2017/18. This was agreed, with the request that there should be specific scrutiny of Initial Teacher Education provision until the review had taken place in 2017/18. Senate Quality Assurance Committee thus gave specific consideration to the annual school quality assurance and enhancement report by the Moray House School of Education at its meeting of 22 April 2014, and confirmed that it was content with the oversight of Initial Teacher Education. See item 6 at <http://www.docs.sasg.ed.ac.uk/AcademicServices/Committees/QAC/2014-15/20150422Minute.pdf>

Thematic student support service review in 2015/16

- Student Mental Health support

Professional, statutory and regulatory body review

A list of accreditations by professional, statutory and regulatory bodies which took place in 2014/15 and their outcomes, and a schedule for reviews in 2015/16 is attached as an appendix. A new system has been developed to collect accreditation data which provides outputs for several purposes, including the Key Information Sets. Some terminology may have changed between the current report and previous years.

September 2015

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee
3 September 2015

Annual Report to the Scottish Funding Council on Institution-led Review and Enhancement Activity 2014/15

Appendix

Degree Programme Title.	Name_of_Accrediting_Body	URL_of_Accrediting_Body	Accredited 2014-2015 - Outcome
MA (Hons) Accounting and Finance	Association of Chartered Certified Accountants (ACCA)	http://www.accaglobal.com/	Partial Accreditation Category 1
MA (Hons) Accounting and Finance	Chartered Institute of Management Accountants (CIMA)	http://www.cimaglobal.com/	Partial Accreditation Category 2
MA (Hons) Accounting and Finance	Chartered Institute of Public Finance & Accountancy (CIPFA)	http://www.cipfa.org.uk/	Partial Accreditation Category 1
MA (Hons) Accounting and Finance	Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales (ICAEW)	http://www.icaew.com/	Partial Accreditation Category 1
MA (Hons) Accounting and Finance	Institute of Chartered Accountants in Scotland (ICAS)	http://icas.org.uk/default.aspx	Partial Accreditation Category 1
MA (Hons) Business and Accounting	Association of Chartered Certified Accountants (ACCA)	http://www.accaglobal.com/	Partial Accreditation Category 1
MA (Hons) Business and Accounting	Association of International Accountants (AIA)	http://www.aiaworldwide.com/	Partial Accreditation Category 1
MA (Hons) Business and Accounting	Chartered Institute of Management Accountants (CIMA)	http://www.cimaglobal.com/	Partial Accreditation Category 2

MA (Hons) Business and Accounting	Chartered Institute of Public Finance & Accountancy (CIPFA)	http://www.cipfa.org.uk/	Partial Accreditation Category 1
MA (Hons) Business and Accounting	Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales (ICAEW)	http://www.icaew.com/	Partial Accreditation Category 1
MA (Hons) Business and Accounting	Institute of Chartered Accountants in Scotland (ICAS)	http://icas.org.uk/default.aspx	Partial Accreditation Category 1
MSc Banking and Risk - 1 Year	The Chartered Institute of Bankers in Scotland	http://www.charteredbanker.com/	Recognised
BSc (Hons) Chemical Physics	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)	http://www.rsc.org/	Full Accreditation
BSc (Hons) Chemistry	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)	http://www.rsc.org/	Full Accreditation
BSc (Hons) Chemistry with Environmental and Sustainable Chemistry	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)	http://www.rsc.org/	Full Accreditation
BSc (Hons) Chemistry with Materials Chemistry	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)	http://www.rsc.org/	Full Accreditation
BSc (Hons) Medicinal and Biological Chemistry	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)	http://www.rsc.org/	Full Accreditation
MChem (Hons) Chemistry	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)	http://www.rsc.org/	Full Accreditation
MChem (Hons) Chemistry with Environmental and Sustainable Chemistry	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)	http://www.rsc.org/	Full Accreditation
MChem (Hons) Chemistry with Environmental and Sustainable Chemistry and Industrial Experience	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)	http://www.rsc.org/	Full Accreditation
MChem (Hons) Chemistry with Environmental and Sustainable Chemistry and a Year Abroad	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)	http://www.rsc.org/	Full Accreditation
MChem (Hons) Chemistry with Industrial Experience	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)	http://www.rsc.org/	Full Accreditation

MChem (Hons) Chemistry with Materials Chemistry	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)	http://www.rsc.org/	Full Accreditation
MChem (Hons) Chemistry with Materials Chemistry and Industrial Experience	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)	http://www.rsc.org/	Full Accreditation
MChem (Hons) Chemistry with Materials Chemistry with a Year Abroad	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)	http://www.rsc.org/	Full Accreditation
MChem (Hons) Chemistry with a Year Abroad	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)	http://www.rsc.org/	Full Accreditation
MChem (Hons) Medicinal and Biological Chemistry	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)	http://www.rsc.org/	Full Accreditation
MChem (Hons) Medicinal and Biological Chemistry with Industrial Experience	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)	http://www.rsc.org/	Full Accreditation
MChem (Hons) Medicinal and Biological Chemistry with a Year Abroad	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)	http://www.rsc.org/	Full Accreditation
MChemPhys (Hons) Chemical Physics	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)	http://www.rsc.org/	Full Accreditation
MChemPhys (Hons) Chemical Physics with Industrial Experience	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)	http://www.rsc.org/	Full Accreditation
MChemPhys (Hons) Chemical Physics with a Year Abroad	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)	http://www.rsc.org/	Full Accreditation
School of Chemistry	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)	http://www.rsc.org/	Full Accreditation
BSc (Hons) Oral Health Sciences	General Dental Council (GDC)	http://www.gdc-uk.org/Pages/default.aspx	Full Accreditation
MA (Hons) Economics and Accounting	Association of Chartered Certified Accountants (ACCA)	http://www.accaglobal.com/	Full Accreditation
MA (Hons) Economics and Accounting	Association of International Accountants (AIA)	http://www.aiaworldwide.com/	Full Accreditation

MA (Hons) Economics and Accounting	Chartered Institute of Management Accountants (CIMA)	http://www.cimaglobal.com/	Full Accreditation
MA (Hons) Economics and Accounting	Chartered Institute of Public Finance & Accountancy (CIPFA)	http://www.cipfa.org.uk/	Full Accreditation
MA (Hons) Economics and Accounting	Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales (ICAEW)	http://www.icaew.com/	Full Accreditation
MA (Hons) Economics and Accounting	Institute of Chartered Accountants in Scotland (ICAS)	http://icas.org.uk/default.aspx	Full Accreditation
BEng (Hons) Civil Engineering	Chartered Institute of Highways & Transportation (CIHT)	http://www.ciht.org.uk/	Full Accreditation
BEng (Hons) Civil Engineering	Institute of Highway Engineers (IHE)	http://www.theihe.org/	Full Accreditation
BEng (Hons) Civil Engineering	Institution of Civil Engineers (ICE)	http://www.ice.org.uk/	Full Accreditation
BEng (Hons) Civil Engineering	Institution of Structural Engineers (IStructE)	http://www.istructe.org/	Full Accreditation
BEng (Hons) Electrical Engineering with Renewable Energy	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)	http://www.theiet.org/	Full Accreditation
BEng (Hons) Electrical and Mechanical Engineering	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)	http://www.theiet.org/	Full Accreditation
BEng (Hons) Electronics	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)	http://www.theiet.org/	Full Accreditation
BEng (Hons) Electronics and Electrical Engineering	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)	http://www.theiet.org/	Full Accreditation
BEng (Hons) Electronics and Electrical Engineering (Communications)	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)	http://www.theiet.org/	Full Accreditation
BEng (Hons) Electronics and Electrical Engineering with Management	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)	http://www.theiet.org/	Full Accreditation
BEng (Hons) Electronics and Software Engineering	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)	http://www.theiet.org/	Full Accreditation

BEng (Hons) Engineering for Sustainable Energy	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)	http://www.theiet.org/	Full Accreditation
BEng (Hons) Structural Engineering with Architecture	Chartered Institute of Highways & Transportation (CIHT)	http://www.ciht.org.uk/	Full Accreditation
BEng (Hons) Structural Engineering with Architecture	Institute of Highway Engineers (IHE)	http://www.theihe.org/	Full Accreditation
BEng (Hons) Structural Engineering with Architecture	Institution of Civil Engineers (ICE)	http://www.ice.org.uk/	Full Accreditation
BEng (Hons) Structural Engineering with Architecture	Institution of Structural Engineers (IStructE)	http://www.istructe.org/	Full Accreditation
BEng (Hons) Structural and Fire Safety Engineering	Chartered Institute of Highways & Transportation (CIHT)	http://www.ciht.org.uk/	Full Accreditation
BEng (Hons) Structural and Fire Safety Engineering	Institute of Highway Engineers (IHE)	http://www.theihe.org/	Full Accreditation
BEng (Hons) Structural and Fire Safety Engineering	Institution of Civil Engineers (ICE)	http://www.ice.org.uk/	Full Accreditation
BEng (Hons) Structural and Fire Safety Engineering	Institution of Structural Engineers (IStructE)	http://www.istructe.org/	Full Accreditation
MEng (Hons) Civil Engineering	Chartered Institute of Highways & Transportation (CIHT)	http://www.ciht.org.uk/	Full Accreditation
MEng (Hons) Civil Engineering	Institute of Highway Engineers (IHE)	http://www.theihe.org/	Full Accreditation
MEng (Hons) Civil Engineering	Institution of Civil Engineers (ICE)	http://www.ice.org.uk/	Full Accreditation
MEng (Hons) Civil Engineering	Institution of Structural Engineers (IStructE)	http://www.istructe.org/	Full Accreditation
MEng (Hons) Electrical And Mechanical Engineering	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)	http://www.theiet.org/	Full Accreditation
MEng (Hons) Electrical Engineering	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)	http://www.theiet.org/	Full Accreditation

MEng (Hons) Electrical Engineering with Renewable Energy	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)	http://www.theiet.org/	Full Accreditation
MEng (Hons) Electronics	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)	http://www.theiet.org/	Full Accreditation
MEng (Hons) Electronics and Computer Science	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)	http://www.theiet.org/	Full Accreditation
MEng (Hons) Electronics and Electrical Engineering	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)	http://www.theiet.org/	Full Accreditation
MEng (Hons) Electronics and Electrical Engineering (Communications)	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)	http://www.theiet.org/	Full Accreditation
MEng (Hons) Electronics and Electrical Engineering with Management	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)	http://www.theiet.org/	Full Accreditation
MEng (Hons) Electronics and Software Engineering	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)	http://www.theiet.org/	Full Accreditation
MEng (Hons) Electronics with Bioelectronics	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)	http://www.theiet.org/	Full Accreditation
MEng (Hons) Engineering for Sustainable Energy	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)	http://www.theiet.org/	Full Accreditation
MEng (Hons) Structural Engineering with Architecture	Chartered Institute of Highways & Transportation (CIHT)	http://www.ciht.org.uk/	Full Accreditation
MEng (Hons) Structural Engineering with Architecture	Institute of Highway Engineers (IHE)	http://www.theihe.org/	Full Accreditation
MEng (Hons) Structural Engineering with Architecture	Institution of Civil Engineers (ICE)	http://www.ice.org.uk/	Full Accreditation
MEng (Hons) Structural Engineering with Architecture	Institution of Structural Engineers (IStructE)	http://www.istructe.org/	Full Accreditation
MEng (Hons) Structural and Fire Safety Engineering	Chartered Institute of Highways & Transportation (CIHT)	http://www.ciht.org.uk/	Full Accreditation

MEng (Hons) Structural and Fire Safety Engineering	Institute of Highway Engineers (IHE)	http://www.theihe.org/	Full Accreditation
MEng (Hons) Structural and Fire Safety Engineering	Institution of Civil Engineers (ICE)	http://www.ice.org.uk/	Full Accreditation
MEng (Hons) Structural and Fire Safety Engineering	Institution of Structural Engineers (IStructE)	http://www.istructe.org/	Full Accreditation
MSc Structural Engineering and Mechanics - 1 Year	Chartered Institute of Highways & Transportation (CIHT)	http://www.ciht.org.uk/	Full Accreditation
MSc Structural Engineering and Mechanics - 1 Year	Institute of Highway Engineers (IHE)	http://www.theihe.org/	Full Accreditation
MSc Structural Engineering and Mechanics - 1 Year	Institution of Civil Engineers (ICE)	http://www.ice.org.uk/	Full Accreditation
MSc Structural Engineering and Mechanics - 1 Year	Institution of Structural Engineers (IStructE)	http://www.istructe.org/	Full Accreditation
MSc Structural and Fire Safety Engineering - 1 Year	Chartered Institute of Highways & Transportation (CIHT)	http://www.ciht.org.uk/	Full Accreditation
MSc Structural and Fire Safety Engineering - 1 Year	Institute of Highway Engineers (IHE)	http://www.theihe.org/	Full Accreditation
MSc Structural and Fire Safety Engineering - 1 Year	Institution of Civil Engineers (ICE)	http://www.ice.org.uk/	Full Accreditation
MSc Structural and Fire Safety Engineering - 1 Year	Institution of Structural Engineers (IStructE)	http://www.istructe.org/	Full Accreditation
BEng (Hons) Artificial Intelligence and Software Engineering	BCS the Chartered Institute for IT	http://www.bcs.org/	Full Accreditation
BEng (Hons) Artificial Intelligence with Management	BCS the Chartered Institute for IT	http://www.bcs.org/	Full Accreditation
BEng (Hons) Computer Science	BCS the Chartered Institute for IT	http://www.bcs.org/	Full Accreditation
BEng (Hons) Computer Science and Electronics	BCS the Chartered Institute for IT	http://www.bcs.org/	Full Accreditation

BEng (Hons) Computer Science and Electronics	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)	http://www.theiet.org/	Full Accreditation
BEng (Hons) Computer Science with Management	BCS the Chartered Institute for IT	http://www.bcs.org/	Full Accreditation
BEng (Hons) Software Engineering	BCS the Chartered Institute for IT	http://www.bcs.org/	Full Accreditation
BEng (Hons) Software Engineering with Management	BCS the Chartered Institute for IT	http://www.bcs.org/	Full Accreditation
BSc (Hons) Artificial Intelligence	BCS the Chartered Institute for IT	http://www.bcs.org/	Full Accreditation
BSc (Hons) Artificial Intelligence and Computer Science	BCS the Chartered Institute for IT	http://www.bcs.org/	Full Accreditation
BSc (Hons) Artificial Intelligence and Mathematics	BCS the Chartered Institute for IT	http://www.bcs.org/	Partial Accreditation Category 3
BSc (Hons) Cognitive Science	BCS the Chartered Institute for IT	http://www.bcs.org/	Partial Accreditation Category 3
BSc (Hons) Computer Science	BCS the Chartered Institute for IT	http://www.bcs.org/	Full Accreditation
BSc (Hons) Computer Science and Management Science	BCS the Chartered Institute for IT	http://www.bcs.org/	Partial Accreditation Category 3
BSc (Hons) Computer Science and Mathematics	BCS the Chartered Institute for IT	http://www.bcs.org/	Partial Accreditation Category 3
BSc (Hons) Computer Science and Physics	BCS the Chartered Institute for IT	http://www.bcs.org/	Partial Accreditation Category 3
MInf (Hons) Informatics	BCS the Chartered Institute for IT	http://www.bcs.org/	Full Accreditation
BSc (Hons) Geophysics and Geology	Royal Meteorological Society (RMetS)	http://www.rmets.org/	Approved
MSc Psychology of Mental Health (Conversion) (ICL) - 24-72 Months	British Psychological Society (BPS)	http://www.bps.org.uk/	Full Accreditation
MSc Psychology of Mental Health (Conversion) - 1 Year	British Psychological Society (BPS)	http://www.bps.org.uk/	Full Accreditation

BEng (Hons) Computer Science and Electronics	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)	http://www.theiet.org/	Full Accreditation
LLB (Hons) Law and Accountancy	Association of Chartered Certified Accountants (ACCA)	http://www.accaglobal.com/	Full Accreditation
LLB (Hons) Law and Accountancy	Association of International Accountants (AIA)	http://www.aiaworldwide.com/	Full Accreditation
LLB (Hons) Law and Accountancy	Chartered Institute of Management Accountants (CIMA)	http://www.cimaglobal.com/	Full Accreditation
LLB (Hons) Law and Accountancy	Chartered Institute of Public Finance & Accountancy (CIPFA)	http://www.cipfa.org.uk/	Full Accreditation
LLB (Hons) Law and Accountancy	Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales (ICAEW)	http://www.icaew.com/	Full Accreditation
LLB (Hons) Law and Accountancy	Institute of Chartered Accountants in Scotland (ICAS)	http://icas.org.uk/default.aspx	Full Accreditation
BSc (Hons) Psychology	British Psychological Society (BPS)	http://www.bps.org.uk/	Full Accreditation
MA (Hons) Philosophy and Psychology	British Psychological Society (BPS)	http://www.bps.org.uk/	Full Accreditation
MA (Hons) Psychology	British Psychological Society (BPS)	http://www.bps.org.uk/	Full Accreditation
MA (Hons) Psychology and Business	British Psychological Society (BPS)	http://www.bps.org.uk/	Full Accreditation
MA (Hons) Psychology and Business Studies	British Psychological Society (BPS)	http://www.bps.org.uk/	Full Accreditation
MA (Hons) Psychology and Economics-4 Years	British Psychological Society (BPS)	http://www.bps.org.uk/	Full Accreditation
MA (Hons) Psychology and Linguistics	British Psychological Society (BPS)	http://www.bps.org.uk/	Full Accreditation
BSc (Hons) Astrophysics	Institute of Physics (IOP)	http://www.iop.org/	Full Accreditation
BSc (Hons) Mathematical Physics	Institute of Physics (IOP)	http://www.iop.org/	Full Accreditation
MPhys (Hons) Mathematical Physics	Institute of Physics (IOP)	http://www.iop.org/	Full Accreditation
MPhys (Hons) Physics with Year Abroad - 5 Years	Institute of Physics (IOP)	http://www.iop.org/	Full Accreditation

Notes:

Partial Accreditation Category 1: Accredited for the purpose of exemption from some professional examinations

Partial Accreditation Category 2: Accredited for the purpose of exemption from some professional examinations through the Accredited degree accelerated route

Partial Accreditation Category 3: Accredited by BCS, the Chartered Institute for IT for the purposes of partially meeting the academic requirement for registration as a Chartered IT Professional

Partial Accreditation Category 4: Accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business

Expected to be Accredited 2015 -2016

Degree Programme Title	Name_of_Accrediting_Body	URL_of_Accrediting_Body	Current Accreditation Status	Expiry Date 2015-16
Business School	European Quality Improvement System (EQUIS)	http://www.efmd.org/	Complete	11-Jun-16
MSc Accounting and Finance - 1 Year	Chartered Financial Analyst Institute (CFA)	https://www.cfainstitute.org/pages/index.aspx	Complete	01-Sep-15

MSc Finance and Investment - 1 Year	Chartered Financial Analyst Institute (CFA)	https://www.cfainstitute.org/pages/index.aspx	Complete	01-Sep-15
BVMS Veterinary Medicine	American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA)	https://www.avma.org/	Complete	13-Nov-15
BVMS Veterinary Medicine	Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons (RCVS)	http://www.rcvs.org.uk/home/	Complete	13-Nov-15
MSc Transfusion, Transplantation and Tissue Banking - 3 Years	Institute of Biomedical Science (IBMS)	http://www.ibms.org/	New being sought	31-Jul-15
BEng (Hons) Chemical Engineering	Institution of Chemical Engineers (ICHEME)	http://www.icheme.org/	Complete	31-Jul-16
BEng (Hons) Chemical Engineering with Management	Institution of Chemical Engineers (ICHEME)	http://www.icheme.org/	Complete	31-Jul-16
MEng (Hons) Chemical Engineering	Institution of Chemical Engineers (ICHEME)	http://www.icheme.org/	Complete	31-Jul-16
MEng (Hons) Chemical Engineering with Environmental Engineering	Institution of Chemical Engineers (ICHEME)	http://www.icheme.org/	Complete	31-Jul-16
MEng (Hons) Chemical Engineering with Management	Institution of Chemical Engineers (ICHEME)	http://www.icheme.org/	Complete	31-Jul-16
LLB (Hons) Law	Law Society of Scotland	http://www.lawscot.org.uk/	Complete	31-Jul-16
LLB (Hons) Law and Accountancy	Law Society of Scotland	http://www.lawscot.org.uk/	Complete	31-Jul-16
LLB (Hons) Law and Business	Law Society of Scotland	http://www.lawscot.org.uk/	Complete	31-Jul-16
LLB (Hons) Law and Celtic	Law Society of Scotland	http://www.lawscot.org.uk/	Complete	31-Jul-16
LLB (Hons) Law and Economics	Law Society of Scotland	http://www.lawscot.org.uk/	Complete	31-Jul-16
LLB (Hons) Law and French	Law Society of Scotland	http://www.lawscot.org.uk/	Complete	31-Jul-16
LLB (Hons) Law and German	Law Society of Scotland	http://www.lawscot.org.uk/	Complete	31-Jul-16
LLB (Hons) Law and History	Law Society of Scotland	http://www.lawscot.org.uk/	Complete	31-Jul-16
LLB (Hons) Law and International Relations	Law Society of Scotland	http://www.lawscot.org.uk/	Complete	31-Jul-16
LLB (Hons) Law and Politics	Law Society of Scotland	http://www.lawscot.org.uk/	Complete	31-Jul-16

QAC: 03.09.15
H/02/28/02

QAC 15/16 1 G

LLB (Hons) Law and Social Anthropology	Law Society of Scotland	http://www.lawscot.org.uk/	Complete	31-Jul-16
LLB (Hons) Law and Social Policy	Law Society of Scotland	http://www.lawscot.org.uk/	Complete	31-Jul-16
LLB (Hons) Law and Sociology	Law Society of Scotland	http://www.lawscot.org.uk/	Complete	31-Jul-16
LLB (Hons) Law and Spanish	Law Society of Scotland	http://www.lawscot.org.uk/	Complete	31-Jul-16
Law (LLB Ord)	Law Society of Scotland	http://www.lawscot.org.uk/	Complete	31-Jul-16

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee
3 September 2015

Draft Student Staff Liaison Committee Principles

Brief description of the paper, including a statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities

The paper contains the draft Student Staff Liaison Committee principles which have been amended to reflect updates to the student representation process and in particular for online distance learners and the new arrangement whereby Schools should share with student representatives the University student email address of the students they represent.

The paper is relevant to the University's strategic goal of 'Excellence in education' and the strategic theme of 'Outstanding student experience'.

Action requested

For approval

Communication/Implementation

The amended principles will be published on the Academic Services and EUSA websites and will be included in communications to students and staff on student representation updates.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? Yes, the collation of student representative names for EUSA and the consideration of meetings with remote participants will involve staff resource. Full student engagement is essential to the enhancement of the student experience.

Risk Assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? No

Equality and Diversity

Has due consideration been given to the equality impact of this paper? Yes

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Originator of the paper

Gillian Mackintosh
Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services

26 August 2015

Any other relevant information, including keywords

Student staff liaison committee, SSLC, student engagement, EUSA, student representation



Draft Principles for Student Staff Liaison Committees (SSLCs)

Purpose of Policy

The principles for Student Staff Liaison Committees (SSLCs) were developed in partnership with the Edinburgh University Students Association (EUSA) as one of the ways to support and promote the engagement of our students in their learning and to strengthen the value of SSLCs.

Overview

The University of Edinburgh is committed to providing an outstanding student experience and we recognise the important role of our students as co-creators of their own academic experience. Our students are encouraged to play an active role in ensuring their University experience is an excellent one. Staff at the University work in partnership with EUSA to ensure that students are central to governance, decision making, quality assurance and enhancement, which provides opportunities for our students to become active participants and gives our students a voice.

The University and EUSA support and promote the engagement of students through a variety of activities and processes including SSLCs.

For the purposes of these principles to reflect the undergraduate, postgraduate taught and research student bodies, Class Representatives and School Conveners will be referred to as Student Representatives. Information on the Student Representative system can be found on the EUSA website:

<https://www.eusa.ed.ac.uk/representation/aboutrepresentation/>

Scope: Mandatory Policy

The policy applies to all students and staff involved in SSLCs.

Contact Officer

Gillian Mackintosh

Academic Policy Officer

Gillian.Mackintosh@ed.ac.uk

Document control

Dates

Approved:
23.05.13

Starts:
01.07.13

Equality impact assessment:
01.06.13

Amendments:
01.08.15

Next Review:
2015/2016

Approving authority

Senate Quality Assurance Committee

Consultation undertaken

EUSA, current School Directors of Quality, a group of Academic and Administrative staff supporting SSLCs

Section responsible for policy maintenance & review

Academic Services

Related policies, procedures, guidelines & regulations

http://www.docs.sasg.ed.ac.uk/AcademicServices/Policies/External_Examiners_Taught.pdf
http://www.docs.sasg.ed.ac.uk/AcademicServices/Policies/Principles_for_learning_from_and_responding_to_the_student_voice.pdf
<http://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/quality-unit/quality-assurance/annual-monitoring-reporting/school-reporting>
http://www.docs.sasg.ed.ac.uk/AcademicServices/Quality/QA/Int%20reviews/TPRPPR_SubjectAreasSchoolsStudentInvolvement.pdf
<http://www.docs.sasg.ed.ac.uk/AcademicServices/Guidance/External%20Examiner%20Summary%20Reports%20at%20Student%20Staff%20Liaison%20Committees.pdf>
<http://www.ed.ac.uk/files/imports/fileManager/StudentDisclosuresV11.pdf>
<http://www.eusa.ed.ac.uk/getinvolved/eusapostgraduate/about/od/>
<https://www.eusa.ed.ac.uk/representation/classreps/>

UK Quality Code

UK Quality Code Chapter B5 Student Engagement
<http://www.qaa.ac.uk/assuring-standards-and-quality/the-quality-code/quality-code-part-b>

Policies superseded by this policy

N/A

Alternative format

If you require this document in an alternative format please email Academic.Services@ed.ac.uk or telephone 0131 650 2138.

Keywords

SSLC, Student Staff Liaison Committee, Student Representation, EUSA



Draft Principles for Student Staff Liaison Committees (SSLCs)

1. Role

Student Staff Liaison Committees (SSLCs; or Course, Teaching or Programme Committees in some schools or Postgraduate Research Forums in some schools) are meetings at which Student Representatives, Programme /Course/Year Organisers, Academic and Administrative staff supporting teaching and learning discuss course and School issues and activities.

Edinburgh University Students' Association (EUSA) coordinates student representation across the University and provides training and support for all Student Representatives (including Class/Programme/Year Group Representatives and elected School Convenors). Student representatives work with the students they represent to identify areas for improvement, suggest solutions, and ensure that the views of the students they represent inform strategic decisions within the University, building a stronger academic community and improving student life.

As structures and systems vary between Schools, Institutes or Research Centres, the format of SSLCs will also be different to reflect this. Nonetheless, the principles should remain the same in that the committee provides a formal mechanism for communication and discussion between academic staff, administrative staff and representatives of the student body relating to all matters connected with the degree programmes, and the student experience.

2. Remit

2.1 Formal Written Remit

SSLCs should be encouraged to have a formal written remit which should be reviewed annually by Student Representatives and staff to ensure that it reflects current learning, teaching and research matters in their School or subject area.

It is suggested that the remit is published on the School/Subject area/ Research Centre/Institute website and that all students in that area are made aware of this.

2.2 Student engagement

Following the publication of the UK Quality Code Chapter B5: Student Engagement, the code states that 'Higher education providers create and maintain an environment within which students and staff engage in discussions that aim to bring about demonstrable enhancement of the educational experience'. SSLCs are one way in which students and staff should engage in discussions to improve student life at the University of Edinburgh, including the online learning environment for students not studying on campus.

Furthermore, the code states: 'Higher education providers, in partnership with their student body, share information so that students and staff involved in quality systems have an equally informed voice'. Student Representatives will be expected to gather representative student views to identify best practices and areas of improvement of the delivery, content, materials, assessment and feedback, and share with staff any suggestions to improve these areas and create a strong academic community within their area.

In addition, staff will share information with students. This could include information such as themes arising from student surveys, themes from External Examiners reports, Part 3 External Examiner reports (Postgraduate Research), course evaluation and review documentation, School Annual Quality Reports, and TPR/PPR reports. Student Representatives and staff should collaborate to



Draft Principles for Student Staff Liaison Committees (SSLCs)

identify trends and areas for improvement. The code also states that students' views should be sought on new programmes and courses as well as on changes to existing ones and the SSLC could provide a forum for this type of discussion.

In partnership with EUSA, QAC has agreed that the SSLC is the best forum for consideration of themes arising from External Examiners' reports and summarised responses of Schools/Subject areas.

In order to streamline material being presented to SSLCs, Schools are encouraged to summarise points from External Examiner reports and group them into themes, together with the response from the School/Subject area/Programme and highlight areas of good practice.

Each School should decide which SSLC is most appropriate to their structure for the consideration of the summary reports.

Following consideration of the themes at the SSLC, comments and suggestions from the meeting will be collated and reported to relevant School Committees or member of staff. Depending on recommendations, ongoing actions would be reported to SSLC meetings later in the academic year and ultimately through subsequent External Examiner reports.

(section 68.1- 68.4 [External Examiners for Taught Programmes Policy](#))

Please refer to Guidance for Students - External Examiner Summary Reports at SSLCs for further information.

3. Membership

SSLC meetings are attended by Student Representatives, Course /Year Organisers, Degree Programme Conveners, School Postgraduate Programme Directors, staff representing Research Centres or Institutes, Personal tutors, School Directors of Quality, Administrative staff supporting teaching and learning, School IT representatives and other relevant staff to discuss programme and course issues.

During the first two weeks of the semester, Course/Year Organisers or Degree Programme Conveners should invite students to become Student Representatives and, where appropriate, hold elections to select the representatives. This should happen as early as possible and ideally no later than the end of Week 2 of each semester. School support staff are required to send the names of all Student Representatives to EUSA (class.reps@eusa.ed.ac.uk) so that EUSA can facilitate training for them in a timely manner.

EUSA holds elections in March (followed by by-elections in October for postgraduate positions and any unfilled positions) each year to elect School Conveners and Undergraduate and Postgraduate Vice-Conveners. These elected Student Representatives should be invited as members of SSLC meetings in their School, or at minimum be informed of the business conducted. Their contact details can be obtained at www.eusa.ed.ac.uk/representation or by emailing democracy@eusa.ed.ac.uk

4. Communication with Student Representatives and Student Body

4.1 Communication before SSLCs

All SSLC members should be informed of the date, time, location of the meeting, and inviting any additional items to be added to the agenda. It is suggested that this happens at least two weeks in advance of the meeting. The agenda should be available in advance of the meeting.



Draft Principles for Student Staff Liaison Committees (SSLCs)

Schools should share with student representatives the University student email address of the students they represent or facilitate alternative ways for Student Representatives to contact classmates e.g. via the VLE or m-list.

The Student Representative may use this only in their role as a Student Representative. If any student wishes to opt out from this, they should tell the School's Teaching Office/Graduate School or equivalent. The School is responsible for removing the relevant student's email from the list before sharing the list with the Student Representative(s). If a student wishes to 'opt out' of receiving emails from their representative after the School has already provided email addresses to the representative, the School is responsible for asking the representative to remove that email address from future circulations, and the Student Representative must delete promptly the details of any student who asks them to do so.

(See [Policy on Disclosure of Student Information](#))

There may be circumstances in which a small number of student representatives do not receive training in time or in some cases at all because of administrative delays in the School passing rep names to EUSA. Therefore Student Representatives could be handling student contact details without having been trained. Nevertheless Student Representatives should be aware of their obligations under Data Protection to only use email addresses for student representation purposes.

4.2 Communication after SSLCs

Staff and Student Representatives are responsible for reporting back information to the people they represent and taking ownership of any action points agreed at the meeting.

Schools should appoint named academic and support staff contacts in each School for Student Representatives to discuss any additional issues as they arise or request additional meetings if required. Student Representatives and EUSA (class.reps@eusa.ed.ac.uk) should be kept informed of the contact details of these staff contacts.

5. Frequency of meetings

The frequency of meetings should be agreed in consultation with School staff and Student Representatives. However at least one formal meeting should be held in each semester. This may vary between Schools depending on their size and structure as well as in terms of undergraduate and postgraduate provision.

For example some SSLCs may operate at School, subject or course level depending on their structure. Some Schools may operate an integrated undergraduate and postgraduate SSLC. At undergraduate level it may be more appropriate to meet once per semester whereas for postgraduate taught students it may be more appropriate to have additional meetings spread over the year.

Some subject areas and schools may meet formally once a semester but may operate a more informal system throughout the year in terms of students having access to other meetings such as Director of Teaching meetings, School Undergraduate Learning and Teaching Committee meetings and meetings taking place at different levels (e.g. programme; subject area; school).

Therefore Schools should operate whichever system is most appropriate to their structure. Schools are encouraged to publish the dates of meetings on the School/Subject area webpage ahead of the meeting and email all members with this information.



Draft Principles for Student Staff Liaison Committees (SSLCs)

6. Meetings – format, agenda and minutes

Schools are encouraged to have student chairing of meetings. This could be an elected School Convener or Vice Convener, or another trained Student Representative. Schools may wish for the chair person to be neutral (e.g. not a student on-programme, Programme Director or Course Organiser teaching on the programme which is being discussed). Some Schools may wish to select a member of staff to support the student chair.

At School level, online distance learning (ODL) student representatives and students should have the opportunity to participate virtually or otherwise input into SSLCs electronically. Consideration should be given for meetings with remote participants for example, student representatives should be able to input into the agenda; receive meeting papers before meetings and minutes afterwards

Meeting organisers should consider the following when arranging the timing of meetings:

- the availability of students who have work commitments ,
- time zone considerations.
- allow students plenty of notice of the meeting
- ensure in advance that students can access whichever system is being used

A number of options exist for Schools to set up meetings to enable ODL students to participate such as Collaborate, Skype or video conference.

Collaborate, for instance, is an IS-supported system designed to support online classes and meetings. Any member of staff or student can set up Collaborate sessions via MyEd, and a wide range of guidance materials is available and accessible online.

- <http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/information-services/learning-technology/communication/collaborate/collaborate-students>

Skype is not centrally supported but is widely used by staff and students, and like Collaborate requires just a computer/tablet and a webcam. Other similarly 'technology light' tools and environments exist and are valued because they are free, and can be used with a lot of flexibility.

- <https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/display/mscdetech/11.+Skype>

Video conference three video conference (VC) suites exist in centrally bookable rooms, and other VC suites are situated in Schools around the university. The VC system is hosted by JANET, and requires registration. Online tutorials are available via the JANET VC webpages, and local support is offered via LTSTS.

- <http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/information-services/computing/comms-and-collab/videoconferencing>

Further information for students on preparing for and chairing meetings, is available on the EUSA Student Rep Forum on Learn, and on the EUSA website at:
www.eusa.ed.ac.uk/classreps

Although the exact format of meetings will vary between schools, this is an example of the basic format which many follow, in the order that they occur. The minutes of the meetings should follow the same structure.



Draft Principles for Student Staff Liaison Committees (SSLCs)

Schools are encouraged to publish the minutes from meetings on the School/Subject area web pages. It should be noted that the minutes of SSLCs meetings are submitted as part of the documentation for internal reviews.

Agenda items can be suggested by students and by staff and should be used as a focal point through which students can be informed about and be involved in decision making processes relating to:

- the School Annual Quality Assurance report
- themes arising from Student surveys
- TPR/PPR preparation, where appropriate
- TPR/PPR Reports, where appropriate
- themes from External Examiner summary reports
- Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) accreditation reports, where appropriate
- Enhancement Led Institutional Review (ELIR)
- student- generated items
- standing items
- staff ideas and communications

Example of meeting outline:

Agenda

Minutes of the last meeting

Matters arising

Agenda items suggested by students and by staff

Any other business (AOB)

Date of Next Meeting: The date and time of the next meeting should be agreed and recorded by the minute-taker.

Students should not be expected to give an immediate response at meetings to all issues or where they would want to consult further; they may feel it necessary to consult with students in the cohort or in the case of PGR, this may involve wider discussion with students in all parts of the School. Most important of all, if any action is called for and agreed upon it should be promptly reported back to students via Student Representatives.

7. Equality

Schools should determine appropriate mechanisms for ensuring that all students have an opportunity to participate. It is suggested that Schools consider the use of online forums or virtual meetings where appropriate.

8. Examples of Good Practice

- the use of the Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) for students to discuss the issues they want to raise. A meeting is then held over Skype using text so that the students can take a transcript for their minutes. (The Royal (Dick) Veterinary School of Veterinary Studies)
- students holding a student-led School Council meeting prior to a SSLC meeting to prepare agenda items
- teaching staff attending Student Staff Liaison Committees for courses other than their own, to share information and good practice.

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee
3 September 2015

Draft Guidance for Students – External Examiner summary reports at Student Staff Liaison Committees (SSLCs)

Brief description of the paper, including a statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities

The paper contains the draft guidance for students – external examiner summary reports at student staff liaison committees. This guidance supersedes guidance for students and schools/subject areas due to the introduction of the External Examiners for Taught Programmes policy which speaks to staff and it was felt that a policy with the primary aim of speaking to students was required.

The paper is relevant to the University's strategic goal of 'Excellence in education' and the strategic theme of 'Outstanding student experience'.

Action requested

For approval

Communication/Implementation

The amended guidance will be published on the Academic Services and EUSA websites and will be included in communications to students and staff on student representation updates.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? Yes, as Schools are encouraged to summarise points from External Examiner reports, group these into themes and highlight areas of good practice, this will involve staff resource. Full student engagement is essential to the enhancement of the student experience.

Risk Assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? No

Equality and Diversity

Has due consideration been given to the equality impact of this paper? Yes

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Originator of the paper

Gillian Mackintosh
Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services

26 August 2015

Any other relevant information, including keywords

External Examiners, Student staff liaison committee, SSLC, student engagement, EUSA, student representation



DRAFT Guidance for Students – External Examiner Summary reports at Student Staff Liaison Committees (SSLCs)

THE UNIVERSITY
of EDINBURGH

Purpose of Guidance

This guidance exists to support students engaged in SSLCs who are encouraged to consider and respond to themes derived from External Examiner reports and suggest enhancements.

Schools must provide an opportunity for student representatives to view themes extracted from External Examiner reports and the Schools' summarised response to these themes. (section 68 External Examiners for Taught Programmes Policy)

In partnership with EUSA, QAC has agreed that the SSLC is the best forum for consideration of themes arising from External Examiners reports and summarised responses of Schools/subject areas (section 68.1 External Examiners for Taught Programmes Policy)

Scope: Guidance is not Mandatory

This guidance applies to students engaged in SSLCs

Contact Officer	Gillian Mackintosh	Academic Policy Officer	Gillian.Mackintosh@ed.ac.uk
------------------------	--------------------	-------------------------	--

Document control

Dates	Approved: 23.05.13	Starts: 01.07.13	Equality impact assessment: 01.06.13	Amendments: 01.08.15	Next Review: 2015/2016
--------------	------------------------------	----------------------------	--	--------------------------------	----------------------------------

Approving authority	Senate Quality Assurance Committee
----------------------------	------------------------------------

Consultation undertaken	EUSA, a group of Academic and Administrative staff supporting SSLCs
--------------------------------	---

Section responsible for guidance maintenance & review	Academic Services
--	-------------------

Related policies, procedures, guidelines & regulations	http://www.docs.sasg.ed.ac.uk/AcademicServices/Policies/External_Examiners_Taught.pdf http://www.docs.sasg.ed.ac.uk/AcademicServices/Policies/Principles_for_learning_from_and_responding_to_the_student_voice.pdf http://www.docs.sasg.ed.ac.uk/AcademicServices/Quality/QA/Int%20reviews/TPRPPR_SubjectAreasSchoolsStudentInvolvement.pdf http://www.eusa.ed.ac.uk/getinvolved/eusapostgraduate/about/od/ https://www.eusa.ed.ac.uk/representation/classreps/
---	---

UK Quality Code	UK Quality Code Chapter B7: External Examining
------------------------	--

Guidance superseded by this guidance	Guidance for Students and Schools/Subject Areas – External Examiner summary reports at Student Staff Liaison Committees
---	---

Alternative format	If you require this document in an alternative format please email Academic.Services@ed.ac.uk or telephone 0131 650 2138.
---------------------------	---

Keywords	SSLC, Student Staff Liaison Committee, External Examiner
-----------------	--



DRAFT Guidance for Students – External Examiner Summary reports at Student Staff Liaison Committees (SSLCs)

1. What is External Examining?

All higher education institutions (HEIs) in the UK appoint suitably qualified External Examiners drawn from other HEIs and, where relevant, industry and the professions.

The External Examiner system forms a key part of the University's quality assurance and enhancement mechanisms. External Examiners help to ensure that degrees awarded by the University are comparable in standard to those of other equivalent departments in appropriate universities, although their content may differ. They also ensure that the assessment system is operated equitably and fairly in respect of the treatment and classification of students.

External Examiners are also invited to comment on course content, balance and structure and on degree programme curricula. Colleges or Schools may also choose to invite External Examiners to see and comment on reports and feedback related to curriculum review and quality of educational provision.

2. The External Examiner Report

2.1 The report structure

External Examiners are required to submit a report annually via the External Examiner reporting system. Each External Examiner writes an annual report based on what he/she has observed of the institution's assessment processes and students' assessed work. The report conforms to a standardised template which includes text boxes for External Examiners to provide comments as they deem appropriate.

In the report the External Examiner is asked to comment on whether:

- the University is maintaining threshold academic standards set for its awards in accordance with the frameworks for higher education qualifications and applicable subject benchmark statements;
- the assessment process measures student achievement rigorously and fairly against the intended learning outcomes of the course (s) or programme(s) and is conducted in line with the University's policies and regulations;
- the academic standards and the achievements of students are comparable with those of other UK HEIs of which the External Examiner has experience;
- they received sufficient evidence to allow them to carry out their role. (where evidence was insufficient, they give details);
- whether issues raised in the previous report(s) have been, or are being, addressed to their satisfaction.



DRAFT Guidance for Students – External Examiner Summary reports at Student Staff Liaison Committees (SSLCs)

- address any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body;
- highlight areas of good practice and innovation;
- where appropriate, recommend opportunities to enhance the quality of the learning opportunities provided to students

2.2 Action by the School in response to the External Examiner report

The School is responsible for responding to the External Examiner on the comments made in the report. Responses are sent to the External Examiner, and must contain information on the consideration of the External Examiner's comments, what action has been taken as a result of the report, and reasons for not accepting particular recommendations or suggestions if applicable.

Themes from External Examiner reports are considered at College and University level.

3. Consideration of External Examiner summary reports at SSLCs

In order to streamline material being presented to SSLCs, Schools are encouraged to summarise points from External Examiner reports and group them into themes, together with the response from the School/Subject area/Programme and highlight areas of good practice. Each School should decide which SSLC is most appropriate to their structure for the consideration of the summary reports.

3.1 Timing of summary reports at SSLCs

Undergraduate External Examiner reports are received after the summer and winter exam diet. For undergraduate students, the summary reports should be made to the first SSLC meeting of the academic year.

Postgraduate Taught External Examiner reports are received between December and January and the summary reports will be submitted for consideration at SSLCs in the 2nd Semester.

The summary reports and responses should be emailed to SSLC members ahead of the meeting and in good time to allow members to prepare responses for discussion.

3.2 Most appropriate SSLC

In some Schools, the School-level SSLC may not be the most appropriate forum for discussion of themes and responses as this will take place at department or programme level rather than as part of the School as a whole.

Consideration should also be given to instances where one External Examiner's report might be relevant to more than one SSLC particularly for joint degrees. Therefore, each School should decide which SSLC is most appropriate to their structure for the consideration of the summary reports.



DRAFT Guidance for Students – External Examiner Summary reports at Student Staff Liaison Committees (SSLCs)

3.3 Using summary reports to enhance the Student Experience

Degree-awarding bodies ensure that student representatives are given the opportunity to be fully involved in this process, enabling them to understand all the issues raised and the degree-awarding body's response (UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Chapter B7: External Examining, October 2011)

The consideration of summary reports is an opportunity to be involved in discussion of potential improvements to courses and programmes recommended by the External Examiners.

During the SSLC meeting, Students should consider the themes and responses in the summary report and provide comments and suggestions.

However it should be noted that there may be occasions when an External Examiner makes a suggestion or recommendation is not possible/practicable for the University to implement. The response from the School to the External Examiner should demonstrate that the University has given full and serious consideration to the comments made and indicates the reason that action cannot be taken forward.

3.4 Closing the loop

Following consideration of the themes at the SSLC, comments and suggestions should be recorded in the SSLC meeting minutes.

Schools are encouraged to publish the minutes from meetings on the School/subject area website.

Student representatives should disseminate feedback and areas of good practice to the wider student body as well as informing when suggestions and changes are not possible due to business reasons (see section 3.3).

Although student representatives have a key role in the dissemination of information, all students have a responsibility to be informed of SSLC minutes.

Depending on recommendations, ongoing actions would be reported to SSLC meetings later in the academic year and ultimately through subsequent External Examiner reports.

3.5 Important points to note

Individual students and members of staff will not be named in the reports.

Where suggestions for improvements are made by External Examiners, these are suggestions for good practice for future implementation. Such suggestions do not call into question the validity of marks agreed by the Board of Examiners.

If an External Examiner makes a recommendation one year and it does not recur in the subsequent report this normally means that the issue has been dealt with to their satisfaction.



DRAFT Guidance for Students – External Examiner Summary reports at Student Staff Liaison Committees (SSLCs)

Summary reports and responses could be posted on a secure webpage for students to comment on.

Each School/subject area has their own student representation structure with course/programme/year-group student representatives and School staff will be aware of all student representatives who are expected to attend their SSLC meetings. If there are any questions, they should be directed to class.reps@eusa.ed.ac.uk

August 2015

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee
3 September 2015

Baseline Statement on Quality Arrangements

Brief description of the paper, including a statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities

The paper presents the baseline statement of the University's quality arrangements. The statement is produced in alignment with the Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance, the Scottish Funding Council's guidance on public information about quality and the Quality Assurance Agency UK Quality Code Part C, Information About Higher Education Provision. It is reviewed annually. The statement has been amended to reflect current Vice Principal and Assistant Principal roles, Court's approval of the Reflective Analysis and Case Studies for the ELIR in Semester 1 2015/16 and the meeting of the conveners of the standing committees of Senate and Court.

The paper is relevant to the University's Strategic Plan Strategic Goal of 'Excellence in Education'.

Action requested

For approval.

Communication/Implementation

Following approval by the Committee the Statement will be transmitted to the September e-Senate and Court for approval. Thereafter it will be published on the University website at <http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/governance-strategic-planning/governance/university-governance/other-useful-information>

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? No.

Risk Assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? No.

Equality and Diversity

Has due consideration been given to the equality impact of this paper? Quality assurance processes are subject to Equality Impact Assessment.

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes.

Originator of the paper

Dr Katherine Novosel, Court Services, Dr Linda Bruce, Academic Services, August 2015.

Any other relevant information, including keywords

Baseline statement quality arrangements, baseline statement, quality arrangements.



THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH STATEMENT ON QUALITY ARRANGEMENTS

The University of Edinburgh's statement on quality arrangements is published in alignment with the Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance and the Scottish Funding Council's guidance on public information about quality and the Quality Assurance Agency UK Quality Code Part C, Information About Higher Education Provision. It is kept under review and updated when relevant.

The statutory framework: the Universities (Scotland) Acts

In common with the other 'ancient' Scottish universities, the University of Edinburgh's governance structures are prescribed by the Universities (Scotland) Acts 1858 to 1966 that, *inter alia*, set out the powers and responsibilities of the University Court and the Senatus Academicus (Senate).

Senate, in accordance with these Acts, has responsibility for the regulation and supervision of teaching and as such has set up arrangements for the quality assurance and enhancement of teaching. Court, as the governing body of the University and in accordance with statute, can review decisions of Senate, and through the Resolution process Court approves the establishment of new degrees, the regulations for the awarding of degrees, student admission, and the recognition of teaching and its regulation by other than Edinburgh University staff.

Within this framework, the Court has recognised that it has significant responsibilities in this area. The quality of teaching is clearly linked to the University's reputation and brand and is of strategic importance. Court therefore requires to be informed of the arrangements made by the Senate for teaching quality assurance and enhancement and to review those arrangements from time to time. Currently Court considers reports on the student experience. Moreover, if there were serious concern about any aspect of the Senate's Quality Assurance and Enhancement arrangements Court could enquire as to the action being taken to address the situation.

Court and Senate structures

The Court and the Senate have committee/group structures which enable them to exercise their responsibilities; these committees and groups operate in accordance with approved terms of reference and reporting arrangements, with some reporting to both Court and Senate. There are also arrangements for direct communications between Court and Senate on items of mutual interest by way of reports on discussion at meetings and, in the case of Senate, on the outcome of the electronic circulation of non-contentious papers. Members of Court are able to attend meetings of Senate and have access to open papers. The Principal, as well as being a member of Court, is also President of Senate and four Assessors, elected by Senate, are full members of Court. The student body is represented on both Senate and Court and many of their committees/groups.

The internal University structure

The University also operates a highly devolved internal system of governance, having established three Colleges: Medicine and Veterinary Medicine; Science and Engineering; and Humanities and Social Science and three Support Groups: University Secretary's Group; Information Services Group; and Corporate Services Group.

The Heads of the Colleges are Vice-Principals appointed by Court for a defined period, following an approved procedure which includes external advertisement. They have overall managerial responsibility for their College combining resource management with academic leadership, including formal responsibility for teaching quality and enhancement issues. The University has a number of thematic Vice-Principals and Assistant Principals who have responsibility for strategic leadership in a particular area or areas, serving on a part-time basis. Thematic Vice-Principals and Assistant Principals are designated by the University Court on the recommendation of the Principal. The University's Senior Vice-Principal has strategic oversight of student experience, and learning and teaching. The remits of the Vice-Principal, Curriculum Innovation, Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance, Assistant Principal Learning Developments and Assistant Principal Researcher Development are relevant to teaching quality and enhancement.

Reporting on assurance and enhancement arrangements

In accordance with its responsibility for the regulation and supervision of teaching, Senate puts in place arrangements in respect of quality assurance and enhancement of education provision and reports on these to Court as necessary. The Annual Institutional Statement of Internal Review Activity to the Scottish Funding Council provides Court with assurances of the effectiveness of these arrangements.

Matters of sufficient importance concerning the quality of the University's teaching and student experience provision may be brought to Court's attention, where appropriate, by the Principal, the Senate Assessors and the Student Representatives or indeed by any other member.

The responsibility for the setting of the strategic direction of the University, principally by approving the University's Strategic Plan, is led by Court. The University's mission as contained in its currently approved Plan states:

The mission of our University is the creation, dissemination and curation of knowledge. As a world-leading centre of academic excellence we aim to:

- *enhance our position as one of the world's leading research and teaching Universities and to measure our performance against the highest international standards;*
- *provide the highest quality learning and teaching environment for the greater wellbeing of our students and deliver an outstanding educational portfolio;*
- *produce graduates fully equipped to achieve the highest personal and professional standards; and*
- *make a significant, sustainable, and socially responsible contribution to Scotland, the UK and the world, promoting health, economic and cultural wellbeing.*

The Strategic Plan is built around three strategic goals, one of which is Excellence in Education, and three enablers to deliver these goals: exceptional people, high-quality infrastructure and financial sustainability. Six strategic themes assist in directing the University's approach to achieving these goals. Progress towards achieving the targets set

within the Strategic Plan is monitored by the Central Management Group, Policy and Resources Committee and Court. The next Strategic Plan is currently under development.

The Colleges' and Support Groups' annual planning submissions, which are used as part of the resource allocation process, are based around the vision of the Strategic Plan and ensure that Court can be satisfied of the actions being taken to deliver against it.

The University's Risk Register and the work of the Internal Audit service as reported to the Audit and Risk Committee, also provide Court with further monitoring of, and assurances about, University activities related to quality arrangements.

Equally as important as the monitoring performed through the range of mechanisms outlined above, quality targets are also subject to day-to-day oversight by individual senior managers: quality assurance permeates the day-to-day activities of those delivering teaching, learning and student services activities.

Senate oversight of quality

Excellence in Education is a core strategic goal in both the University's current (2012-2016) and previous (2008 to 2012 and 2004 to 2008) strategic plans.

Senate exercises ultimate control of quality assurance. In order to strengthen academic governance and enhance the student experience, Senate devolves powers to four committees which take forward discussion, decision-making and action within specific strategic remits: Senate Learning and Teaching Committee, Senate Quality Assurance Committee, Senate Curriculum and Student Progression Committee, and Senate Researcher Experience Committee. Representatives of the student body are members of these committees. Court receives the annual report of the Senate committees. A meeting of the Conveners of the Standing Committees of Senate and Court took place during 2014/15 in order to promote information sharing on the work and priorities of the respective committees.

Senate Quality Assurance Committee is convened by the Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance. It is responsible for the University's academic quality assurance framework. The committee oversees the monitoring and review arrangements of colleges and student support services, and acts as a planning forum for the discussion and promotion of developments in academic quality assurance, whether internally driven or externally indicated. Along with the other Senate committees, Quality Assurance Committee reports annually to Senate on its actions and proposes future activity for endorsement within the framework of the University's Strategic Plan. Senate Quality Assurance Committee includes representatives of all three Colleges, of Schools, an external member from within the Scottish Higher Education system, representatives of EUSA, of the Institute for Academic Development, the University Secretary or nominee, a representative of a student support service, and a member with expertise in distance learning and e-learning. Up to three additional members may be co-opted onto the Committee.

University-led monitoring and review of quality and standards

The University's quality assurance framework is based on a set of key principles:

Every member of staff involved in learning and teaching has a role to play in ensuring teaching quality; monitoring and review should add value and should not be formulaic or 'tick-box'; monitoring and review should lead to enhancement of the student experience; monitoring and review should take place as close as possible to delivery; assurance that

monitoring and review is comprehensive and that consequent appropriate action is taken should be undertaken at the next closest level.

Formal responsibility for routine monitoring of teaching quality at the University is largely devolved to the three colleges. This affords greater flexibility to the colleges to operate slightly different approaches to reflect the particular structure and context of the college, while at the same time operating within the University's framework for quality assurance and enhancement. This framework is constructed in alignment with the Quality Assurance Agency's expectations and indicators as set out in the UK Quality Code. The Quality Assurance Agency's periodic review of the Code provides the University with the opportunity to map its detailed alignment through its policies and procedures, and to carry out enhancements if necessary. Senate Quality Assurance Committee has oversight of this process.

The University's annual monitoring process covers all credit-bearing provision, and all schools conduct annual monitoring. An overview of issues arising (positive and areas for further development) from this monitoring feed in to the annual school quality report to the appropriate college. Good practice is identified for wider dissemination, and recommendations are made where development needs are identified. Colleges in turn report to Senate Quality Assurance Committee on key trends arising from annual monitoring as part of their broader report on the assurance of quality. The Senate level committee similarly identifies commendations and recommendations, and uses these to inform its activity.

Student services which support the student learning experience are reviewed annually by Senate Quality Assurance Committee. The outcomes are discussed at the same meeting as those from school and college annual monitoring, thus enabling interlocking themes and actions to be identified.

Periodic review of academic and support service provision is carried out on a cycle of not more than six years, and align in frequency and content with Scottish Funding Council guidance (SFC/14/2012). Review reports contain commendations which form the basis of highlighting good practice for wider dissemination in the University, and recommendations for further development which may be directed to the academic area, the college, or any part of the University. Progress with recommendations is monitored at set points following the reviews until completion. The impact of reviews on the student learning experience is strengthened by collaboration with the Institute for Academic Development, which provides support to schools in taking forward recommendations where appropriate and capacity-building workshops based on good practice commended in reviews take place annually.

Effective student representation is a vital aspect of the University's quality assurance processes and the University and Edinburgh University Students' Association (EUSA) work in partnership to promote student representation and engagement. The EUSA and University Student Engagement Statement sets out the joint commitment in this respect. The University is committed to providing an outstanding student experience and recognises the important role of its students as co-creators of their own academic experience. Students are encouraged to play an active role in ensuring their University experience is an excellent one. Students are critical members of a thriving and vibrant academic community which is constantly evolving and developing. Staff at the University work in partnership with EUSA to ensure that students are central to governance, decision making, quality assurance and enhancement, providing opportunities for our students to become active participants and giving our students a voice. Crucial to this is the engagement of students at every point in the student journey, at every level of the University, and in both the formal curriculum as well as in co-curricular activities.

Feedback from students on their learning experience forms a key part of annual monitoring and periodic review. Further student views are gathered annually through the Edinburgh Student Experience survey, sent to all pre-final year undergraduate students, and through external surveys including the National Student Survey, the Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey, the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey and the International Student Barometer. Course surveys gather students' views on their experience at this level.

Externality is a key feature of the University's monitoring and review processes and takes account of external examiners, external subject specialists on internal reviews, professional, statutory and regulatory bodies (PSRBs) and other external bodies including employers.

The University reports annually to the Scottish Funding Council on its monitoring and review activity, including reviews held by PSRBs during the year. The report highlights the key messages from review activity, institutional actions and the impact of these, and is aligned with other relevant Scottish Funding Council monitoring and reporting arrangements. Court receives the report for endorsement, via Senate Quality Assurance Committee and Senate. In endorsing the report, Court confirms that it is satisfied the University has effective arrangements to maintain standards and to assure and enhance the quality of its provision, and that the standards and quality of the learning provision continue to meet the requirements set by the Council.

The effectiveness of the University's management of quality and standards is subject to external scrutiny through the periodic Enhancement-Led Institutional Review (ELIR) operated by the Quality Assurance Agency in Scotland. At its most recent ELIR the University received the highest possible outcome of 'confidence in the [...] current, and likely future, management of the academic standards of its awards and the quality of the student learning experience it provides'. Court receives information on the ELIR outcome, to endorse the University's approach to these reviews and to consider the outcomes. The University's next ELIR takes place in October/November 2015. Court has approved the Reflective Analysis and Case Studies which form a key part of the evidence base for the review.

Conclusion

Court is content that the primary overall responsibility for teaching quality assurance and enhancement rests with Senate, and that the University's reporting framework is such that Court has sufficient access to information and papers to enable it to monitor the effectiveness of these arrangements and to raise any matters of serious concern should these arise.

September 2015

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee
3 September 2015

**Proposal to change process for Lead Readers' Reporting on
College Annual QAE Reports**

Brief description of the paper, including a statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities

The paper contains the following:

The paper puts forward a proposal recommending a change the current process for Senatus Quality Assurance Committee members reporting on College Annual Quality Assurance and Enhancement reports.

The paper is relevant to enhancing Committee processes.

Action requested

To consider and approve recommendations

Communication/Implementation

The outcome will be communicated to relevant stakeholders and implemented as appropriate by the committee.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? No

Risk Assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? N/A

Equality and Diversity

There are no equality and diversity implications

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Originator of the paper

Marion Judge, former SQAC Secretary
16th July 2015

Any other relevant information, including keywords

College Annual Quality Assurance and Enhancement reporting

Proposal to change process for Lead Readers' Reporting on College Annual QAE Reports

Currently the process for SQAC reviewing College Annual Quality Assurance and Enhancement reports is that each report is considered by a team consisting of a Lead Reader and a Reader from within the Committee, who jointly produce a written report. This report is then circulated to the Committee, with each report being considered and discussed at a Committee meeting (normally in April) each year.

As a change in process, it is proposed that report readers will continue to be allocated to a College report, and will be requested to provide an outline of their observations on the report they are requested to consider. The Convener will meet readers prior to the April meeting to discuss and collectively produce an overview report drawing out themes from observations. This report will then form the basis of the Committee's discussion at the April meeting, alongside the College reports. The report will be published as an Open paper.

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee
3 September 2015

Senatus Quality Assurance Committee
Remit and Terms of Reference 2015-16

Brief description of the paper, including a statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities

The paper puts forward a proposal recommending a change the current remit and terms of reference for Senatus Quality Assurance Committee.

Action requested

For approval.

Communication/Implementation

The outcome will be communicated to relevant stakeholders and implemented as appropriate by the committee.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? No

Risk Assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? N/A

Equality and Diversity

There are no equality and diversity implications.

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Originator of the paper

Linda Bruce, Academic Services, August 2015

Any other relevant information, including keywords

Senatus Quality Assurance Committee Remit and Terms of Reference

It is proposed that Clause 10 of Composition of the Senatus Quality Assurance Committee Terms of Reference be amended as follows:

“The Committee shall appoint a member from a student support service, and a member with expertise in the area of ~~collaborative academic provision~~ distance learning and e-learning”.

Members are invited to approve the amendment.

Current Remit and Terms of Reference:

<http://www.docs.sasq.ed.ac.uk/AcademicServices/Committees/QAC/QACRemit.pdf>

Current Committee Membership:

<http://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/committees/quality-assurance/members>

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee
3 September 2015

MOOCs mid-year report

The MOOCs initiative began in June 2012 with the first wave of courses launched in January 2013 and has since grown substantially, now offering a portfolio of 24 courses across all three academic Colleges (10-14 Schools). More than 40 new course proposals have been received in 2015 with interest to develop MOOCs in 19 academic schools.

MOOCs are currently delivered via two platform providers: Coursera and FutureLearn. The University has also recently partnered with edX – a third platform provider – and aims to deliver courses through them by mid-2016. All participation data is shared openly on the MOOCs data website: <http://moocs.is.ed.ac.uk/>

Headline figures: University wide

Total number of courses	Schools participating	Participation to date	Retention figures
24 officially announced * Coursera = 21 * FutureLearn = 3 A further 3 have been approved but not yet scheduled. 6 on-demand versions	Live: BioMed, Business, ECA, Education, HiSS, Informatics, MGPHS, PPLS, Physics, SPS, VetMed In discussion: Business, HCA, Engineering	1.56 million sign ups (including new courses) 898,657 active learners 104,909 statements of completion distributed 9,142 paid-for certificates sold	Sign-up > active learners = 63% Active learners > completion = 13%

Summary figures by College

College	Number of courses (announced only)	Sign ups	Active learners *including on demand	Completed	Retention (active > completed) *excluding on demand courses
CHSS	11	840,270	478,468	39,649	10%
CMVM	7	384,014	199,112	41,557	21%
CSCE	6	359,531	221,077	23,658	14%

Summary figures by School

School	Number of courses (announced only)	Sign ups	Active learners	Completed	Retention (active > completed) *live courses only
BioMed	2	234,025	100,042	13,535	14%
ECA	2	212,015	111,965	5,654	7%

Education	4	104,725	51,118	3,315	6%
HiSS	1	88,127	48,539	7,335	15%
Informatics	2	185,016	114,674	4,792	5%
MGPHS	1				
Physics	3	174,515	106,403	18,886	29%
PPLS	2	421,374	258,333	20,961	12%
SPS	2	14,029	8,451	2,429	29%
VetMed	4	144,276	99,070	28,022	29%

Demand from students

Continuing on from the collaborative Universitas 21 pilot project in November 2014, a second instance of the course was delivered in March 2015. This was a private run of the Edinburgh Critical Thinking MOOC, offered only to students at U21 institutions. This second iteration saw 1,584 students sign up from around the world, 997 participated in the course and 404 students completed; 131 Edinburgh students signed up and 26 completed. Across the two iterations, 407 students engaged and 48 completed.

As part of the evaluation survey, students participating in the second iteration were asked about their interest in recognition of participation options – of the 101 students who replied, 94% expressed interest in University formal acknowledgement, e.g. presence on their academic transcript, and 80% were interested in the potential for academic credit.

There are no current plans for the pilot to be extended at this time, although the feedback from staff and students was very positive – 82% of participants rated the experience very good > excellent – and there are many options available for further collaboration. The U21 conference (October 2015) will reflect on the experience and suggest next steps for the initiative.

EUSA are keen to mobilise students as part of the upcoming Scottish Elections and a politics MOOC, which connects with high school pupils, is in discussion with Prof Charlie Jeffery and Dr Alan Convery (SPS) who also led both the Scottish Referendum and General Election courses. Repurposing content, both Edinburgh created and external, and joining up initiatives, such as Innovative Learning Week, Digital Edge, Digital Footprint and Community engagement with MOOCs and wherever possible in collaboration with students is the main aspiration for the next 6 months of development.

Demand for credit-bearing provisions

There has been increasing demand for credit-bearing options and pathways offered through or recognised by the University from learners on MOOCs. As MOOCs themselves gain currency, demand is set to grow further to recognise the MOOC experience as part of CPD portfolios or to use MOOC certificates as a stepping-stone into degree programmes, potentially including RPL contributions. A paper outlining the options for MOOC > credit articulation models and implications for central support services, e.g. course finder and application processes, will be developed by end 2015 for further discussion.

We have also seen a rise in University postgraduate taught applicants indicating they applied to their degree programme as a result of studying with Edinburgh on a MOOC: 45 applicants in 2013; 104 applicants in 2014; and 88 applicants in 2015 (snapshot taken 03.08.15).

Applicant marketing respondents selecting 'MOOC or free online course'	Study delivery method applied to	Completed application	Converted to Unconditional Firm (UF) student status	Conversion from completed application
237 applicants (2013-15)	ODL = 103	88	31	36%
	On-campus = 134	114	10	9%

MOOC Strategy

Over the summer, Prof Jeff Haywood (VP Digital Education) convened a group of senior stakeholders, with broad representation from around the University, to discuss the longer-term vision of MOOCs and strategy formation. There was consensus that MOOCs are a tool to facilitate key University strategies and priorities – rather than requiring an independent vision, MOOCs should align with existing strategies and be articulated within these contexts. A series of meetings were then held with key strategy owners, e.g. Internationalisation and Recruitment, to embed the ownership of MOOCs across the whole institution, which has been positively received. The process of proposing and approving courses will also change in accordance with this approach – in addition to going through normal course approval processes (requiring approval of School Boards of Studies) - proposals will need to justify development relative to strategic alignment and a new MOOC Strategy Group will be established to consider and prioritise strategically significant new course investment. These new processes will be established by early 2016.

Amy Woodgate

Project Manager – IS Special Projects, MOOCs & DEI
26th August 2015

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee
3 September 2015

Student representation for Distance Learners task group implementation progress report

Brief description of the paper, including a statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities

The paper provides an update on the implementation work of the task group to date, a further update will be provided at the end of academic year 2015/16 on further progress.

The paper is relevant to the University's Strategic Plan Strategic Goal of Excellence in Education and Strategic Theme of Outstanding Student Experience.

Action requested

For information – the committee are asked to note the position that Schools should share University student email addresses with Student Representatives as a matter of course so that Student Representatives can contact the students that they represent – see recommendation 1.

Communication/Implementation

The progress report outlines updates directed to Schools and students via updated guidance and email communication as well as a new webpage to be accessible by students and staff seeking information.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? Yes. The development of training and updating of guidance will involve staff resource in the services identified.

Risk Assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? No

Equality and Diversity

Has due consideration been given to the equality impact of this paper? The paper itself is not subject to an Equality Impact Assessment. Policies and procedures are subject to an Equality Impact Assessment. An Equality Impact Assessment of revised/new policies and guidance owned by Academic Services will be carried out.

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Originator of the paper

Mrs Erin Jackson, Task group convener
August 2015

Any other relevant information, including keywords

Distance learning, student representation, ODL, EUSA

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee
3 September 2015

Student representation for Distance Learners task group implementation progress report

Recommendation	Action taken	Progress towards completion
<p>1. Sharing of student University email address within student representation system</p>	<p>Following discussion with Academic Services, EUSA, Records Management and Student Systems, the following wording can now be issued to Schools regarding the sharing of student university email addresses:</p> <p>Schools should share with student representatives the University student email address of the students they represent or facilitate alternative ways for reps to contact classmates e.g. via the VLE or m-list</p> <p>The student representative may use this only in their role as a student representative. If any student wishes to opt out from this, they should tell the School's Teaching Office/Graduate School or equivalent. The School is responsible for removing the relevant student's email from the list before sharing the list with the Student Representative(s). If a student wishes to 'opt out' of receiving emails from their representative after the School has already provided email addresses to the representative, the School is responsible for asking the representative to remove that email address from future circulations, and the Student Representative must delete promptly the details of any student who asks them to do so</p>	<p>Communication of new procedure:</p> <p>An all staff and all student email signed on behalf of Professor Tina Harrison and Jonny Ross-Tatam, EUSA President to be circulated in mid-September updating on new arrangements and student representation in general</p> <p>Briefing document to be emailed to Schools with ODL programmes updating on new arrangements – mid September (see recommendation 2 below)</p> <p>Briefing document to be emailed to School Teaching Administrators, Directors of Teaching and School Directors of Quality updating on new arrangements and operational points to note in relation to data protection</p> <p>Policy/Guidance updates:</p> <p>New guidance will be developed for Schools outlining the expectations about sharing email addresses, mechanisms for doing so and data protection information. We aim to send this guidance to Teaching Administrators in Schools prior to the all staff and all student email so that Schools are briefed in advance to be able to handle any questions/queries from Course organisers etc.</p>

		<p>The following Policies have been updated to include information about sharing student university email addresses:</p> <p>Programme and Course Handbooks Policy – approved by CSPC June 2015</p> <p>Updated information on student representation in Course/Programme Handbooks focussing on the purpose and operation of the student representation system, and indicating that Schools should share students' university email address with student representatives as a matter of course and that if any student wishes to opt out from this they should contact the School's Teaching Office/Graduate School or equivalent.</p> <p>Policy on Disclosure of Student Information- updated June 2015</p> <p>A new paragraph has been inserted stating that 'Class, programme or similar student representatives should receive the University email addresses only of the cohort they represent; They may use this only in their role as a student representative, and must delete promptly the details of any student who asks them to do so'</p> <p>Student Representative training</p> <p>EUSA Student representative training includes information explaining to students their obligations under Data Protection</p>
<p>2. Schools briefing document</p>	<p>Implementation group to compose a document to assist colleagues in Schools with ODL programmes in matters such as ODL student engagement, enabling ODL student reps to participate in meetings, practical matters around scheduling and running virtual meetings, training information to assist with</p>	<p>Schools briefing document currently being drafted and to be emailed to Schools with ODL programmes following all staff and all student email</p>

	ODL meetings and link to new ODL student representation webpage	
3. Development of new ODL student representation web presence within the Online Learning area of the main university website	New page currently being developed by University web team – live date estimated Sept 2015	Communicate new page to Schools with ODL programmes via Schools briefing document Links to new page from other relevant web pages, including EUSA website and programme pages
4. Updating existing guidance	The task group identified existing guidance, relevant to the ODL student representation system for updating by the start of AY 2015/16 Academic Services own a significant number of guidance documents and policies which are listed in the following column EUSA also has important practical guidance for student representatives to be adapted to ensure inclusivity for distance learners, not least the student rep training materials which are being developed on an online form and as videos	The following guidance documents have been updated : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principles for Student Staff Liaison Committee – for approval at QAC Sept 2015 • Guidance for Students -External Examiner Summary Reports at Student Staff Liaison Committees – for approval at QAC Sept 2015 • Guidance for Internal Reviews – review team administrator guidance and guidance for Subject areas/Schools • Online Distance Learning Policy – approved at CSPC June 2015 • EUSA and University Student Engagement Statement – approved at QAC May 2015 EUSA Student Rep training materials have been updated
5. Briefing for training providers	The task group identified a number of sources of training and practical guidance in relation to technologies, meeting protocols and management such as HR Learning and Development courses, IS and IAD The training providers were contacted to request that training provision accommodate specific requirements to support ODL student representation	HR Learning and Development have confirmed that they will contact the external provider of the Effective Chairing course for relevant content to be included, in house provider of the committee servicing course will include relevant content LTSTS – information on booking video conference suite is available on the IS website. Guidance on video conference system available on V Scene.

QAC: 03.09.15
H/02/28/02

QAC 15/16 1 M

		<p>LTSTS have followed up with JISC to ask about availability of more simplified guidance</p> <p>IAD provide courses, guidance and support in relation to professional and transferrable skills and information relevant to student reps and channel this effectively e.g. via the IAD website, social media, newsletters etc</p>
--	--	---

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee
3 September 2015

**Internal Review:
Summary report of recommendations remitted to the University
and other areas**

Brief description of the paper, including a statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities

The paper contains a summary of the responses to recommendations from internal review reports remitted to the University and other areas of the institution from academic year 2011/12 to 2013/14.

The paper is relevant to the University's strategic goal of 'Excellence in education' and the strategic theme of 'Outstanding student experience'.

Action requested

For information

Communication/Implementation

The report will be used by Academic Services to continue to track responses and identify potential enhancements from internal reviews.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? No.

Risk Assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? No

Equality and Diversity

Has due consideration been given to the equality impact of this paper? Yes

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Originator of the paper

Gillian Mackintosh
Academic Policy Officer
Academic Services

26 August 2015

Any other relevant information, including keywords

Internal Review

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee
3 September 2015

Internal Review:

Summary report of recommendations remitted to the University and other areas

Year	PPR/TPR	Recommendation	Responsibility of	Response (from year on report)
2011/12				
Feb 2012	TPR of Biomedical Sciences	The review team recommends the formulation of a detailed 5-year strategic plan for teaching	School of Biomedical Sciences, College of Medicine & Veterinary Medicine, School of Biological Sciences	The Director of Teaching will be tasked with producing a detailed 5-year strategic plan for teaching. This plan will highlight policies that will be addressed in a shorter time frame, i.e. 12-18 months, and also flag up issues that might arise over a longer period, i.e. 8- 10 years. The drafting of the plan will be overseen by the Teaching Executive and will involve discussions with the Director of Learning & Teaching and other staff in the College of Medicine & Veterinary Medicine as well as consultation and dialogue with the School of Biological Sciences. The initial strategic plan will be produced before the start of the 2013-14 academic year and will be updated on an annual basis with major reviews being developed as required
Nov 2011	TPR English Literature	College to consider encouraging others Schools to implementing a similar support system as appropriate	CHSS	Generally across the College, Schools tend to organise by course rather than programme cohorts so that English Literature is more unusual in the way that it support students. However, discussions were being held at University level at the same time that the TPR was undertaken to discuss a new Student Support System that would provide enhanced support to students in addition to support provided by course or programme administrative staff. The new system brought into being School Student Support Teams and academic Personal Tutors (PT) with each student being allocated a PT. Wherever possible, the PT remains with the student over their four year degree programme ensuring consistency of support.

				There is a great deal of work currently being undertaken across the University considering the overall student experience of the programme, rather than just through individual components such as courses or year of study cohorts. This work is designed to promote greater programme cohesion and will promote greater identity with the programme by the students.
		School and College to consider creating career-development opportunities for administrative and secretarial staff to sustain quality provision for students	CHSS	The information provided by HR in Appendix "recognition for contribution to role and appropriate remuneration" is relevant to this recommendation
Nov 2011	TPR of Physics and Astronomy	Concerning student support, the panel recommends that UoE and its Colleges review the DoS system, in order to avoid unevenness in the DoS support received by students and to clarify the role of administrative staff in providing pastoral and academic support.	UoE and its Colleges	<p>The Personal Tutor system has been implemented within the School and all students have been assigned a Personal tutor and all semester 1 meetings have been completed. School tutoring statement in place and initial student information wiki with statements and FAQ are in place. Staff resources for Personal Tutors have been updated and available on-line. The enhances Teaching Office support for Personal Tutors is in place and in particular there is enhanced monitoring of student progress available. This is currently implemented via LEARN.</p> <p>Risk: New Personal Tutor system will not fulfil student expectations.</p> <p>System in place by September 2012, enhancements to resources and development of extra support for Personal Tutors is on-going.</p>
		The School is recommended to work in partnership with the Careers Service, and consultation with the student body, to explore new ways to support broader career awareness and the development of skills relevant for careers that fall out with the focus of academic Physics, with a particular focus on pre-Honours years.	School in partnership with the Careers Service	There have been regular meetings with the Careers Service and DoT/Senior Tutor. A Personal Tutor Group meeting to raise the profile of careers and support available was implemented in October 2012, but student engagement was very disappointing and there are on-going discussions with Ongoing the Careers Service and students on how to improve this; perhaps via ILW meetings; PTAS award for alumni mentoring scheme started by September 2012. The staff are in place and is currently identifying suitable Alumni. It is expected that a trial scheme

				will be launched to students in mid-2013. Barrier: We are at the moment unable to identify an Employability Officer to lead developments. We believe that this post should be filled by someone with personal experience, ideally recent, outside academia. At present we have no academic staff that fulfil this criteria however the Senior Tutor has significant experience from a decade ago and is currently using her experience to cover this role for the medium term. Risk: Student engagement in any employability scheme has been very disappointing; it is unclear how to address this
Feb 2012	TPR of Social Anthropology	It was noted that if there is further expansion of student numbers, it is important that staffing levels expand correspondingly and it is recommended that the School and College ensure that academic and support staff staffing levels keep pace accordingly.	CHSS	Five more lecturers have been appointed in Social Anthropology over the past year. To help cope with ongoing increases in administrative burdens, two additional senior admin staff have been appointed in the School.
		It recommended that a clear description of roles and responsibilities of those involved in student support (both the current system and the soon to be introduced University-wide system) should be sought as a matter of priority.	CHSS	University-wide new Personal Tutor and Student Support system adopted and announced online to all students and staff. New induction for PTs. SPS website has enhanced clarification of support staff roles and responsibilities, and all support for UGs is now organized under the 'Undergraduate School' administrative system with help from the newly appointed School's Deputy Administrator and Undergraduate School Administrator
2012/13				
Nov 2012	TPR of Childhood Practice	The review team recommend that the APASQA liaise with the SSSC to discuss the alignment of SSSC quality assurance requirements and standards with those of the University and discuss the development of this for future reviews	Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance	The Programme Director emailed the School Director of Quality and the SSSC contact person to arrange a meeting about the way forward.
		The review team recommend the development of a three-way partnership agreement between the University, the workplace and the student	Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance	A three-way partnership agreement called 'Guidelines on the roles of student, university and employers' was created in July 2013. A meeting was conducted between the Scottish Social Services Council, a final year BACP student rep and BACP staff,

				which allowed the development of agreed guidelines in relation to expectations, roles and responsibilities.
		The review team recommend that the Head of Student and Academic Services group give consideration to the availability of Student Support Services to ensure that they meet the needs of students with unconventional patterns of study, such as those on this programme. We see this as an important general issue if the University is fully and equitably to support an increasingly diverse student body.	Head of Student and Academic Services group	In Semester 1 a meeting was arranged between the BACP Programme Director and the Undergraduate Teaching Office staff. The Undergraduate Teaching Office staff were very supportive and it was agreed that a meeting should be arranged with the Student Support Office too to take discussions forward. In 2014 (Semester 2 and Summer 2014) a further meeting will be arranged with the Student Support Office and the Undergraduate Teaching Office to take this forward.
	TPR of Classics	The University provide some information on copyright but it is at a very high level and not really of practical use for users within Schools. The review team recognise that this is an issue that staff require help and guidance on and recommend that Information Services (IS) are approached with a view to providing more guidance on what copyright is, what it covers, and do's and don'ts with regard to the learning and teaching environment.	Information Services	There is now updated guidance on the Information Services website.
	TPR of Earth Sciences	The review team recommends that the Teaching Organisation collates records of the educational professional development of its teaching staff and the School incentivises staff to undertake training in education	School with IAD	All academic staff currently receive a tariff in the workload model for completing the Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice and we promote staff, particularly, new staff taking the second level of the programme. Promotion of available training opportunities will be distributed to academic staff. Teaching Committee to approve rewarding innovation policy
Feb 2013	TPR of Economics	It is recommended that such considerations [incorporation of rewards for different forms of excellence in School work allocation	Director of Human Resources	The Director of Human Resources responded as follows: "I am pleased to confirm that we have already a significant body of work in train, led by Dr Sue Rigby and Professor Alan Murray, with input from Professor Charlie Jeffrey and Professor Graeme

		<p>model] are fed into the development of the University rewards system.</p>		<p>Laurie, which will go beyond this particular recommendation, in producing exemplars of excellence across all aspects of our academic portfolio, that is to say, these will address how to evidence excellence in learning and teaching; research impact; and interdisciplinary work, as well as how to embed these considerations into School workload models. We would be very pleased to work with Economics on further developing their current model. It must be stressed that workload allocation models have to be developed at disciplinary level. Thus, whilst the University rewards system and guidance on work allocation identify clear principles that should be incorporated in such models, these have to be tailored at local level, in order to be relevant to the particular disciplinary field. The University has already had much success in blending these principles of subsidiarity and consistency of practice and we will be building on these strong foundations in further enhancing our rewards systems.”</p>
		<p>The review team recommends that the Enhancing Student Support Project considers making coursework marks for all subjects available to Personal Tutors to allow an overview of student performance</p>	<p>Enhancing Student Support Project</p>	<p>This has been referred to the Enhancing Student Support project. The following response has been provided: The Enhancing Student Support project intends to make coursework marks for all subjects available to Personal Tutors to allow an overview of student performance. However, this enhancement to the current PT system is dependent on IT systems developments being made during the implementation of other projects across the University (such as the Programme and Course Information Management project) and therefore the timing of its delivery is uncertain at this point.</p>
		<p>The need for further University guidance to ensure consistency of practice [in Special Circumstances cases] was noted, together with more specific guidance on Special Circumstances for students. The review team recommends that these issues are considered by the Senate Curriculum and Student Progression Committee (CSPC) Special Circumstances task group.</p>	<p>Senate Curriculum and Student Progression Committee (CSPC)</p>	<p>Economics has noted that a Task Group of the Senatus Curriculum and Student Progression Committee has been reviewing the Special Circumstances Policy for the University. A revised policy will be implemented across the University for all assessments relating to courses which run from 16 September 2013 onwards</p>

2013/14				
March 2014	TPR of Chemistry	The review team recommend that the Timetabling Unit / Timetabling Project Board continue to address issues with the University timetabling system to improve the effectiveness of this system for School administrative and academic staff	Timetabling Unit / Timetabling Project Board	The problems highlighted in the Analytical Report have largely been resolved. In particular the introduction of the Course Timetable Browser within EUCLID has enabled Personal Tutors to sensibly manage the task of constructing workable timetables for their students.
		The review team recommend that the College of Science and Engineering continue to work with the School to address issues relating to social and study space	Head of College / College Registrar/ Head of School	Substantial progress has been made on plans for a major refurbishment of the Joseph Black Building. This will include a large open atrium space with all teaching spaces being moved adjacent. This will not only substantially improve the communal space for all in the school, but also create a teaching hub with new, expanded teaching spaces. The appointed architects have provided plans which meet these and other needs in the school through a thorough consultation process, and these have the approval of the College. The timescale for the work is as yet undecided, but progress should be made on a 2-3 year timescale.
		The review team recommend that the Institute for Academic Development assess the need for a tutor and demonstrator course that is specific to the requirements of science and engineering tutors and demonstrators.	Institute for Academic Development	We have reviewed the courses currently provided by the IAD for tutors and demonstrators and plan to continue to use these as introductory for all new laboratory demonstrators. In addition, we are creating a bespoke in-house course for Chemistry demonstrators to cover topics and issues specific to the School.
Oct 2013	TPR of Divinity	Recognising that effective joint degree administration is relevant across the College, the review team recommends that the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, College of Humanities and Social Science reviews the effectiveness of mechanisms for the administration of joint degrees, with a focus on the student experience, formal and consistent mechanisms to deal with issues that arise, and the curriculum development process	Dean of Undergraduate Studies, CHSS	CHSS recognizes this as an issue across the College, which teaches a very large number of joint programmes. The management of these programmes and, in particular, the student experience on such programmes has been discussed both at Learning and Teaching Committee and by senior management at College level. It has already been agreed that all joint programmes will have a Programme Director (in reality one director may look after a group of programmes) and will have a named responsible person in the partner school. Work on the student experience on these programmes will also be undertaken over the next academic year and this

				<p>recommendation will be taken into account in that work. More broadly, as part of the new College of Humanities & Social Science Learning and Teaching Strategy, a number of initiatives aimed at improving the student experience will impact on these students. The most important of these is the Programme Pathways Project, which is looking at ways to bring more flexibility into how a student puts her/his programme together and the possibility that specific joint degrees may not be necessary to the same extent as is currently the case.</p>
		<p>It is recommended that the College of Humanities and Social Science reviews barriers posed by the current financial and curriculum models to the internal student mobility that is promoted by the University as a feature of its undergraduate degree programmes</p>	<p>Dean of Undergraduate Studies, CHSS</p>	<p>The potential disconnect between the claim of flexibility in our four-year programmes and the reality is a starting point for the Programme Pathways Project and this issue is being actively reviewed by College and schools.</p>
		<p>It is recommended that the College of Humanities and Social Science clarifies to the School how intake targets are arrived at in order to assist the School in aligning its recruitment efforts with recruitment target</p>	<p>Head of Undergraduate Admissions, CHSS</p>	<p>Every year the overall College Intake Target is set by negotiations between the College Senior Management and Institutional Governance and Strategic Planning in October/November. UG individual School Intake Targets are then set, based on the institutional college targets, for each College by negotiation for all Schools in October/November. These targets are initially set and decided between the Head of School, Director of Professional Services, Helen Taylor in HSS Planning and Resources, Frank Gribben - College Registrar and UG Head of Admissions, based on the final intake of students from the previous admissions cycle, information from the School Plan incorporating any indication of expansion and the College Plan for future growth. Once targets are initially set by all parties, UG Head of Admissions will then finesse these provisional intake targets with information based on conversion data from the previous admissions cycle, and including any specialist admissions information/sector developments they are aware of. These final suggested Intake Targets are then sent back to Head of School and Director of Professional Services for approval. In the 2014 admissions cycle we used a new approach</p>

				for RUK intake targets, which were based on creating a minimum and maximum RUK School target and this allowed the UG admissions office to have more flexibility in achieving the targets needed, as long as, where possible, the outcome target always lay between the minimum and maximum numbers set. The Head of Undergraduate Admissions and Associate Dean for Recruitment and Admissions will be meeting in the near future with all Heads of Schools and Directors of Professional Services to discuss the approach taken in 2014 and the ways in which the intake target setting could be enhanced for the 2015 admissions cycle.
		It is recommended that the Enhancing Student Support Project evaluate and consider for wider adoption the School's model of week 5 audit in each Semester and Semester 1 performance feedback meetings for students with their Personal Tutor and its programme of specialist training for Personal Tutors who have a particular interest in and aptitude for the pastoral care of students with more complex psychological or emotional difficulties	Enhancing Student Support Project	The University has in 2014-15 introduced a new system of attendance monitoring which has enabled rapid identification of students who are persistently absent. During the academic session 2014/15 the Enhancing Student Support (ESS) Student Support Implementation Group (SSIG) will focus on the further development and enhancement of the Personal Tutors system in response the recommendations and issues raised in the phase one evaluation. As part of this development the number of scheduled tutorials and their place in each semester will be reviewed for each year for taught programmes. The induction, training and supporting resources for all Personal Tutors (PT) will also be reviewed in the context of developing and potentially expanding the scope of the PT role to align with the aspirations articulated in the key principles for the future design of the undergraduate curriculum
		It is recommended that the Enhancing Student Support project explores the feasibility of offering training to students in use of the relevant [Personal Tutor interaction] software	Enhancing Student Support Project	As identified in point 8 above and in response to phase one evaluation, the Personal Tutor online tools will be reviewed regarding their ease of use and the training resources redeveloped to more effectively support both students and staff. The effective use of the online tools is currently of concern regarding the overall volume and scope of usage and will be a focus of enhancement activity during SSIG phase three in 2014/15
		A current University project, 'Programme and Course Information Management', includes	Programme and Course Information	CSPC has now agreed the principles developed and recommended by the Programme and Course Information

		information provided to students to assist course choice and student engagement with this information] within its scope, and it is recommended that it includes this information from the TPR in its considerations.	Management Project	Management Project (PCIM) for the design and development of an enhanced course descriptor and the development of core content to be contained in each course handbook. The overall aim of this project is to ensure that students and their academic advisors have timely access to consistent and accurate information to enable informed decisions to be made for course selection. In the School of Divinity, with effect from January 2014, the semester 2 meetings of students with their Personal Tutors now include a specific agenda item offering guidance on course selection for the following year.
Nov 2013	TPR of Geography	The review team recommends that the Senate Convenors Forum is sensitive to the additional pressures placed on Schools by the volume and frequency of University wide strategic initiative	Senate Convenors Forum	Convenors' Forum noted the recommendation from the TPR of Geography at its meeting on 16 June 2014.
March 2014	TPR of Politics and International Relations	The review team believes that there will be an increasing demand for feedback on At school level, we are discussing providing written feedback on individual exam scripts. This will not be extensive, but will be complemented by the generic feedback on exams we already provide online. We will continue to encourage students with queries to make an appointment to view their exam paper with the Course Convenor. Ongoing examinations and therefore recommends that the subject area liaise with the School and College on the appropriate measures that need to be taken to provide more appropriate feedback on examinations	Subject area with the School and College	At school level, we now provide written feedback on individual exam scripts. This is not extensive – two or three sentences which summarise the key strengths and weaknesses – but is complemented by the generic feedback on exams we have long provided online. We continue to encourage students with queries to make an appointment to view their exam paper with the Course Convenor. We continue to ensure that all relevant course convenors post their generic exam feedback on their course's Learn page in a timely manner by keeping an up-to-date record administered by the Subject Secretary.
		The review team notes the difficulty of students gaining access to the full range of their academic performance (component marks) and recommends that this should be	Subject area with the School and College	Things are better but still a bit of a challenge – not helped by the decommissioning of one of the computer labs and the introduction of new courses requiring tutorials in the labs – The option of allowing staff to exit from Citrix has helped

		raised at the appropriate School and College level committees for discussion and action		tremendously but access to software for teaching in the labs remains problematic for UG courses.
March 2014	TPR of Social Policy	It is recommended that, in order to avoid over-reliance on the Senior Tutor, Social Policy, in conjunction with the College of Humanities and Social Science, produces an online resource pack for Personal Tutors	Social Policy and College	Online resources to support staff in teaching roles operate primarily at School level. Such resources have been stronger at PG level than for UG teaching, and the new director of UG teaching is undertaking a review of such resources.
		It is recommended that the Institute for Academic Development considers re-introducing University-level training for Postgraduate Tutors	IAD	University level training for Postgraduate Tutors already exists. The IAD provides courses and resources for those with tutoring, demonstrating and related responsibilities

Year	PPR/TPR	Recommendation	Responsibility of	Response (from year on report)
2011/12				
May 2012	PPR of Chemistry	The Panel supports the School's ambition to develop a common area for research students and recommends that the College Planning team considers medium term funding priorities to assist the school to develop space to the standard of the recently renovated JMCB student area and the School of Engineering Crush Hall area	College of Science and Engineering and the University.	As part of an ongoing review of the School of Chemistry estate, plans will be formulated for development of a social area for students and staff in the Joseph Black Building, for discussion with the College. As part of a reorganisation of NMR Services in the School, relocation of equipment in Summer 2013 will free-up an area which would be suitable for such development.
March 2012	PPR of Engineering	The Panel recommends that the College reviews the provision of management data to Schools and works with the Schools and GaSP to identify what data is required and to provide access to standard BOXI reports to retrieve this data from EUCLID.	Dean of Quality Assurance, CSE	Currently following up on response
		The Panel requests that SACS provides 'hands on' training sessions in BOXI for staff to compliment the current online training provision.	Head of Academic Affairs, CSE	Currently following up on response
2012/13				
May 2013	PPR of GeoSciences	The review team noted that questions about the capacity and efficiency of Euclid / BOXI as tools to manage PGR student records has been raised in other PPR reports in 2011-12, and recommends that Student Admissions and Curricula Systems (SACS) take action to improve the capacity of Euclid / BOXI to support the administration and quality assurance of PGR provision (2.2.1).	Student Admissions and Curricula Systems (SACS)	SACS has extended EUCLID capacity for PGR to include recording the date of PhD thesis submission. This is currently available to schools/colleges via BOXI's 'EUCLID Schools Student Management' (ESSMU) universe. GaSP and Student Services are still developing reports, with the final versions available as BI Suite reports. Schools will be able to export the reports from BI Suite to Excel. GaSP / Student Systems will be organising a training session on using the BI Suite reports in August. A report on 4 year PhDs is still being developed.
		The review team recommends that the University Scholarships and Student Funding Services review and development the guidance and support provided for Principal's Career Development PhD Scholarships	University Scholarships and Student Funding Services	Scholarships and Student Funding Services is responsible for requesting the central university funds for half of the costs of the Principal's Career Development Scholarships (PCDS), promoting the scheme and ensuring that all scholarships are awarded each year. The Institute for Academic Development

				<p>provides training and development to scholars in receipt of a Principal's Career Development Scholarship. Working with the Edinburgh Beltane Beacon for Public Engagement they provide a range of additional guidance and support for the scholars which is already available at:</p> <p>http://www.ed.ac.uk/schoolsdepartments/institute-academicdevelopment/postgraduate/doctoral/careermanagement/principals-scholarships</p> <p>A case study for each of the four career development areas with the PCDS scheme will be added to the website</p>
May 2013	PPR of LLC	The Panel was concerned that the timing of the University's QA cycle does not allow for effective reporting of postgraduate activity. There is currently very limited opportunity for external examiner reports to be assessed before the School's QA report is due. It is recommended that the University take this into account and take measures to change the QA reporting mechanisms by the forthcoming academic year.	Academic Services	The College Deans for Quality Assurance have agreed that from the current reporting cycle Schools will be asked to provide a supplement to the School annual quality report to College containing themes from postgraduate external examiner reports. Each College will set a timescale for receipt of the supplement in relation to its preparation of the College annual report to Senate Quality Assurance Committee.
		The Panel recommends that action is taken to ensure that all PhD external examiner reports are copied to the School by the College so that the Graduate School is informed of the result of vivas	College Postgraduate Office, LLC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part II reports are now copied to supervisors following their approval by HSS PG Examinations Committee. • We will review the possible value of these reports to QA monitoring at School and subject area level as part of our review of PhD provision in the school. • Possible move to an electronic system is under discussion at College level, which would make this process much easier. Year-on Update We have made changes to processes to increase communication between internal examiners and Graduate School. Discussion on circulation of reports deferred until anticipated move to electronic system.
		The First Year Review for PhD students is currently carried out in different formats across the School. The Panel strongly recommends that a consistent process be	LLC, College Postgraduate Office	Internal review of PhD processes and provision to be completed by summer 2014; review of PG Management Committee remit and responsibilities to be completed by summer 2014. Changes

		instated as part of the PhD 'road map' with a similar format to apply to all students. However, it is recognised that this should also allow subject areas appropriate flexibility (e.g. some students may only submit a written document, with others give an oral presentation or produce a film). The Panel also suggests that the School consider using 'arms-length' interviews in the future, giving the opportunity for students to be reviewed at a distance from their supervisory team		to PhD process (1st year review, research methods training) to be trialled in 2014/15; reviewed and confirmed for 2015/16. Internal review of PhD processes and provision has been completed and approved by PG Management Committee. Revisions to be recommended in 2014/15 and implementation agreed between subject areas and Graduate School; to be mandatory from 2015/16.
		The Panel heard that staff are concerned that the University's Postgraduate Research Assessment Regulations for examination recommendations equate with timeframe and not the nature of the required corrections. It is recommended that this be reviewed by the University and changes made as a matter of urgency as students are currently disadvantaged and the quality of the examination process may be affected.	Academic Services	This is being taken forward in the context of the annual Assessment Regulations review.
		The Panel was concerned that full IS facilities are not available 24/7 which is detrimental to ODL students and recommends that further training be offered to all Information Services help-desk staff.	Information Services, LLC	Currently following up on response
		The Panel recommends that the School investigate the possibility of running School level research methods training for PhD students in conjunction with IAD. Centralised training workshops provided by the IAD are promoted by supervisors on an ad hoc basis and the Panel heard that some students and staff did not view the current provision as relevant or beneficial. The panel recommends	LLC, Institute for Academic Development	Remit of Postgraduate Management Committee to be established, in order to establish clear responsibilities for progress monitoring and training. • Membership of Postgraduate Management Committee to be reviewed, with possibility of establishing new post of Director of PhD programmes, with overall responsibility for progress monitoring and training. • Working group to be established to review processes for recruitment, admission, progress monitoring and training of PhD students, with key aim to improve consistency across School. • PGMC to review recommendations of Working

		that the School develop a cohesive policy to promote skills training for PhD students.		<p>Group and work with Heads of Subject to trial and then implement proposals.</p> <p>Internal review of PhD processes and provision has been completed and approved by PG Management Committee. Revisions to be recommended in 2014/15 and implementation agreed between subject areas and Graduate School; to be mandatory from 2015/16.</p>
March 2013	PPR of ECA	The Panel was concerned that the provision of Research Methods training is variable, with a variety of courses being offered. It is recommended that a structured programme, allowing for discipline-specific content, be developed.	ECA (with coordination with IAD)	For and during 13/14, academic colleagues will be exploring the Research Methods training to confirm core requirements and discipline-specific divergences, and how best to structure training to accommodate these. We expect the Deputy Director of PG Studies to coordinate ECA and IAD colleagues to develop appropriate research methods training provision for 14/15 onwards All five subject-areas have agreed to provide some tailored Research Method sessions with IAD being used to ensure core research training is available to all PGR students within ECA. SGS will also be providing research methods to AHRC-funded students across Scotland. Where possible this provision will also be used as a training resource for all ECA students .
		The Panel shared ECA's concern that there is currently a high proportion of male PhD supervisors and that this may cause difficulties for female students needing to discuss pastoral issues and recommends that female academic members of staff be encouraged to consider supervision in the future, with appropriate mentoring and training opportunities to be provided by ECA and more widely.	ECA (with coordination with IAD and CHSS)	This issue is expected to reduce over time, as more colleagues undertake second supervision leading to a successful completion, before they take on first supervisor duties. At present, the ECA Director of PG Studies provides a route for female students to discuss pastoral issues with a female academic, if required. Colleagues will be encouraged during annual review to undertake supervision. Mentoring and training will be provided via the normal routes – for instance, 2 x ECA-specific IAD supervisor training sessions have been organised for September.
		The Panel heard positive feedback about the supervisor briefings coordinated by the CHSS Postgraduate Office which some academic staff had attended. It is recommended that in	ECA (with coordination with CHSS)	2 ECA-specific sessions have been organised for September 2013. CHSS PG Office are seeking funding for an additional post; if successful, CHSS will have capacity to liaise with IAD to provide

		line with QAA guidelines all supervisors attend a briefing session at least every five years.		reminders to ECA colleagues as to when their last training was. There will also be further CHSS-provided training events in the future. This is now monitored and staff are reminded about Supervisor Training on a regular basis
		The Panel acknowledged that the current process for the nomination of PGT external examiners is lengthy and recommends that this is investigated further with the College Postgraduate Office	ECA and CHSS	ECA and CHSS recognises that this is an issue for the whole CHSS college, and so discussion with all Schools is required. CHSS will set up a working group, with input from all Schools, to review all processes related to external examiners, from nomination to reporting and payment. CHSS have now advised Schools: 1. After discussion with Academic Services, there will now be no change to the nomination and appointment process. Schools will continue to nominate external examiners to the College and the College will formally appoint them. 2. From 1st April 2014, the college budget for external examiner fee payment and expenses will be devolved to Schools. 3. The College will continue to receive the External Examiner Report and Schools will arrange payment upon notification to do so from CHSS. 4. PGR External Examiner administration remains the same and College will continue to pay fees and expenses.
2013/14				
May 2014	PPR of Education	The review team recommends that the University Learning and Teaching committee consider how to devise a costing model for digital programmes, including on-campus and distance learning, to enable Colleges and Schools to form a coherent strategy and produce meaningful projections of programme costs.	Senate Learning and Teaching Committee	At the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee meeting on the 28 th January 2015 it was minuted that these matters were being progressed by the Colleges and this did not therefore require further consideration by Learning and Teaching Committee.
		It was recommended that the University, through the Learning and Teaching Committee, build an understanding of MHSE's good practice in the area of Assessment and Feedback.	Senate Learning and Teaching Committee	The University is holding a 'Learning from Internal Review' event on 15 June 2015. Teaching Programme Reviews and Postgraduate Programme Reviews identify many areas of good practice which are valuable to share across the University, and during the session colleagues from The Moray House School of Education and from other recent reviews will share some of these examples.

				The session will provide opportunities to discuss practical approaches to enhancing the student experience. The event is aimed at colleagues who have recently been involved in a TPR or PPR or are preparing for a review in AY 2015/16
		The panel recommends the School, with the help of the College, consider its fundamental aims and raison d'être within the wider context of the College of Humanities and Social Science and the University of Edinburgh	School and CHSS	The School of Education has a core responsibility to provide professional degree programmes for teacher training and career development at UG, PGT and Doctoral level. This is in line with a number of Schools with strong professional focus. This has some impact on PG admissions since most graduate teachers do not continue into post-graduate study. However, Moray House does attract high numbers of overseas students, often funded by overseas governments. The cohort is therefore different from the University norm and the School seeks a balance in its academic and professional profiles.
March 2014	PPR of Informatics	The Review Team recommends that the Student Systems reviews corporate system capability to better match Theon capability so that other Schools across the University can have access to similar system functionality to support administration and quality assurance of PGR provision	Student Systems	<p>Early discussions with Student Systems have taken place, with Informatics representation added to a cross-College PGR Student Systems Working Group. We expect a further meeting later in Semester 1 and are awaiting contact from the Director of Student Services.</p> <p>Further discussion with Student Systems has taken place including an internal demonstration of PGR provision in Theon. This demonstration has fed into the development of a paper which is going to REC to propose the start of a development of more comprehensive PGR functionality within EUCLID. This development will be phased in but the long term aim is to pull all of the centrally delivered PGR functionality into one system and to develop some of the functionality within Theon in EUCLID so it is available to other schools</p>
		The Review Team recommends that the College review supervisor briefings to ensure that supervisors receive adequate training to manage the student experience and are made aware that students are expected to complete	College of Science and Engineering	The College's Dean of Students and Academic Affairs Officer (PGR) met with IAD in the summer of 2014 to review the Supervisor Briefing sessions that had taken place in 2013/14. A meeting to discuss and plan for the 2014/15 sessions will take place in late October 2014 and the agenda for this

		<p>a PhD within the Prescribed Period (i.e. three years for a full-time PhD).</p>		<p>meeting will include discussion of the recommendation made by the Informatics PPR Review Team.</p> <p>Although a full scale review of the Supervisor Briefings is yet to take place, emphasis on the importance of completion rates and the expectation that PhD students will complete within the Prescribed Period was increased in both the College and School briefing presentations at the most recent Supervisor Briefing for Informatics. It is expected that this will continue for future briefings and will be noted in the full review to take place by the start of the next academic session. Ongoing with the expectation that a detailed review of the Supervisor Briefing will take place by the start of the next academic session 31-Jul-15</p>
		<p>The Review Team recommends that the Annual Progress Review form be amended to include a training record attachment with information about seminars attended, conferences attended, conference presentations and training attended during the review period and that each student be required to submit this to the Review Panel.</p>	<p>Academic Services (Governance and Regulatory team)</p>	<p>The recommendation has been sent to the Head of Academic Services and copied to the Convener of the Postgraduate Research Enhancement Project (PREP) and the Secretary to the Researcher Experience Committee (REC). PREP and REC will take this forward in line with the current review of potential enhancements to the student record and annual monitoring for postgraduate research students.</p> <p>The University standard annual progression review form for PGRs was reviewed July 2014 and includes questions on conference attendance and training:</p> <p>“16. Has the student spent any time away from Edinburgh in an international research environment in relation to their studies? (For example visits to labs, conferences, use of archive material, exchanges.) Yes/No Please provide details of location, duration and nature of visit: 17. What career development and training opportunities has the student undertaken? 18. List suggested training and development opportunities for the next year.”</p>

				<p>The form is available for download from Academic Services website: http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/academic-services/forms/school-college-forms</p>
March 2014	PPR of PPLS	<p>The review team RECOMMENDS the University, at Vice Principal level, liaises with NHS Research Scotland as a matter of urgency to reduce the time taken to process Research Passports (1.4.2)</p>	Heads of CHSS and MVM Colleges	<p>Work is ongoing and PPLS have now raised this issue at the HSS Research Ethics and Integrity Review Group meeting which took place on Monday 23rd March 2015</p>
		<p>The review team RECOMMENDS the College adopts the system used very effectively in other areas of the university, and devolves resources for PhD scholarships to subject areas to manage locally. The review team RECOMMENDS the College reviews the level of scholarship funding available</p>	CHSS PG Office	<p>The College have now devolved the scholarships funds to Schools to make awards. Guidance on the levels of awards has been issued by the College but Schools are now in a position to decide how they would like to distribute awards within these guidelines</p>
		<p>The review team RECOMMENDS the Vice Principal Planning, Resources and Research Policy takes these concerns (regarding flexible school spaces) into account when planning estate issues</p>	Vice-Principal Planning, Resources and Research Policy	<p>Response from Vice Principal: Delighted to see the recommendation and will support plans from the School to use its teaching space optimally and flexibly. If the pilot space management process with the School of Divinity is successful in substantially increasing room usage and repurposing spare space to good use, we will try to find some further funds to support such plans. Of course, the College HSS will need to find the balance of funds and prioritise appropriately via papers to Estates committee</p> <p>Update: The School has also negotiated successfully with the central Timetabling unit to retain control of flexible study space on offer within the School</p>

Nov 2013	PPR of SPS	The panel recommends to the University that the mechanisms for annual reports are reviewed in order to ensure that the reporting system is effective and robust	University Academic Services: Governance and Regulatory Framework Team	At its meeting of 11 March 2014, REC agreed to remit this to ESS Phase 3, now the Postgraduate Researcher Experience Project. The meeting noted the College of Science and Engineering's work on data management in relation to the annual reporting process and would recommend it to the PREP as an example of good practice. Following consultation with CHSS Postgraduate Office, we propose that annual reporting be carried out via the portfolio as described above, with no further reference to Postgraduate Office other than referral of the most problematic cases
		The panel recommends that the University seeks to acknowledge the problems faced by excellent administrative staff and address the problem of career development and progression	CHSS Human Resources	Response accepted

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee
3 September 2015

Annual Report of the Senate Committees

Brief description of the paper, including a statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities

This is the sixth annual report of the four Senate Standing Committees: Curriculum and Student Progression Committee, Learning & Teaching Committee, Quality Assurance Committee, and Researcher Experience Committee. It reports on activity of the Committees for 2014/15 and proposes ambitions for 2015/16 and beyond. The Committees will seek to deliver as many of these as possible, while adjusting them as necessary to take account of any changes in the internal and external environment.

Action requested

For information

Communication and Implementation

The paper will be circulated to Senate Committees at their next meeting and information will be included in the Senate Committees' Newsletter.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? Yes this paper will have resource implications. Some of the resource requirements will be met through existing resources or has agreed funding in place. Other activities will have funding cases considered through the annual planning round or on an individual basis through relevant channels. These will be taken forward by the relevant committee or functional area.

Risk Assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? No

Equality and Diversity

Has due consideration been given to the equality impact of this paper? Yes

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Originator of the paper

Anne Marie O'Mullane, Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services
Tom Ward, Director of Academic Services
Ailsa Taylor, Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services
Philippa Ward, Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services
Marion Judge, Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services
Susan Hunter, Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services

Annual Senate Committees' Report 2014/15

1. Executive Summary

This report outlines the achievements of the Senate Committees for Academic Year 2014/15 and the planned priorities for Senate Committees for 2015/16 and beyond. Senate Committees have reflected on their operation through the Senate Committees' Symposium. They consider themselves to be robust and effective and are confident that they can support their planned priorities. Senate Committees agreed their priorities and strategic direction at the Senate Committees Symposium. The work of the Senate Committees is monitored and coordinated by the Senate Committee Conveners' Forum to ensure that they maintain their strategic approach and remain effective.

Action requested: Senatus is invited to note the major items of Senate Committees' business from 2014/15 and to approve the ambitions proposed by each of the four Senate Committees for 2015/16 and beyond.

2. Introduction

This is the sixth annual report of the four Standing Committees of Senate, hereafter referred to as the Senate Committees. The Senate Committees are Curriculum and Student Progression Committee, Learning & Teaching Committee, Quality Assurance Committee and Researcher Experience Committee.

Links to the Terms of Reference for the Senate Standing Committees:

Curriculum and Student Progression Committee: [Link](#)

Learning and Teaching Committee: [Link](#)

Quality Assurance Committee: [Link](#)

Researcher Experience Committee: [Link](#)

The report sets out the Senate Committees' achievements for the year 2014/15. It proposes their strategic ambitions for 2015/16 and beyond. These proposals arose from Committee discussions, discussion at Senate Committees Conveners' Forum and discussion at the Senate Committees' Symposium which took place on the 8 May 2015. The report also outlines suggestions made at the Senate Committees Symposium. .

3. Key Numbers for 2014/15

Name of Committee/Sub-Committee/Task Group	No. of meetings
Curriculum and Student Progression Committee (CSPC)	6
CSPC: Sub Group Concessions	1
CSPC: Working Group - Children and Vulnerable Adults Policy	3
CSPC: Working Group - Assessment Regulations/ Degree Regulations and Programmes of Study Review 2014/15	4
CSPC: Working Group - Assessment and Progression Tools	6
CSPC: Working Group - UG Progression Boards	3
CSPC: Working Group - Student-Led Individually-Created Courses	5
CSPC: Working Group - Tier 4 Student Attendance and Engagement Monitoring Working Group	3

QAC/CSPC: Task Group - Dual Degrees	2
Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC)	5
LTC: Working Group - Code of Practice for Taught Postgraduate Programmes	4
LTC: Task Group - Distance Education Task Group	3
LTC: Working Group - Grade Point Averages	1
Quality Assurance Committee (QAC)	6
QAC: Student Support Services Quality Assurance Framework Sub-Committee	2
QAC: Task Group - Student Representation for Distance Learners	4
QAC: Task Group - Quality Hub	2
QAC: Working Group - External Examiner Policy Development	1
Researcher Experience Committee (REC)	7
REC: Task Group - Distance PhD	1
REC: Task Group - PhD Publications Track	4

4. Senate Committees' Achievements

4.1 Curriculum and Student Progression Committee (CSPC) Achievements 2014/15

4.1.1 Management Data on Students

Building on the principles established by the CSPC 'Use of Student Data' task group and the discussions conducted by Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) in relation to the 'Quality Hub', Student Systems and Academic Services are working with the Senate Committees to take forward this important agenda, starting with a series of workshops in May 2015. These workshops will assist Student Systems and Academic Services to develop their understanding of how management information regarding students can support Schools and Colleges to make key strategic and management decisions, and will feed into discussions at Senate Learning and Teaching Committee and Senate in May / June 2015, and subsequent developments to the provision of management information.

4.1.2 Projects

i. Programme and Course Information Management Project (PCIM)

The PCIM project is on track to achieve its main deliverables:

- An enhanced course descriptor has been implemented, which will provide students with more comprehensive and relevant information (including enhanced information regarding feedback on assessment arrangements).
- Based on last year's work on Draft University Level Principles, a new University policy on Programme and Course Design, Development, Approval, Changes and Closure has now been developed and approved.
- The Board of Studies Terms of Reference has been updated and Boards of Studies guidance has also been developed (this will go to the June Committee meeting).

- A Programme and Course Handbooks Policy has been developed and will be considered by CSPC in June.

ii. **Assessment and Progression Tools Project**

The Assessment and Progression Tools Project is on track to achieve its main deliverables:

- CSPC has extended the policy on Informing Taught Students of their Final Programme Results so that it now also covers Course and Progression results.
- Significant systems development work now enables Schools to input progression and course awards into EUCLID, and to communicate these results to students via EUCLID / MyEd (with effect from May / June 2015).
- CSPC approved the introduction of an Undergraduate Progression Boards policy for introduction in 2015/16.

iii. **Open Content Courses/Student-Led Individually Created Courses (SLICCs)**

SLICCs are credit-bearing self-directed courses intended to help students to develop their own set of personal or professional skills and attributes. CSPC approved the arrangements for SLICC pilots which will run during the summer of 2015 and be evaluated in the autumn. The generic level descriptors that would apply to these pilots were approved, and issues relating to credit/credit levels, progression, course creation, academic support and assessment were considered.

iv. **MSc Progression Hurdles**

CSPC completed some light-touch background research in relation to internal progression hurdles within MSc PGT programmes. Research had shown that there was an element of variation but that this variation did not appear unjustified. CSPC agreed that although it may be preferential to harmonise MSc progression arrangements at some stage, there was no urgent requirement to take this forward in 2014/15.

4.1.3 **Regulations, Policies, Guidance and procedure**

This section outlines the delivery of regulations, policy, guidance and procedure that are not captured elsewhere in the report:

i. **Regulations**

- Annual review of Taught Assessment Regulations and Postgraduate Assessment Regulations for Research Degrees completed for 2015/16.
- Annual review of Undergraduate, Postgraduate and Higher Degree Regulations completed for 2015/16.

- A review of academic/ withdrawal and exclusion / student conduct appeal documentation and processes was conducted in March and April 2015– leading to streamlined new Student Appeal Regulations (and associated guidance).
- Revision to Code of Student Conduct, to take account of the first year of the operation of the Code, and to align with the new Support for Study Policy.

ii. Policies

- A dual awards policy developed as part of broader guidance on collaborative provision (see QAC).

iii. Guidance

- Terms of Reference for College Progression Boards for Study Abroad. These Terms provide operational guidance and include a credit for study abroad classification.
- Revised Degree Programme Specification Guidance.

iv. Procedure

- Revised Withdrawal and Exclusion from Studies procedure.

4.1.4 New priorities identified and progressed during the session

i. Support for Study policy

A new Support for Study policy, developed by the Mental Health Strategy Group, was approved for introduction in 2015-16 to help support students whose behaviour may give cause for concern.

ii. Marking and assessment boycott

During the 2014/15 academic year the Universities and Colleges Union (UCU) called on its members to take part in an assessment setting and assessment process boycott. CSPC approved temporary concessions to minimise the impact of the industrial action on students without compromising academic standards

iii. Academic year dates and examination timings: 2015 and 2016

Due to the academic year dates for 2015/16 and 2016/17, there will be a reduced revision period for students within the semester 1 period. CSPC has provided guidance to Colleges regarding an approach to organising teaching during week 11 which will maximise the amount of time available to students for revision within the constraints of the academic year.

iv. Extended Common Marking Scheme

A cross-College short-life working group was established and has made some initial proposals regarding the University's Extended Common Marking Scheme. These proposals have raised regulatory and systems issues and will need broad support across the University, and will therefore require substantial further scoping and consideration.

4.2 Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) Achievements 2014/15

4.2.1 Projects

i. Emerging Vision for Learning and Teaching

The Committee's key priority for 2014/15 was the development of the University's emerging vision for learning and teaching. LTC oversaw extensive consultation regarding the vision and the information gathered will be presented at the May meeting of Learning and Teaching Committee, and the June meeting of Senate.

ii. Enhancing Student Support Project

During 2014/15, LTC has monitored the Student Support Implementation Group (SSIG)'s work on evaluating the undergraduate Personal Tutor system and mainstreaming and enhancing the system, which includes the following developments:

- Quality Assurance Committee will be responsible for ongoing monitoring of the effectiveness of the Personal Tutor System.
- Schools will continue to have a degree of autonomy over how they implement the Personal Tutor System.
- There will be a focus on reward and recognition of individual Personal Tutors.
- A set of Key Performance Indicators will be developed to assist with reward and recognition and to facilitate annual quality assurance processes.
- Greater emphasis will be placed on enabling first year UG students to have an extra scheduled meeting with their Personal Tutor during the first semester while reducing the need for scheduled meetings in later years.

During Summer 2014/15, SSIG will evaluate the postgraduate taught Personal Tutor system.

iii. Leading Enhancement in Assessment and Feedback Project (LEAF)

The Committee continued to provide oversight for this Project, which is making use of the TESTA (Transforming Experience of Students through Assessment) methodology. Nine programmes across two Colleges have gone through TESTA audit. The methodology supports Schools to rationalise their assessment schedules, identify and share good practice, and map students' experiences onto everyday classroom practices.

iv. Information Services Learning Technology Projects

a. Open Education Resource Strategy

LTC welcomed and commented on the 'Vision for Open Educational Resources at the University of Edinburgh'.

b. Learning Analytics

The Committee had an initial discussion regarding the opportunities and challenges associated with learning analytics. The Convener of LTC is in the process of taking forward discussions regarding the development of University policy in this area.

c. Assessment and Feedback Tool Pilots

LTC has continued to oversee IS Technology Enhanced Learning section's work with Schools to pilot new online tools for assessment and feedback.

4.2.2 Task Groups/Working Groups

i. Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs)

Mainstreaming of all MOOCs academic governance processes and procedures has been completed during 2014/15 including establishing course approval and quality assurance processes. The University has now established a group to take forward its MOOC Strategy.

ii. Grade Point Averages Project (GPA)

LTC has monitored the Higher Education Academic's programme of GPA pilots, with one member of LTC representing the University on the HEA project. LTC has developed an initial position regarding potential adoption of GPA and briefed the Principal. The Committee is awaiting the outcome of the HEA report on the way forward for GPA. In addition to LTC's strategic discussions, CSPC has also undertaken an initial assessment of practical issues that the University would need to address were it to adopt a GPA model.

iii. Online Distance Education Provision

An LTC Task Group was established to oversee the mainstreaming of online distance education. The group has met several times and undertaken a programme of interviews and research. It will present its initial findings at the May 2015 meeting of LTC.

iv. Curriculum for Excellence

The Committee continued to monitor the implications of Curriculum for Excellence for the University's learning, teaching and assessment to assist the University to prepare for the first significant intake of students educated under the new curriculum in 2016. LTC also considered impending changes to A-Levels in England.

4.2.3 New priorities identified and progressed during the session

i. Enhancement Theme – Student Transitions

An Institutional Team was established and is responsible for developing, coordinating and (where appropriate) delivering a programme of work relating to the Theme; for communicating about Enhancement Theme developments within the constituency they are representing; and acting as key Enhancement Theme contacts. LTC has provided oversight for this work and received regular updates.

ii. **Review of Code of Practice for Taught Postgraduate Programmes**

Following a review of this document, LTC agreed to replace this document with a more succinct and user-friendly document for students and staff from 2016/17.

iii. **Higher Education Achievement Record (HEAR)**

LTC discussed and approved some new categories of achievement for inclusion in the HEAR, and changes to existing categories of achievement.

4.3 Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) Achievements 2014/15

4.3.1 Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) 2015 Planning

The ELIR Steering Group has put in place all necessary preparation for ELIR including:

- Drafting and consulting on the draft Reflective Analysis and Case Studies in preparation for their sign off by the Committee, Senate and University Court.
- Preparing the logistics for the ELIR visit.
- Planning the showcase session for the morning of the Part 1 visit which will cover how the University supports all students irrespective of mode of delivery or level, aspects of the student journey, use of technology to enhance the student experience and support quality assurance and enhancement processes, and how we work with students as partners in the enhancement of learning and teaching.

4.3.2 Enhancing the Student Experience: Student Data

i. Student Data

Please refer to section 1.1.1 for more information on this achievement.

ii. Quality Systems Development

QAC oversaw the introduction of a new External Examiner Online Reporting System that will allow the University to maximise the benefits from information gathered in External Examiner reports so as to inform the University's strategic approach to quality assurance and quality enhancement. QAC also approved a revised policy for External Examiners for Taught Programmes and a new Handbook for External Examiners. Following a successful pilot in autumn 2014, full roll-out of the Online Reporting System is now ongoing, in time for the May/June Board of Examiner Meetings.

4.3.3 Collaborative Provision

With oversight from a Steering Group, Governance and Strategic Planning, Academic Services and International Office have been continuing to work together on enhancing a framework of guidance on Collaborative Provision. The following work has been undertaken:

- Production of a suite of template Memoranda of Agreement and Understanding;

- Updating of the authoritative list of the University's collaborative arrangements;
- Revised guidance on the approval processes for introducing collaborative programmes is in the process of being discussed with Colleges.

4.3.4 Course evaluation electronic system

The Committee has overseen the development of the student survey framework including the work undertaken by Student Surveys Unit on piloting and developing the EvaSys course evaluation software, which provides a standardised approach to the gathering and reporting of course level student feedback. The level of interest and demand from Schools has been very positive and currently 15 of the University's 22 Schools have opted into the use of EvaSys. The Committee has also overseen the Student Survey Unit's work on introducing a Student Panel.

4.3.5 Task groups

i. Enabling Student Representation for Distance Learners

A short-life group investigated and advised on the technological infrastructure and meeting protocols that need to exist for the Edinburgh distance learning student voice to be heard at School, College and institutional level. QAC has approved the group's recommendations, and the task group is now working to implement a set of actions, including new web-based resources, new arrangements to assist student representatives to communicate with students, and briefings for Schools, that will deliver the following outcomes:

- A student representation system that is transparent and robust.
- Processes that are well understood and consistently implemented.
- Effective working of the representation network.

4.3.6 Core Business

i. Internal Subject Review

The Committee has continued to oversee and approve Internal Subject Review reports and responses, engaging positively with a new process for commenting on reports and responses, and monitoring the effective implementation of review recommendations as well as the dissemination of enhancements identified in reviews, and tracking emerging actions and themes. This academic year seven Teaching Programme Reviews (TPR), three Postgraduate Programme Reviews (PPR), and a combined TPR and PPR have taken place.

ii. Annual Review of Student Support Service Quality Assurance Framework

The Annual Review of Student Support Services took place in March 2015.

iii. Periodic Review

A periodic review of the Student Disability Service was undertaken in Spring 2015, commending the Services for its support, and recommending further work in some areas.

Senate Quality Assurance Committee has agreed that the student support service Periodic Review for 2015/16 should be a thematic review on student mental health, covering a range of services.

iv. Annual Reports on Student Discipline, Student Appeals and Complaint handling

QAC continued to monitor reports on Student Discipline and Student Appeals annually, and considered reports on Complaint Handling submitted quarterly and annually. QAC has proposed enhancements to the approach to these reports, and has requested an annual thematic report pulling together common themes across reporting in these areas of business, to take effect from December 2015.

v. Policy development arising from UK Quality Code mapping

Policy development and enhancement arising from mapping of the University's policies and procedures to the UK Quality Code continued to take place this session.

4.4 Researcher Experience Committee (REC) Achievements 2014/15

4.4.1 Projects/new initiatives

i. Strategy and Vision

The Committee developed and published its strategy and vision in November 2014. Strategic goals include raising the profile and enhancing the experience of postgraduate research students and early career researchers; ensuring training for employability for postgraduate research students and career development support for early career researchers; identifying challenges and opportunities for innovation in relation to these goals. The vision can be found at: www.docs.sasg.ed.ac.uk/AcademicServices/Committees/REC/VisionStrategy.pdf

ii. Postgraduate Research Experience Project (PREP)

Consultation on proposals for PREP was carried out over summer 2014 which informed the development of a bid submitted to the planning round. While the bid was unsuccessful for 2014/15, the Committee, Academic Services and the Institute for Academic Development (IAD) are exploring what can be delivered going forward within existing resources.

iii. Doctoral Training Centres (DTCs)

The Committee received reports from Colleges on DTCs and is continuing discussions on how Schools and Colleges can be supported in bidding for and setting up DTCs.

iv. Postgraduate Research Student Induction

The Committee agreed a pilot for ongoing induction for postgraduate research students starting throughout the year, including the development of induction cohorts. The Committee worked closely with the Student Experience Project Induction Team and IAD on developing this and has monitored progress throughout 2014/15.

v. Postgraduate Research Space

The Committee opened discussion with the Space Enhancement Management Group and is working on recommendations for input to policy discussion.

4.4.2 Task Groups

i. Early Career Researcher Support

The Committee reviewed progress on the recommendations of its 2013/14 task group. Further discussions are underway with HR and the Vice Principal People and Culture on developing this area and the Committee will continue to review progress.

ii. PhD Study

The REC task group on PhD Publications Track delivered its report in April 2015. The Task Group made various recommendations to clarify how students can include publications as chapters of PhD theses, whilst ensuring the overall PhD remains a coherent body of interrelated work. REC approved the recommendations and fed them into the annual regulations review and the Code of Practice for Supervisors and Research Students update for 2015.

A REC task group reviewing distance PhDs began its work during 2014/15 and will report to REC in 2015/16. The Committee began discussion on 'What is an Edinburgh PhD' and will continue to examine this at its 2015 summer meeting.

4.4.3 Core Business

REC continues to interact with student and staff experience surveys (PRES, CROS, PIRLS), academic code, policy and regulation reviews as required and other Senate Committees as part of its core business. It also continues to promote sharing best practice and reviews its membership and communications strategy as part of core business.

4.4.4 New priorities identified and progressed during the session

i. Student record system developments to support PGR

In advance of the proposed PREP project, Student Systems has worked with the Committee to develop an online reporting mechanism for postgraduate research student annual progression reviews. This is being taken forward by Student Systems with regular reports to REC, with a view to implementation in Summer 2015

ii. Handbook for External Examining of Research Degrees

The Committee developed a new Handbook for External Examining of Research Degrees, pulling together guidance previously provided by Colleges and key information from the regulations, and presenting it in an appropriate format which aligns with the Handbook External Examiners for Taught Programmes.

5. Senate Committees' strategic objectives for 2015-16 to 2017-18

For the first time, in addition to undertaking annual planning the Senate Committees have set out their longer-term objectives. These are to:

- Develop and implement the emerging vision for Learning and Teaching.
- Coordinate and support activities to enhance the student experience in order to address issues raised by the National Student Survey and other student surveys.

- Enhance availability and ease of use of management data regarding students to support quality processes and broader work to enhance the student experience.
- Promote research-led and independently-directed learning.
- Continue the programme of activity to support programme and course design, approval, publication and navigation, and management of data on course and programme outcomes.
- Provide strategic direction to the University's IT infrastructure developments to assist the University to anticipate future learning and teaching requirements.
- Continue to develop the University's academic regulations so that they guide academic staff towards the University's key objectives while supporting and encouraging innovation.
- Enhance the postgraduate research student experience.

6. Senate Committees' Priorities for 2015-16

The following are the Senate Committees' ambitions for 2015-16. The Committees will seek to deliver as many of these as possible, while adjusting them as necessary to take account of any changes in the internal and external environment.

6.1 Learning and Teaching Committee

In order of priority:

1. Coordinate and support activities to address issues raised by the National Student Survey and other student surveys.
2. Develop new publication to replace Code of Practice for Taught Postgraduate Programmes.
3. Transitions Enhancement Theme –institutional oversight of activities (broadly focussed on maximising the benefit of the Theme for current priorities).
4. Feedback on assessment – implement recommendations from 2014-15 Internal Audit report, including developing quality standards for feedback.
5. Oversee the Leading Enhancement in Assessment and Feedback (LEAF) / Transforming the Experience of Students Through Assessment (TESTA) Project.
6. Support pilot activities to explore innovative learning and teaching using IT and other modern methods.
7. Online Distance Learning - Continued work to develop a strategic framework for Online Distance Learning.

8. In partnership with the Knowledge Strategy Committee, develop a University policy on Learning Analytics.
9. Promote research-led and independently-directed learning.
10. Grade Point Averages – respond to outcomes of Higher Education Academic discussions and pilots.
11. Ongoing development of Continuing Professional Development framework for learning and teaching.

6.2 Curriculum and Student Progression Committee

In order of priority:

1. Deliver the next phase of work on EUCLID assessment and progression tools, including implementing the recommendations of the task group on UG progression boards.
2. Review University policy on extensions to coursework deadlines, in the context of special circumstances.
3. Enhance availability and ease of use of management information regarding students to support quality processes and broader work to enhance the student experience – complete scoping work initiated in 2014-15 and begin to implement. (QAC and CSPC leading on this, but may involve other Committees)
4. Evaluate 2014-15 pilot of Student-led individually-Created Courses (SLICCS) and consider further pilots and / or wider roll-out.
5. Review and align the University's student conduct-related policies (eg Code of Student Conduct, Codes of Practice on Alcohol and Drug Abuse, Support for Study Policy) taking account of planned review of Dignity and Respect Policy.
6. Programme and Course Information Management (PCIM) – Embed processes to enhance course descriptor information and dissemination.
7. Scope out a possible programme of work to enhance marking and feedback practices by harmonising University Common Mark Schemes and (if the University chooses to adopt Grade Point Averages) align with GPA, with a view to undertaking some initial development work in 2015-16.
8. Review University moderation policy.

6.3 Quality Assurance Committee

In order of priority:

1. Enhancement-led Institutional Review – support review and follow-up, including beginning to respond to any recommendations from the review.

2. Quality assurance framework – following ELIR and conclusion of SFC review of quality, review and streamline annual and periodic review arrangements.
3. Enhance availability and ease of use of management information regarding students to support quality processes and broader work to enhance the student experience – complete scoping work initiated in 2014-15 and begin to implement. (QAC and CSPC leading on this, but may involve other Committees)
4. External Examiner Project - Complete roll-out of phases one and two of new External Examiners system and policy, introduce new role of Programme External Examiner, and undertake relatively light-touch work to evaluate new system and policy.
5. Embed quality review processes for Personal Tutor system and oversee transition from Enhancing Student Support project to mainstreamed activity.
6. Collaboration – follow up joint Governance and Strategic Planning / International Office / Academic Services Collaboration project with further guidance and support for collaborative activities.

6.4 Researcher Experience Committee

In order of priority:

1. Enhance annual progression review process - oversee implementation of the new EUCLID system tools for supporting the online annual progression review process and encourage Schools to use them; review guidelines for postgraduate research student annual progression review.
2. Develop a clearer idea of what an Edinburgh PhD should be, through benchmarking, consultation, and alignment with broader thinking in the University (eg the development of the Strategic Plan, work regarding collaborative provision).
3. Review supervisor selection and training arrangements.
4. Explore options for a Mentoring role.
5. Explore concept of Distance / Flexible Learning PhDs.
6. Support/promote career development planning for Early Career Researchers.
7. Doctoral Training Centres – monitor development of new centres and feed into the development of proposals for central coordination and support.
8. Postgraduate Research Space – identify priorities / recommendation for policy development by Space Enhancement and Management Group.

6.5 Cross-committee priorities

In order of priority:

1. Undertake externally-facilitated Senate and Senate Committees Effectiveness review.
2. Policies and Codes - Programme of review of policies including equality impact assessments.
3. Contribute to the development of the University's next Strategic Plan, taking account of the Committees' priorities, visions and values (for example regarding sustainability and social responsibility).

7. Senate Committees Symposium

The Senate Committees' Symposium took place on the 8 May 2015. Seventy people attended the symposium including Committee members, participants from EUSA, Court and Senate, staff invited from the Schools, Colleges and Student Services. The Symposium gave the Senate Committees the opportunity to reflect on their work undertaken during the academic year, and to plan activity for the forthcoming year in a coordinated manner. The predominant area identified for enhancement was communication with stakeholders. This issue will be explored further in the light-touch governance review of Senate and the Senate Committees, which is being undertaken during Spring / Summer 2014/15. Senate will consider the report of this light-touch review at its first meeting in 2015/16.

Authors

Anne Marie O'Mullane (Academic Services)
 Tom Ward (Academic Services)
 Ailsa Taylor (Academic Services)
 Philippa Ward (Academic Services)
 Marion Judge (Academic Services)
 Susan Hunter (Academic Services)

26 May 2015

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee
3 September 2015

Guidance for Senate Committee members on authoring papers and other aspects of Committee business

Brief description of the paper, including a statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities

The purpose of this paper is to remind the Committee of the guidelines on authoring committee papers and on managing the communication, implementation and evaluation of committee decisions, which the Senate Committees approved in September 2014.

Action requested

For information.

Communication and Implementation

The paper is only of direct relevance to Committee members, and therefore no further communication activities are required.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? Yes. Streamlined committee papers will reduce the resource implications involved in committee participation.

Risk Assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? No. The proposals will support greater consistency in applying good practices in academic governance, and do not create any significant risks.

Equality and Diversity

Has due consideration been given to the equality impact of this paper? Yes – there are no equality and diversity implications.

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Originator of the paper

Tom Ward, Director of Academic Services

Any other relevant information, including keywords

Guidance for Senate Committee members on authoring papers and other aspects of Committee business

Description of Paper

- 1 The purpose of this paper is to remind the Committee of the guidelines on authoring committee papers and on managing the communication, implementation and evaluation of committee decisions, which the Senate Committees approved in September 2014.

Authoring succinct committee papers

- 3 As part of broader changes in its operation, in August 2014 Court introduced new guidelines on preparing Court committee papers. These guidelines aim to ensure that Court receives succinct stand-alone papers, in order to reduce the volume of papers and assist Court with its governance role. For further information on these Court changes see:

<http://edin.ac/1uwsphQ>

- 4 In producing committee papers (including task group reports) please could authors take account of the Court guidance on producing papers ([Court and Committees - guidelines for authors](#)) and on house style ([House style - guidance notes](#)).

Senate committee paper cover sheet

- 5 In addition to providing guidelines on producing papers / house style, Court also produced a template for authors to follow in producing papers (ie rather than complete a standard cover sheet, Court papers authors write their reports using standard headings and structures). Given the different nature of the Senate and Court business, Senate Committee paper authors do not need to follow the Court paper template. We have however revised the Senate Committees paper cover-sheet to take account of the headings in the Court paper template. The latest version of this cover-sheet is available at:

www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/academic-services/committees

Communicating and implementing Senate committee decisions

- 6 In September 2014 the Senate Committees agreed to adopt the following approach to managing the communication and implementation of decisions:
 - All papers that seek Committee approval for a decision should explain how that decision would be communicated and implemented. In many cases this is likely to be very straightforward (for example, “College representatives will be responsible for informing School Directors of Learning and Teaching or equivalent of change in policy”.)
 - All reports from task groups should include a communication and implementation plan.

- Where it appears likely that implementation would be complex or challenging, authors should consult with key College administrative and academic staff, and relevant support services, when developing communication and implementation plans.
- Academic Services will continue to use the Senate Committees Newsletter to communicate developments to stakeholders.
- At the end of each academic session, Academic Services will publish a list of all significant changes to regulations, policies and codes, and will bring them to attention of staff. (For 2015 example see www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/academic-services/policies-regulations/new-policies)

7 Academic Services continues to be happy to assist with communication / implementation of Senate Committee decisions, for example by holding briefing meetings for relevant stakeholders, or introducing items at School or College Committee meetings.

Evaluating the impact of the implementation of committee decisions

8 Where the Committee makes a significant decision, it would be appropriate for the Committee to decide when and how it would evaluate whether a decision has been implemented and the impact it has had. Approaches to evaluation can include:

- Committing to the Committee reviewing a new policy x years after implementation.
- Colleges to review whether Schools have consistently implemented a significant regulatory change.
- For major developments, conducting a formal review (eg including staff and student surveys) after x years

9 In September 2014 the Senate Committees agreed that, when committee papers seek Committee approval for significant developments, the papers should set out plans for evaluation.

Further guidance for committee members

10 The Senate Committees members' guidance provides further information on other aspects of the role of Committee members. The latest version of this guidance is available at:

www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/academic-services/staff/committees

Tom Ward

Director of Academic Services

19 August 2015

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee
3 September 2015

Student Support Service Quality Assurance Framework Revised Annual Report Template

Brief description of the paper, including a statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities

The paper is the revised annual report template to be used in 2015/16 by services within the Student Support Service Quality Assurance Framework. Following consultation with services the revised template was approved electronically by Senate Quality Assurance Committee in August 2015 in order to have it available to services for preparation of their annual reports.

Action requested

For information.

Communication/Implementation

The revised template has been communicated to relevant student support services.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? No.

Risk Assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? The revised template includes a risk analysis.

Equality and Diversity

Has due consideration been given to the equality impact of this paper? The revised template includes reporting on demographics of student user groups, which may identify equality and diversity implications.

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes.

Originator of the paper

Linda Bruce, Academic Services, August 2015.

Any other relevant information, including keywords

Student Support Service Quality Assurance Framework, SSSQAF

Student Support Service Quality Assurance Framework Revised Annual Report Template

Service:	
Submitted by:	Date:

Criterion	Evidence <i>Provide reflection with evidence of the effectiveness and impact of activities on the student experience, including any gaps that need to be addressed.</i> <i>Some examples of what might be included - this will vary depending on the nature of the service.</i>
1. Fit with Strategic Plan goals	<i>Demonstrate your specific link to relevant elements of University Strategic Plan and/or to related strategies such as Learning & Teaching.</i>
2. Service usage figures	<i>Number of users (if quantifiable); number of enquiries received; number of visitors; indicate trends, coverage and reach for example student groups (UG, PGT, PGR) and demographics (male/female, other available demographic information). Include numbers of student user groups: highlight in particular over or under use by particular groups.</i>
3. Innovations and successes	<i>New developments and their impact on service delivery.</i>

QAC 15/16 1 P

	<i>("Doing new things").</i>
4. Business process developments/new ways of working	<i>Changes to processes, policies, services in response to reviews, external drivers. ("Doing the same things in a new way"). Include any learning, efficiencies and effectiveness achieved from these changes that could be shared with other services. Include anything that has ceased.</i>
5. User communications & feedback	<i>Summary information on communications to and consultation with users: for example surveys, focus groups, feedback forms provide a reflection on trends, include key themes and responses/actions taken (or not) with the reasons why.</i>
6. Service reputation/esteem measures	<i>External recognition, for example in professional networks; formal accreditation; awards</i>
7. Analysis of service monitoring and achievement of service levels	<i>Input/output statistics, turnaround/throughput times, as appropriate for relevant service. Results against any specific SLA measures for this service. Focus on the key measures/KPIs.</i>
8. Income generation activity, where possible	<i>As appropriate to the service; for example sales of materials/services; external partnerships; income 'in kind'; efficiency savings.</i>
9. Partnerships/shared services (including working with Schools and Colleges)	<i>Internal or external collaboration that has supported service delivery, include opportunities, and any examples, of working across boundaries.</i>
10. External reference points/benchmarking (for example best practice outside the sector)	<i>Professional body guidelines, policies, legal frameworks that impact on your service. Indicate any comparators with</i>

QAC 15/16 1 P

	<i>equivalent services in other universities or in other sectors</i>
11. Staff Development activity	<i>Highlight key staff development activity that has been undertaken to support business objectives and the impact on service delivery; also indicate any identified gaps in skills/knowledge with possible adverse impact on the service</i>
12. Risk analysis (risk of under/non-performance, over-delivery)	<i>Indicate any specific risks – both to users and/or to the University - if this service is not delivered or not delivered successfully. Depending on the service, the risks of over-delivery might also be relevant.</i>

Summarise key issues raised and key priorities for the coming year:

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee
3 September 2015

QAC'S RESPONSE TO INTERNAL REVIEW REPORTS AND RESPONSES

Final Reports:

PPR Pilot review of ODL:

Recommendation 1.4.7 will pass (from SSIG) to the newly established QAC sub-group that is overseeing the monitoring of the PT system and review of PT statements.

The Committee approves the report.

TPR Biological Sciences:

The Committee approves the report

TPR Informatics:

The Committee approves the report

TPR Music:

The committee approves the report.

TPR Oral Health:

The committee approves the report.

Periodic Review of Student Disability Service:

The Committee approves the report.

14wk Responses:

PPR HSS:

QAC commends HSS for a very detailed and considered response that shows serious engagement with the review process and positive engagement with students.

Specific points are as follows:

- Point 3 (recommendation 1.6.2) does not seem to present a plan for action in this area. QAC will be interested to see any development in relation to a Graduate School and how this may enhance the PhD community.
- Under recommendation 2.1.8 the school's analysis of potential conflicts between taught and research regulations will be very welcome to REC's discussion on regulations for Professional Doctorates.
- QAC looks forward to seeing an update in the year-on response on the outcome of the review of PGT programme and course provision that commenced in March 2015.
- The school has an excellent approach to teaching support, ensuring staff have a part subject and part school function to ensure resilience and continuity of support in the context of administrative resource constraints.
- QAC looks forward to hearing in the year-on response about the planned activities to engender community in the new MA Hons programme and what comes out of the consideration to establish a Graduate School.
- The School shows positive evidence of learning from the experience of SPS in exam and course data entry and management. QAC urges HSS to consider this as a means to ensuring data reliability and robustness.

PPR Maths:

QAC commends the School on its very detailed and considered response that demonstrates a positive engagement with the review process and with enhancement of learning of teaching. The response provides extremely clear plans for development and action to address the recommendations; in many cases good progress has already been made at this early stage. QAC looks forward to seeing the development in the year-on report. QAC also appreciates the efforts made by the School to feedback the outcomes of the review to students and keep students in the loop.

TPR History:

QAC thanks the School for the clear plans to address the recommendations and the serious consideration that has been given to the outcome of the review and looks forward to seeing updates on progress in the year-on report. There are positive efforts to keep students in the loop regarding the response to the recommendations. QAC encourages the School to continue to keep students updated on progress. One area would benefit from further consideration: there does not seem to be a clear plan for how to address enhancement of professorial engagement and leadership. QAC would like to see an update on this in the year-on response

TPR/PPR Law:

QAC commends the School on its extremely detailed and considered response to the review recommendations. The response clearly shows serious engagement with the review process and detailed consultation with staff and, where relevant, students in the setting of forward plans. QAC looks forward to seeing the progress in the year-on response that is likely to indicate significant impact in at least a few of the areas.

Year-on:

PPR Education:

The year-on response clearly shows carefully considered plans to address the recommendations. A number of areas have not been fully addressed at this point as they are intended to take place over 2-3 years. QAC encourages the School to continue to progress with the planned actions in a reasonably timely fashion and to provide an update on further progress in the School's next annual quality assurance report to the College.

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee
3 September 2015

Allocation of Annual Committee Business

Brief description of the paper, including a statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities

The paper notes proposed main committee business for 2015-16. Items will continue to be added in response to developing business needs.

Action requested

For information.

Communication/Implementation

For communication by College representatives to relevant College committees.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? No.

Risk Assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? No.

Equality and Diversity

Has due consideration been given to the equality impact of this paper? N/A

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes.

Originator of the paper

Linda Bruce, Academic Services, August 2015.

Any other relevant information, including keywords

Committee Business, Senate Quality Assurance Committee

Allocation of Annual Committee Business

29 October 2015

- College quality assurance priorities for 2015/16
- Student data dashboard update
- Internal review 14 week and student support service review progress reports
- ELIR update

10 December 2015

- Annual report on Student Complaints
- Annual report on Student Appeals
- Annual report on Student Discipline
- Thematic report on themes from Student Complaints, Appeals and Discipline reports
- College reports on Quality Framework consultation
- Knowledge Strategy Committee report
- Internal review reports and year-on reports
- ELIR update

4 February 2016

- ELIR initial action planning
- Mid-year update on progress with committee priorities
- Internal review reports, year-on and 14 week reports
- Quality Assurance Framework review
- Initial planning for 2016/17 priorities

20 April 2016

- ELIR outcome and technical reports
- ELIR action plan
- Annual College quality assurance and enhancement reports
- Oversight of School annual quality assurance and enhancement report due to amended TPR schedule
- Annual report from the Student Support Service Quality Assurance Framework sub committee
- Annual report on themes from External Examiner reports
- Outline plan for 2016/17 priorities
- Internal review reports, year-on and 14 week reports
- Quality Assurance Framework review

26 May 2016

- ELIR action plan progress report
- Report of the Thematic Review of Student Mental Health provision
- Annual report to Senate, including 2016/17 priorities
- Annual report of Personal Tutor sub group
- Quality Assurance Framework proposals
- Internal review reports, year-on and 14 week reports

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee
3 September 2015

UK Quality Code for Higher Education: Revised Mapping Chapter B1: Programme Design, Development and Approval

Brief description of the paper, including a statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities

The attached paper is a revised mapping of the University's top level policy, guidance and information to Chapter B1 of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education: Programme Design, Development and Approval. The mapping has been revised to take into account the outputs of the Programme and Course Information Management (PCIM) project which has addressed the majority of "areas for further development" identified in the previous version of the mapping. This paper is relevant to the University's strategic need to comply with the Code.

Action requested

For approval

Communication/Implementation

Approved versions will be published on the University website.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? No. Resource implications were taken into account as part of the PCIM project.

Risk Assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? No. A risk assessment was carried out as part of the PCIM project.

Equality and Diversity

Has due consideration been given to the equality impact of this paper? Yes. Equality impact assessments were completed as part of the PCIM project.

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes.

Originator of the paper

Nichola Kett, Academic Services, 24 August 2015.

Any other relevant information, including keywords

Programme, course, design, development, approval.

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee
3 September 2015

UK Quality Code for Higher Education: Revised Mapping Chapter B1: Programme Design, Development and Approval

Interactive Mapping of the University of Edinburgh's Quality Assurance Framework to the UK Quality Code

Chapter B1: Programme, design, development and approval

<http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Pages/Quality-Code-Chapter-B1.aspx#.VfGp9Z1wY5s>

Expectation: Higher education providers, in discharging their responsibilities for setting and maintaining academic standards and assuring and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities, operate effective processes for the design, development and approval of programmes.

Note that much of the chapter "may also be applied proportionately as appropriate, to modules in their own right"

Indicators	Mapping to the University's Quality Assurance Framework	Areas for further development
<p>Indicator 1 Higher education providers maintain strategic oversight of the processes for, and outcomes of, programme design, development and approval, to ensure processes are applied systematically and operated consistently.</p>	<p>Senatus Curriculum and Student Progression Committee Terms of Reference. Specifically remit item 2.1 "Offer strategic advice on the University's portfolio of undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes."</p> <p>Programme and Course Design, Development, Approval, Changes and Closure Policy This policy, and the programmes and courses pages of the Academic Services website, constitute the University's approach to and management of the processes for design, development, approval, changes and closure of programmes and courses. Supplementary College level guidance provides additional information on local practice such as timescales, specific roles and responsibilities, and</p>	

	<p>templates: College of Humanities and Social Science College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine College of Science and Engineering</p> <p>Delegated authority (from the Policy): <i>“The University programme and course approval, changes and closure processes ensure institutional oversight of standards and quality. Authority is delegated by the University, via the Senate Curriculum and Student Progression Committee (CSPC), to Colleges and, where appropriate, to Schools. The level of authority required should be proportionate to the extent of the proposal and decisions must ensure objectivity and impartiality. To this end, Colleges may elect to wholly delegate the authority to approve all changes to existing courses, proposals for new courses, and closure of courses to Schools but must retain a method of oversight, particularly to ensure that decisions are taken independently of the home subject area of the course. Colleges must retain authority to approve major changes to existing programmes and new programmes.”</i></p> <p>Levels of approval: School Boards of Studies Terms of Reference School Boards of Studies Guidance</p> <p>College of Humanities and Social Science College Undergraduate Studies Committee College Postgraduate Studies Committee</p> <p>College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine College Undergraduate Studies Committee College Postgraduate Taught Learning and Teaching Committee (also Validation Event Review Panel)</p> <p>College of Science and Engineering Learning and Teaching Committee</p>	
--	--	--

	University Senate Curriculum and Student Progression Committee	
<p>Indicator 2 Higher education providers make clear the criteria against which programme proposals are assessed in the programme approval process.</p>	<p>Programme and Course Design, Development, Approval, Changes and Closure Policy This policy, and the programmes and courses pages of the Academic Services website, constitute the University's approach to and management of the processes for design, development, approval, changes and closure of programmes and courses. Supplementary College level guidance provides additional information on local practice such as timescales, specifics roles and responsibilities, and templates</p> <p>Fit with principles contained with the Curriculum Framework http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/academic-services/staff/curriculum/curriculum-framework</p> <p>IAD Guidance on accessible and inclusive curriculum http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/institute-academic-development/learning-teaching/inclusive/accessibility/curriculum</p> <p>The definitive record of programme and course information is available in the Degree Regulations and Programmes of Study</p> <p>All programmes and courses are approved indefinitely unless otherwise stated.</p>	<p>Definitive programme information held on student systems (Degree Programme Tables and Degree Programme Specifications are currently held in the Degree Regulations and Programmes of Study).</p>
<p>Indicator 3 Higher education providers define processes, roles and responsibilities for programme design, development and</p>	<p>Programme and Course Design, Development, Approval, Changes and Closure Policy This policy, and the programmes and courses pages of the Academic Services website, constitute the University's approach to and management of the processes for design, development, approval, changes and closure of programmes and courses. Supplementary College level guidance provides additional information on local practice</p>	

<p>approval and communicate them to those involved.</p>	<p>such as timescales, specific roles and responsibilities, and templates: College of Humanities and Social Science College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine College of Science and Engineering</p> <p>School Boards of Studies Terms of Reference School Boards of Studies Guidance</p> <p>College of Humanities and Social Science College Undergraduate Studies Committee College Postgraduate Studies Committee</p> <p>College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine College Undergraduate Studies Committee College Postgraduate Taught Learning and Teaching Committee (also Validation Event Review Panel)</p> <p>College of Science and Engineering Learning and Teaching Committee</p> <p>University Senate Curriculum and Student Progression Committee</p>	
<p>Indicator 4 Higher education providers evaluate their processes for programme design, development and approval and take action to improve them where necessary.</p>	<p>The Programme and Course Design, Development, Approval, Changes and Closure Policy is part of the academic governance framework and will be regularly reviewed. The Senatus Curriculum and Student Progression Committee own the Policy and membership includes EUSA representation.</p>	

<p>Indicator 5 Higher education providers make use of reference points and expertise from outside the programme in programme design and in their processes for programme development and approval.</p>	<p>Reference points The Programme and Course Design, Development, Approval, Changes and Closure Policy details links to reference points.</p> <p>Expertise from outside the programme The Programme and Course Design, Development, Approval, Changes and Closure Policy requires evidence of expertise from outside the programme and states: <i>“In programme approval, the involvement of individuals external to the University is required to offer independence and objectivity to the decisions taken.”</i></p> <p>Boards of Studies are required to have <i>“...at least one external member from another Board of Studies within the University.”</i></p>	
<p>Indicator 6 Higher education providers involve students in programme design and in processes for programme development and approval.</p>	<p>Student involvement The Programme and Course Design, Development, Approval, Changes and Closure Policy states <i>“... students must be proactively involved at the earliest practicable point in programme and course design, development, approval, changes and closure processes. Their involvement should be proportional to the activity taking place and representative. The opportunity to be involved must allow for representation from students with protected characteristics. Consultation should involve students academically closest to the proposed changes and be in line with the EUSA and University Student Engagement Statement.”</i></p> <p>Student representatives are members of School Boards of Studies.</p>	Provision of training and support (to be discussed with EUSA).
<p>Indicator 7 Higher education providers enable staff and other participants</p>	<p>Institute for Academic Development Part of remit: support for curriculum, programme and assessment design and development</p>	

<p>to contribute effectively to programme design, development and approval by putting in place appropriate arrangements for their support and development.</p>	<p>Creating and enhancing courses (resources and advice)</p> <p>Designing Courses option in the PG Cert in Academic Practice</p> <p>Designing courses course (aimed primarily at tutors and demonstrators)</p> <p>Involvement in programme approval work can be recognised within the new CPD Framework for learning and teaching</p>	
--	---	--

Nichola Kett, Academic Services
24 August 2015

DRAFT