



# THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

## **Senatus Academicus**

Wednesday 5 February 2020 at 2.00 p.m.  
Lecture Theatre 5, Appleton Tower

### **AGENDA**

**This section of the meeting is open to all members of staff**

#### **CONVENER'S COMMUNICATIONS**

##### **SENATE YEAR-ON UPDATE**

###### **Research Excellence Framework (REF)**

1. Introduction and Update – Professor Jonathan Seckl, Vice-Principal Planning, Resources and Research Policy
2. REF 2021 Process, effort and challenges involved in preparing the REF 2021 submission - Professor David Leach, Dean of Academic Excellence, College of Science and Engineering

#### **PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION**

##### **Student Support and Wellbeing**

1. Review of Personal Tutoring and Student Support - Rosalyn Claase (Design Lead) and Professor Emma Hunter (Professor of Global and African History)
2. Student Mental Health Strategy - Andy Shanks, Director of Student Wellbeing

**Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR)** - Professor Tina Harrison, Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance

#### **Tea/Coffee Break**

#### **FORMAL BUSINESS**

**This section of the meeting is open to Senate members only**

1. New Members:  
Shruti Anand, CAHSS PG School Representative  
Dhruvi Chakravarthi, CAHSS UG School Representative  
**For formal noting**
2. Senate members' feedback on presentation and discussion topics
3. Report of E-Business conducted 14 – 22 January 2020 S 19/20 2 A  
**For approval**
4. Senate Election arrangements 2020 S 19/20 2 B  
**For approval**

5. Externally-facilitated review of Senate and its committees: University response  
**For information** S 19/20 2 C

**COMMUNICATIONS**

6. Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR)  
**For information** S 19/20 2 D
7. Report from the Research Policy Group  
**For information** S 19/20 2 E

The University of Edinburgh

Electronic Senate

**Report of Electronic Business of Senate conducted from  
Tuesday 14 January to Wednesday 22 January 2020**

**Formal Business**

1. Minutes from the Senate Meeting on 2 October 2019 (e-S 19/20 2 A)

The Minutes of the meeting of Senate held on 2 October 2019 were approved.

a. Special Meeting and Graduation Ceremonials on 23, 25, 26, 27, 28 and 29 November 2019

The Minutes of the Special Meetings and Graduation Ceremonials in November 2018 were taken as read and approved. It was noted that copies were available from Student Administration, Old College.

2. Membership of Senate (e-S 19/20 2 B)

Senate noted the new professorial and student members.

3. Conferment of the title Emeritus Professor (e-S 19/20 2 C)

Senate agreed to confer the title of Professor Emeritus on those professors listed in the paper who had recently retired, or whose retirement was imminent.

**Matters Arising**

There were no matters arising.

**Communications and Reports**

4. Communications from the University Court (e-S 19/20 2 D)

Senate noted the content of the report from the University Court on its meetings of 30 September 2019 and 2 December 2019.

5. Resolutions (e-S 19/20 2 E)

Senate, having considered the draft Resolutions below, offered no observations.

Draft Resolution No. 1/2020: Foundation of a Personal Chair of Scottish Legal History

Draft Resolution No. 2/2020: Alteration of the title of the Chair of Geography

Draft Resolution No. 3/2020: Foundation of a Personal Chair of Computational Statistics

Draft Resolution No. 4/2019: Foundation of a Personal Chair of Fine Art

9. Report from the Knowledge Strategy Committee (e-S 19/20 2 F)

Senate noted the Report of the Knowledge Strategy Committee meeting on 11 October 2019.

**Senate**

**5 February 2020**

**Senate Election Arrangements 2020**

**Description of paper**

1. This paper requests actions from Senate in order to implement University Ordinance 212 (Composition of the Senatus Academicus) and the Senatus Academicus (Senate) Election Regulations.

**Actions requested**

2. Senate is asked to **approve**:
  - a. The appointment of a Returning Officer and Deputy Returning Officer for the Senate election;
  - b. The opening of the call for nominations for members of academic staff to stand for election to Senate;
  - c. The deadline for the submission of nominations and the date of the election.
3. Senate is asked to **note**:
  - a. That Ordinance 212 (Composition of the Senatus Academicus) has now received approval from the Privy Council;
  - b. Amendments to Appendix 1: Senate *Ex Officio* membership of the Senatus Academicus (Senate) Election Regulations.

**Background and context**

4. Under University Ordinance 212 (Composition of the Senatus Academicus) academic staff elect from their own number 200 members of the Senatus Academicus.
5. Under the Senatus Academicus (Senate) Election Regulations, the call for nominations will normally be made at the first Senate meeting after 31 January. At this meeting, Senate will annually agree a deadline for the submission of nomination forms and the date on which the election will be conducted, and will appoint a Returning Officer and Deputy Returning Officer.

**Discussion**

6. Sue MacGregor, Director of Academic Services, is nominated as the Returning Officer of the Senate Elections. Kathryn Nicol, Academic Policy Officer, is nominated as the Deputy Returning Officer. Senate is invited to approve these nominations and appoint these candidates under paragraph 25 of the Senatus Academicus (Senate) Election Regulations.
7. Senate is invited to approve the dates of the nomination and election process set out below, under paragraph 24 and 25 of the Senatus Academicus (Senate) Election Regulations.

Nominations open (online)	5 February 2020
Deadline for nominations	5 March 2020 (1200 GMT)
Voting open (online)	24 March 2020 (0900 GMT) to 26 March 2020 (1230 GMT)

8. Senate is asked to note amendments to the Senatus Academicus (Senate) Election Regulations in Appendix 1: Senate *Ex Officio* membership. This has been amended to include Heads (Deans) of the Deaneries of the Edinburgh Medical School, the Director of the Institute for Academic Development, and the University Leads on Climate

Responsibility and Sustainability, and Equality, Diversity and Inclusion. The University Secretary has made this change under paragraph 4 of the Senatus Academicus (Senate) Election Regulations.

**Resource implications**

9. The cost of the Senate elections will be met from within existing budgets.

**Risk management**

10. The University's Risk Policy and Risk Appetite statement refers to the University holding 'no appetite for any breaches in statute, regulation.' Senate elections are mandated by University Ordinance 212.

**Equality & diversity**

11. An Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) has been conducted and is available on the [Equality and Diversity webpages](#).

**Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action agreed**

12. Senate elections will be managed by staff within the Academic Services team.
13. Information is available on the [Senate webpages](#).
14. Following approval by Senate, the opening of nominations for candidates to stand for election to Senate will be announced through multiple channels including the Senate website and all-staff email.

**Author**

Kathryn Nicol  
Academic Policy Officer

**Presenter**

Sue MacGregor,  
Director of Academic Services

**Freedom of Information**

Open

**Senatus Academicus**

**5 February 2020**

**Formal response to the externally-facilitated review of Senate and its Committees**

**Description of paper**

1. This paper provides the University's formal response to the externally-facilitated review of Senate and its committees, conducted by external consultant, Dr Jennifer Barnes of Saxton Bampfylde.

**Action requested / recommendation**

2. This paper is for information.

**Background and context**

3. The external review was completed in March 2019 and presented to University Executive for discussion on 23 April 2019 (Paper F), and to Senate for discussion on 29 May 2019 (Paper S 18/19 3 B).
4. Following discussion at Senate and the University Executive, Academic Services coordinated the University's formal response to the review, with the intention to present this to Senate at the meeting on 2 October 2019. This response has been delayed due to priority being given to the implementation of the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016, which required changes to the membership of Senate, and to the completion of the review of Senate Standing Committees, conducted by a Task Group convened by the Senior Vice-Principal. These tasks, relevant to the membership and responsibilities of Senate, were undertaken during 2018/19 and have now been concluded, and a brief summary is provided below.
5. Implementation of the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016 required changes to the membership of Senate. The membership arrangements from 1 August 2020 onwards is set out in [Ordinance 212: Composition of Senatus Academicus](#). Under this Ordinance the size of Senate has been reduced from over 850 members to approximately 300 members, including 200 elected academic staff members and 30 elected student members. Therefore although the membership of Senate has been reduced significantly, it remains a very large committee.
6. The Task Group conducting the review of the Senate Standing Committees reported to Senate on 29 May 2019 and resulting changes to the Senate Standing Committees were approved by Senate in September 2019. The remit of the review of Senate Standing Committees was to evaluate the current structure, memberships and terms of reference of the four Senate standing committees (at that time these were the Learning and Teaching Committee, Researcher Experience Committee, Quality Assurance Committee, Curriculum and Student

Progression Committee). Changes to the delegation of powers from Senate to the Standing Committees were out with the scope of this review, and therefore following this review, the academic governance of the University continues to rely heavily on the Senate Standing Committees.

7. The externally-facilitated review noted the initiatives above, both of which were in progress during the period in which the externally-facilitated review report was produced and finalised.
8. The externally-facilitated review also noted the introduction of the role of Vice-Principal Students to the University senior leadership: at the time of the review report, the Vice-Principal Students was not yet in post.

## Discussion

9. The external review was undertaken in response to the 2017 version of the Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance, which requires the University to undertake an externally-facilitated review of Senate and its committees every five years. The review made proposals concerning the role of Senate, the remit of its committees, and the way in which they link to University governance structures more generally. Key issues raised by the report included:
  - The future role of Senate and its Committees;
  - The relationship between the academic governance structures of Senate and its Committees, and the Executive and Court governance structures;
  - The role of Senate and its Committees in relation to research;
  - Governance of broader student experience matters.

The full report was presented to Senate on 29 May 2019 (Paper S 18/19 3 B).

10. Following discussion at the University Executive and at Senate, and taking into consideration the matters listed above, the response to the recommendations of the externally-facilitated review is summarised below.
11. Senate will continue to be primarily a consultative and communicative body, acting as a key forum for discussion, through which the academic community can engage with the senior leadership of the University, and participate in debate on strategic projects and priorities.
12. Senate will continue to delegate significant decision-making power to the Senate Standing Committees, as reflected in the current [Senate Standing Committees' Terms of Reference](#). Following extensive consultation, Senate approved the new membership model of approximately 300 members, and the reasoning behind this was that this was felt to create an effective model for discussion and debate, allow for a diversity of views, and potentially encouraging an engaged membership through a majority of elected positions. While the size of Senate will decrease significantly from August 2020 onwards, it remains unlikely to be an effective forum for the variety, depth and volume of work currently handled by the Senate Standing Committees.
13. Senate will continue to host Presentation and Discussion events on key strategic priorities: these provide an opportunity for a substantial discussion on a current

project or priority area in an open forum, and these have been very successful in increasing staff engagement with Senate. Senate will also be given opportunities to comment at an early stage on University-wide strategic projects relating to learning, teaching and research, through the formal Senate meeting agenda.

14. Senate agreed in May 2019 that the Research Policy Group should have dual reporting lines to Senate and to the University Executive, and the remit of the Research Policy Group has been updated to reflect this. The Research Policy Group remit has also been updated to include responsibility for early career researcher matters, as part of the review of Senate Standing Committees and following the dissolution of the Researcher Experience Committee. Therefore this change to reporting structures will enhance Senate's role in strategic research matters.
15. The membership of the Senate Standing Committees has been revised to include greater College representation on postgraduate research student matters, and to add Heads of Schools to the formal membership of Education Committee (formerly the Learning and Teaching Committee).
16. The VP Students has strategic responsibility for the University's commitment to the student experience, and the introduction of this role provides an opportunity for consideration of the governance of broader student experience matters. Work on the Student Experience Action Plan is currently overseen by a sub-group of the University Executive and these arrangements will be kept under review.
17. Academic Services, with the Conveners of the Senate Standing Committees, has established a Conveners' Forum to facilitate planning, coordination and prioritisation of Senate Standing Committee business. This includes ensuring that there is appropriate engagement with and reporting to Senate, and ensuring that there is engagement by the Senate Standing Committees with the annual planning round.
18. The detailed recommendations of the externally facilitated review and the University's response to these recommendations are in Appendix 1.

### **Resource implications**

19. Any resource requirements will be met from within existing budgets.

### **Risk management**

20. Effective academic governance assists the University in managing risk associated with its academic activities.

### **Equality & diversity**

21. There are no specific equality and diversity issues associated with this paper. Equality and diversity issues in relation to the changes in Senate membership as a result of the implementation of the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016 are reviewed in the related Equality Assessment Impact published on the [Equality and Diversity webpages](#).

**Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action agreed**

22. Review will be through annual internal reviews and five-yearly reviews of Senate effectiveness.

**Author**

Kathryn Nicol, Academic Policy Officer  
Sue MacGregor, Director of Academic Services

**Presenter**

Sarah Smith  
Vice-Principal and University Secretary

**Freedom of Information**

Open

## APPENDIX 1

### Formal response to the externally-facilitated review of Senate 2018-19 – detailed response to recommendations

The recommendations made in the review report have been grouped into 5 themes:

- Senate and Research
- The current and future role of Senate
- Standing Committees
- Professional services roles
- Vice-Principal Students role

Rec. No.	Review Recommendation	Theme	Response
15	To consider when and how the Learning and Teaching Policy Group and the Research Policy Group would produce a unified view or request to the Senate and its Standing Committees.	Senate and research	<p>Senate agreed in May 2019 that the Research Policy Group should have dual reporting lines to Senate and to the University Executive, and the remit of the Research Policy Group has been updated to reflect this. The Research Policy Group remit has also been updated to include responsibility for early career researcher matters, as part of the review of Senate Standing Committees and following the dissolution of the Researcher Experience Committee. Therefore this change to reporting structures will enhance Senate's role in strategic research matters.</p> <p>The Learning and Teaching Policy Group (LTPG) was led by the Senior Vice-Principal and acted as a forum for discussion and coordination among Vice- and Assistant-Principals, College Deans and Heads of Services. This group was not part of the formal governance structure and has been disbanded. A Senate Committee Conveners' Forum is proposed to replace some of the functions of LTPG, and this is discussed in more detail below.</p> <p>No changes are currently proposed to the Strategic Presentation and Discussion events hosted at Senate meetings, These events have been very effective in creating a forum for debate and discussion, and increasing staff engagement with Senate, and they will continue to be used to highlight and debate strategic developments in the University's management</p>
16	To consider how the Senate might have a role as the 'supreme academic body' in acknowledging the exceptional research activity of the university and supporting Research.		

			of research. In 2018/19 and 2019/20, Senate Presentation and Discussion topics have included Support for Early Career Researchers and the Research Excellence Framework.
1	To utilize the 2016 Act as a mechanism to reinvigorate a wider understanding of the role of the Senate as the 'supreme academic body' of the University of Edinburgh. At present the Senate has largely abrogated its right as the voice of advocacy for the academic community.	The current and future role of Senate	Following the implementation of the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) 2016 Act, Senate will be reduced in size to approximately 300 members and a larger proportion of the membership (over two-thirds) will be elected academic staff or student members. This is an opportunity to develop a more engaged membership with a more focused understanding of the role of Senate, and opportunities to stand for election to Senate will be widely advertised to encourage a diverse membership.
3	To rebuild a system whereby the Senate can recommend to the Court collective agreement on academic policy and strategy, encompassing teaching and research.		Senate has decision-making power in relation to academic policy and strategy, working within the strategic direction contained in the University's Strategic Plan (approved by Court), but does not have decision-making power in relation to resource allocation.
6	To use the Senate meeting to open and close University-wide consultations on broader academic strategy. 'The Discussion' part of the Minutes could be enhanced by recording who or what committee will address and progress the issues, prior to forming formal recommendation of the Senate to the Court. The Annual Report could then capture explicitly the actions taken by the Standing Committees on behalf of the Senate.		Therefore the engagement of Senate or Senate Standing Committees with planning rounds is one key aspect of advocacy for the academic community to Court. Engagement with the planning round is being reviewed by Academic Services and the Senate Standing Committee Conveners: a variety of approaches to facilitating this have been used in previous years, but there remains potential for a clearer understanding of the value of Senate Standing Committees' engagement with planning and identification of the most effective mechanism to achieve this.
8	To define what role the Senate has in receiving recommendations from their Standing Committee in relation to the Senate's role in recommending proposals to the Court.		Senate provides a key forum for consultation and communication between the academic community and senior University leaders including the Principal as Convener of Senate. This takes place via the Strategic Presentation and Discussion events hosted by Senate and within Senate business. The Presentation and Discussion section hosted by Senate will continue to be focused on current strategic priorities and will continue to provide an opportunity for wide-ranging discussion and feedback to the project leads and members of the senior management team. Recent topics have included Support for Early Career Researchers, Teaching and Academic Careers, Enhancing the Student Experience, Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy, Refreshing the University Strategic Plan, The Future of Distance Learning, and The University and the City.
9	To clarify the role of Senate Assessors to the Court, and to consider how the Assessors could update the Senate throughout the year, rather than		

<p>retrospectively, of issues relevant to the remit of the Senate.</p>	<p>While the Presentation and Discussion provides a forum for discussion of key strategic projects, these do not encompass all current business relevant to Senate, and Senate will continue to receive reports on and engage with a wider range of strategic projects relating to learning, teaching and research during formal Senate meetings. In recent years Senate has given input into work on the Teaching Excellence Framework, Development of a Learning Analytics Policy, Development of a Policy on Lecture Recording, Investment in student-facing buildings and facilities, and the Student Partnership Agreement. Typically Senate received reports on these projects when they were at an early stage and was invited to contribute to the early discussion and framing of the project, with further work then being carried forward by one of the Senate Standing Committees or another named task group.</p> <p>Senate will continue to provide comments on the annual revision of the Undergraduate, Postgraduate and Higher Degree Regulations, the approval of new degree programmes, and the approval of new chairs: these observations are reported to Court which has final approval. Senate will also continue to approve the award of Emeritus / Emerita professorships, and the award of degrees.</p> <p>Senate will continue to delegate significant decision-making powers and priority-setting to the Senate Standing Committees, within the specific remit of each committee. The recently approved remits of the Senate Standing Committees have not explicitly added Senate members to the membership of the Standing Committees. However, all Senate Standing Committees include senior members of academic staff from each College within their membership, and from 2019/20, three Heads of School have been added to the membership of the Education Committee, and additional academic representatives with responsibility for postgraduate research have been added to the Education Committee and Academic Policy and Regulations Committee. Senate Standing Committees do not have a role in setting policy or strategy in relation to research, and therefore Senate does not have access to this through Senate committees but going forward will receive reports from the Research Policy Group.</p> <p>Delegation to the Senate Standing Committees is in part of function of the need for Senate's work to be conducted effectively and timeously. Though the membership of Senate has</p>
--	--

			<p>been reduced, it remains a very large committee. This prohibits Senate from meeting frequently and has the potential to result in meetings which do not reach a quorum and therefore inhibit decision-making. The Senate Standing Committees have wide-ranging and diverse remits and engage with detailed matters of learning and teaching strategy, academic governance and policy, and quality assurance governance and processes. As an illustration, in 2018/19 the Learning and Teaching Committee (now Education Committee), Curriculum and Student Progression Committee (now Academic Policy and Regulations Committee) and Quality Assurance Committee agendas each included over 30 distinct projects or items of business for discussion, comment and / or approval. Senate in its current form would not be an effective forum to undertake the work currently carried out by the Standing Committees. Therefore attention will be focused on ensuring that Senate is engaged and consulted at an appropriately early stage in higher level projects. Work by Senate Committees carried out on behalf of Senate will continue to be reported to Senate annually: the frequency of reporting will be kept under review.</p> <p>While decision-making power and strategic direction remains with the Standing Committees, Conveners of these committees have the power to raise issues with Senate and Senate has the power to request updates from these committees. Therefore there is scope for Standing Committee Conveners to request a view from Senate on strategic issues as part of formal Senate business and for Senate to request a report from the Standing Committees.</p> <p>Academic Services will work with Court Services to clarify the Senate Assessors' role, in advance of the next Senate Assessors' election, following the end of current appointees' terms of office in 2022.</p>
10	To consider how the agendas of the Senate and its committee would be involved in planning round discussions, as was noted in the 2016 'light-touch' review of the Senate. This could be an aspect of the Senate Assessors' role, through the Learning and Teaching Policy Group, or by some other mechanism.	Standing committees	Academic Services will work with the Senate Standing Committee Conveners to increase coordination and flow through of business, intended to ensure Senate has a voice and is involved where most effective. In particular, a Senate Committee Conveners' Forum is proposed to provide a space to prioritise and coordinate committee business, to avoid duplication between committees where possible, and to identify opportunities for Senate Committees to engage with wider University strategy. Senate Assessors are not represented

7	At present the Senate committees request permission to set their own annual agendas. These should be integrated within the wider planning process which takes into account the long-term strategies as set by the Colleges, deliberated by the Senate and approved by the Court.		on the Senate Standing Committees and therefore their involvement is unlikely to be effective.
5	To better define the principle of subsidiarity so that committees are clear when they can take a decision, review a decision, mitigate a decision, approve a decision or refer to committees higher in the committee hierarchy.		Academic Services will refresh and republish the Senate Committee member's guidance in response to the recommendations of this review, to reinforce and clarify where necessary the principles of subsidiarity and powers of the Standing Committees.
2	To better integrate the work of the Standing Committees with the emergence of key central groups and committees'		As noted above, Senate Standing Committee Conveners are empowered to raise business with Senate, and the Education Committee is also empowered to refer business to the University Executive as required.
4	In the 2008 deliberations, the Standing Committees were set up to be 'both reactive and proactive', with both 'governance' and 'operation' within its remit. Within the newly-constituted Senate, use the forthcoming review of Standing Committees to define these committees' remits not only within the Senate, but also in the wider university governance.		Senate and the Standing Committees do not have budgetary authority but the Standing Committees' involvement in the planning round and access to the University Executive now allow them to effectively raise issues with budgetary implications.
13	To use the forthcoming review of the Standing Committees of the Senate to ensure a systems approach between groups and committees to avoid duplication.		
14	To consider how the University Executive and other, smaller bodies defined by the delegated authority of the Principal, could integrate the work of the Standing Committees of the Senate more effectively in terms of wider university strategy.		
11	To clarify the role of professional services colleagues in the reformed Senate and further to define their role in the future Standing Committees.	Professional services role	The implementation of the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016 required a review of the membership of Senate, and one of this outcomes of this review was that professional services staff will only be members of Senate as <i>ex officio</i> members (Vice-

			<p>Principals, Assistant Principals and the Director Library and University Collections), and will not be among the elected membership of Senate.</p> <p>Professional services staff continue to be full members of the Senate Standing Committees, and may be <i>ex officio</i> members, co-opted members, or College representatives.</p>
12	<p>To consider how the role of Vice-Principal Students will impact the work of the Standing Committees of the Senate, and ensure that this individual has sufficiently robust mechanisms through the Senate or other committees to influence policy and strategy.</p>	<p>Vice-Principal Students role</p>	<p>The VP Students has strategic responsibility for the University's commitment to the student experience, and is responsible for the development of innovative approaches to all aspects of student satisfaction and experience, including curriculum development, and the nurturing of a high-performance culture in teaching and learning.</p> <p>The VP Students is a member of the senior leadership team, and is the Convener of the Senate Education Committee, Convener of the Space Strategy Group, and a member of Senate and the University Executive.</p> <p>The VP Students is also a member of the Senate Standing Committees Conveners' Forum.</p>

**Senate**

**5 February 2020**

**Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR)**

**Description of paper**

1. An update on preparations, next steps and information on visits for ELIR 2020.

**Action requested / recommendation**

2. For information.

**Background and context**

3. ELIR is the method by which the Quality Assurance Agency Scotland (QAAS) reviews universities and other higher education institutions in Scotland. The University's next ELIR takes place in semester 1 2020/21.

**Discussion**

***Preparation of the Reflective Analysis***

4. Drafts of chapters 2, 3, 4 and 5, developed using information gathered from colleagues across the University and the Students' Association, were made available to all staff and students in November and December 2019 with accompanying Teaching Matters blog posts. Comments received on the draft chapters were used to develop a first draft of the reflective analysis.
5. The first draft is being reviewed by key internal and external stakeholders in the last week of January and the first week of February. Comments received on the first draft will be used to develop a second draft which will be made available to all students and staff to comment on in March 2020<sup>1</sup>. Briefing sessions will be held in early March for staff and students in roles who may be asked to meet the review team at visits. These briefing sessions will, as well as covering the background to ELIR and our preparations, encourage staff to comment on the second draft. A final version of the reflective analysis will then pass through University committees for approval in June 2020.
6. The development of the reflective analysis is being supported by a coordinated communications and engagement plan developed in consultation with Communications and Marketing and the Students' Association. The key elements of this plan are:
  - A Spotlight On ELIR series on Teaching Matters publicised to staff and students via email, social media channels and quality website<sup>2</sup>
  - Group meetings with students
  - Engagement with College committees
  - Regular update papers to Senate committees
  - Senate committee newsletter entries

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/quality/elir/elir-2020>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.teaching-matters-blog.ed.ac.uk/tag/spotlight-on-elir/>

## Visits

7. A review team, comprising three academic reviewers, two student reviewers and one co-ordinating reviewer has been appointed by QAAS to conduct the ELIR and will visit the University twice, meeting with staff and students.

6 August 2020	Deadline for submitting the Reflective Analysis and supporting Advanced Information Set to QAAS
17 September 2020	Early feedback provided to the University by QAAS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions and/or themes for exploration in the planning visit</li> <li>• Any areas where the team think they need additional documentation</li> </ul>
1 October 2020	PLANNING VISIT  Likely meetings: Meeting 1: Senior staff leading preparations Meeting 2: Group of student representatives Meeting 3: Group of staff involved at the discipline level
8 October 2020	Deadline by which we will receive (as an outcome of the planning visit): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An agreed set of themes to be explored during the review visit</li> <li>• A draft programme for the main visit</li> <li>• A note of additional information requested by the team</li> </ul> <p>We will have at most 6 weeks to organise and brief the staff and students who will be meeting the review team. In preparation, during semester 2 2019/20 we will identify staff and students in roles who may be asked to meet the review team at visits.</p>
26 October – 2 November 2020	Earliest and latest deadlines for providing additional information requested by the team (2-3 weeks to gather the information).
Week beginning 16 November 2020	Review visit  Meetings with groups of staff and students likely to be held Monday to Thursday (inclusive).

## Resource implications

8. Students and staff are asked to contribute to the development of the reflective analysis and some students and staff will be asked to meet the team during the planning and review visits.

## Risk management

9. A successful ELIR is of vital importance to the University.

## Equality & diversity

10. No issues are associated with this paper.

## Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action agreed

11. As outlined above.

**Author**

Professor Tina Harrison and Nichola Kett  
January 2020

**Presenter**

Professor Tina Harrison  
Assistant Principal Academic Standards  
and Quality Assurance

**Freedom of Information**

Open

**Senate**

**Wednesday 5 February 2020**

**Research Policy Group Update**

**Description of paper**

- 1 Summary of issues raised at Research Policy Group (RPG) that are relevant to the wider University community

**Action requested / recommendation**

- 2 For information

**Background and context**

- 3 Following a review of Senate Committees in 2018/19, RPG has taken on responsibility for early career researchers. This group of staff were formerly under the aegis of Researcher Experience Committee. Accordingly, RPG has taken the following steps:
  - To revise its Terms of Reference (changes indicated in italics) to take on responsibility for supporting the training and development of research staff *with particular regard to those early in their research careers*; Appendix 1
  - To provide reports for information to meetings of Senate on matters discussed by RPG of relevance to the wider University community

**Discussion**

New Universities UK Research Integrity Concordat

- 4 In October UUK produced its new Research Integrity Concordat following a consultation that took place earlier in 2019. All the main UK research funders such as UKRI and the Wellcome Trust are signatories. Key themes of the new Concordat are stronger linguistic tone around obligations and accountabilities, a greater degree of prominence for promoting a research culture that promotes a high standard of research integrity. There is also a stronger focus on the distinct role of funders in upholding research integrity.
- 5 The UK Research Integrity Office anticipate a lead-in period of a year before the Institutions can expect to be held to account. We understand that, initially, the signatories will judge institutions against three basic criteria:
  - Does the institution produce and publish an annual research ethics and integrity statement?
  - Does the institution have a webpage dedicated to research integrity?
  - Does the webpage contain contact points for questions and concerns?
- 6 The University already meets these three criteria which allows us space and time to focus on the new aspects of the concordat. To that end, a RAG analysis has been carried out by the University's Research Integrity Manager and presented to RPG. RPG has instructed Research Ethics and Integrity Group to develop an action plan.
- 7 It is intended that the views of Senate will be sought as a part of the process of developing the action plan and agreeing how to enact it.

New Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers - progress

- 8 At its meeting on 2 October Senate was informed that a new UK Researcher Career Development Concordat had been published. The University was invited to become a signatory and develop an action plan in order to deliver expectations of employers set out in the Concordat. Since then the Institute of Academic Development has been working with a range of internal stakeholders to develop an outline action plan so that

the University can commit to formally signing the Concordat. At its meeting on 21 January, University Executive accepted the recommendation from RPG and agreed that the University will become a signatory to the concordat and will undertake those measures that are deemed necessary for its implementation.

### **Resource implications**

9 Where relevant, funding is being sought or will be sought through the planning round.

### **Risk management**

10 The University is committed to meeting the expectations on employers that are set out in these two concordats. It is vital that we develop and maintain the highest standards for research integrity and that at whatever stage in their careers the university's researchers have the right environment to achieve their potential.

### **Equality & diversity**

11 Equality Impact Assessments will be carried out once action plans have been developed.

### **Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action agreed**

12 The implementation of Researcher Developer Concordat and the Research Integrity Concordat will require a widespread communication plan as well as a diverse group to implement the action plans. RPG will take a lead in overseeing these tasks and will update Senate. Senate had a discussion centred on the Researcher Development Concordat in October. RPG anticipates that Senate would welcome a discussion on meeting the expectations of Research Integrity Concordat in 2019/20 or early 2020/21.

13 It is only by working together working together across the University that we can ensure that importance of good practice in research is recognised, continue to strengthen the University's research culture as well as supporting researchers and enable them to realise their academic potential.

### **Author**

Dr Susan Cooper  
Senior Strategic Planner and secretary to RPG  
28 January 2020

### **Freedom of Information**

Open

## Appendix 1

### Research Policy Group

#### 1) Terms of reference

Research Policy group is responsible for:

- Development of the University's research strategy and monitoring of progress against the strategy
- Development of research practice, including:
  - identification and prioritising emerging areas
  - targeting existing areas for enhancement
  - supporting interdisciplinarity
  - encouraging large scale bids
  - prioritising bids to external agencies, when necessary
  - supporting mechanisms to identify and facilitate impact
  - facilitating the development of key external research partnerships
  - stewardship of relationships with funders
  - supporting the provision of training and development for research staff with particular regard to those early in their research careers
  - recommending developments in the research environment
  - developing policy to address changes in the research environment such as open access, open data, data repositories, open science and new funding opportunities.
- Oversight of the Edinburgh Research Office, with particular reference to research funding, impact and research governance arrangements
- Oversight of good research practice and stewardship of university-wide research policies, including those relating to researcher development, research ethics and integrity.
- Oversight of requirements for formal reporting to Court and funders associated with research practice policies, but exclusive of research programmes involving animals in scientific research<sup>1</sup> or the participation of volunteers in clinical trials<sup>2</sup>
- Assessing research performance against key performance indicators
- Ownership of the processes for the delivery of external assessments such as the Research Excellence Framework
- Delivering institutional responses to external consultations on research policy, best practice, guidance/advice and legislation

#### 2) Stakeholders

Research Policy Group's stakeholders are:

- Colleges, Schools, their academic and research support staff
- University Senior Management, through University Executive
- Edinburgh Research Office <sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.ed.ac.uk/research/animal-research/regulation>;

<sup>2</sup> <http://accord.scot/about-accord>

<sup>3</sup> The Research Support Office will adopt a new name on Monday 7 October. It will become the Edinburgh Research Office.

- Edinburgh Innovation (industry engagement, innovations/Intellectual Property development)
- Governance and Strategic Planning
- Finance
- Human Resources (researcher careers)
- Estates
- Procurement
- Information Services Group
- Communications and Marketing
- Development and Alumni
- Social Responsibility and Sustainability
- Institute for Academic Development
- External research funders <sup>1</sup>
- Research policy bodies<sup>4</sup>

### **3) Governance and reporting**

Research Policy Group reports to University Executive and, on occasion, to Senate.

### **4) Membership**

The core membership is given below. Other members will be co-opted for limited periods as required.

- Convener: VP (Planning, Resources and Research Policy)
- College Deans of Research
- Director of Edinburgh Research Office
- Head of Strategic Performance and Research Policy, GaSP
- Deputy Secretary, Strategic Planning
- Chief Information Officer and Head of ISG
- IAD Assistant Director/ Head of Researcher Development
- Chief Executive Officer, Edinburgh Innovations

In attendance:

- RPG Secretary: GaSP, Senior Strategic Planner
- Senior College Research Officers
- Relevant Senior policy officers as required (e.g. Library Research and Learning Services, Communications and Marketing, Finance, Human Resources)

### **5) Frequency of meetings**

Research Policy Group will meet five times a year.

### **6) Public availability of record of meetings**

---

<sup>4</sup> Scottish Funding Council, Research England, Russell Group, Universities Scotland, Universities Scotland Research Knowledge Exchange Committee, UK Research and Innovation, Universities UK, League of European Research Universities, Universitas21, etc.)

A public record of each meetings of RPG is uploaded once the note of the previous meeting has been formally confirmed <https://www.ed.ac.uk/governance-strategic-planning/research/rpg>.