

The University of Edinburgh
Periodic Review of Student Disability Service

Year on response report on recommendation actions

Periodic Review of Student Disability Service:

Date of Review: March 2015

The Support Service is responsible for reporting on progress of all recommendations, including joint recommendations which will be tracked by Academic Services. Recommendations remitted solely to other areas of the University for action will be followed up and tracked by Academic Services. Please report on progress towards meeting each recommendation. Any urgent recommendation should be highlighted along with a deadline for response. If any recommendation has been fully addressed please record the action taken and date completed. Any barriers to progress should be highlighted on this report.

Recommendation	Timescale for completion <i>If no timescale suggested in Final Report, please indicate a realistic timescale.</i>	Comment on progress towards completion and/or identify barriers to completion	Completion date/ Expected completion date
<p>Recommendation 1: The AILP is a positive and important development. The Review Team recommends to senior managers, including key University committees such as the Senatus Learning and Teaching Committee and EUSA that they: i. enhance engagement with the policy by communicating it more widely across the University, as well as bringing greater awareness of the implications of AILP; ii. help strengthen the policy through further work on implementation and embedding across the wider University.</p> <p>Recommendation 2: It is recommended that it might be helpful for a focused, small-scale audit of the Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy to be conducted to investigate how successful implementation of the policy has been, as well as to identify any obstacles to full implementation.</p>	<p><u>Student Disability Service's Response</u></p>	<p><u>Student Disability Service's Response</u></p> <p>Professor Tina Harrison (TH) and Sheila Williams (SW), SDS Director hosted a workshop for Coordinators of Adjustments on the policy, with the focus on the extent of implementation, sharing experience and good practice.</p> <p>SW met with Gavin Douglas, Deputy Secretary, Student Experience and professor Charlie Jeffrey, VP Learning and Teaching, in January, to discuss non-implementation of disabled student support, including the Accessible and Inclusive learning Policy "mainstreamed" adjustments and other disability issues.</p> <p>At Prof Jeffrey's instigation, SW consulted with key academic staff and prepared a paper for the University's Central Management Group (CMG) in April. However, this paper was withdrawn in light of EUSA's vote of no confidence in the Principal and the substantial coverage in "the Student" on the topic of the "University failing disabled students."</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Done</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Jan/April 2016</p>

		<p>The Principal has now initiated a review of support for disabled students convened by Professor Jane Norman, VP People and Culture, which includes Gavin Douglas, Professor Sandy Tudhope, Head of School of Geosciences and Jess Killeen, student representative.</p> <p>SW currently preparing an update on the Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy for the Learning and Teaching Committee meeting in May 2016.</p> <p>SW to explore involvement of Equality and Diversity Champions from Schools and revisit previous paper to LTC on additional adjustments for mainstreaming.</p> <p>Vet Med, working with SDS, have produced a postcard highlighting the Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy with their staff. Evaluation of awareness ongoing.</p> <p><u>College of Humanities and Social Science's response to Recommendation 1</u></p> <p>The College has disseminated this policy and holds biannual meetings with EUSA Sabbatical Officers, the Head of College, College Registrar, Deans and Head of Academic Administration at which the reach of mainstream adjustments, inter alia, is discussed.</p> <p><u>College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine's response to Recommendation 1</u></p> <p>The AILP is a positive and important development. The Review Team recommends to senior managers, including key University committees such as the Senatus Learning and Teaching Committee and EUSA that they: i. enhance engagement with the policy by communicating it more widely across the University, as well as bringing greater awareness of the implications of AILP; ii. help strengthen the policy through further work on implementation and embedding across the wider University.</p> <p>Whilst this recommendation is mainly aimed at the Senatus Learning and Teaching Committee and EUSA, the College has reminded Heads of Schools/Deans and Directors of Teaching and the College Teaching Organisations of the existence of the policy. The policy will also be an agenda</p>	<p>Ongoing/current</p> <p>May 2016</p> <p>April/ongoing</p>
--	--	--	--

		item for Deanery/School/College learning and teaching committees.	
<p>Recommendation 3: The Review highlighted the need for strong two-way engagement in order for communications to be effective, and recommends actions for the wider University in this area, ensuring inclusion of the Student Disability Service, EUSA Disability societies and disability access specialists in all relevant discussions across the University, particularly</p>	<p><u>Student Disability Service's Response</u></p> <p>As above</p>	<p><u>Student Disability Service's Response</u></p> <p>SW and Professor Tina Harrison, Convenor of the University's Disability Committee met with Gary Jebb, Director of Estates on 30/09/15.</p> <p>The objective was to seek permanent solutions and discuss future strategy/consultation and the possibility of E and B involving disabled students in their committees and/or processes.</p> <p>However – and despite SW's follow up, no meaningful response was received and no further engagement was forthcoming.</p>	<p>June 2016</p>
<p>Recommendation 4: The Review Team recommends that the Service makes wider use of student groups to enhance student engagement, for example through the student/staff liaison committees.</p> <p>Recommendation 5: The Review Team recommends that student representation on relevant committees and groups be further enhanced, particularly in relation to consultations over estates issues.</p>	<p><u>Student Disability Service's Response</u></p> <p>As above</p>	<p><u>Student Disability Service's Response</u></p> <p>There is already EUSA representation on all SDS serviced committees. SDS/SW will take forward proposals/discussion on either an annual or once per semester student focus group eg on the Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy and on issues from the student body.</p>	<p>June 2016/ongoing</p>
<p>Recommendation 6: The Review Team recommends, that lines of responsibility for ensuring adjustments are implemented could be made clearer, and suggests for example ensuring regular meetings between SDS and CoAs in Schools.</p>	<p><u>Student Disability Service's Response</u></p> <p>As above</p>	<p><u>Student Disability Service's Response</u></p> <p>SDS Assistant Director (Development) has training lead with the service. She will carry out initial work before Schools approached. Incremental approach needed to clarify which roles need what training needed; then make it available and notify Schools.</p>	<p>June - August 2016</p>

Recommendation 7: It is **recommended** that Schools find effective ways to implement a requirement of attendance at regular, relevant training sessions.

Explore possibility of doing more with IAD (initial discussions are underway) eg possibility of an online resource, showcase of good practice, tie in with ECU guidance on competence standards for academics.

The Student Disability Service, along with the student Counselling Service, will be heavily involved in delivering mental health training to Personal Tutors from September onwards.

College of Humanities and Social Sciences response

Recommendation 6

The College publishes the contact details for CoAs for all of its Schools on its own web pages but notes that the information available on the SDS website is largely guidance material for the CoAs to access. There is, perhaps, scope for more proactive management of this network by SDS. Nonetheless, the College will look at the effectiveness of the interaction carefully in 2016/17.

The College's Head of Academic Administration would be keen to see any further review of SDS look at the authority of Learning Profiles and associated recommendations/requirements issued by SDS to Schools. This would be helpful in navigating situations in which proposed adjustments, particularly in relation to assessment, are held to be inconsistent with the pedagogical priorities of the subject area concerned.

Recommendation 7

The College has had some success in this area, perhaps particularly in the area of mental health awareness training for front-line staff, including Student Support Officers. Professor Murray's recent initiative to provide student mental health awareness training to personal tutors, which has been disseminated throughout the College, is also a very positive development.

That said, attendance at such training, while strongly encouraged for particular roles, is not compulsory. It would be helpful if, as is the case with training for particular roles with other governance responsibilities (e.g. roles in Finance,

**From
September 2016**

where access to systems is withheld pending training being undertaken), the University would render training in these very important pastoral areas mandatory for roles with specific responsibilities.

We note that reference is made to the potential involvement of HR. This would be useful from the policy perspective of rendering any training mandatory but, as importantly, from an HR administrative perspective. The current Oracle system has no way of tracking training to enable the University to evidence appropriate development of staff and/or to identify milestones at which refresher training should be provided. Any new system arising from the HR Transformation Project should address this.

College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine's response

Recommendation 6: The Review Team recommends, that lines of responsibility for ensuring adjustments are implemented could be made clearer, and suggests for example ensuring regular meetings between SDS and CoAs in Schools.

Although School CoAs are referenced in this recommendation it is our view that implementation should be led by the SDS. The College will be happy to support measures to improve clarity in this area by promoting the need for engagement within the CoA community. One way of helping to do this would be to have greater visibility of who the Co-ordinators of Adjustments are, for example on the Student Disability Service website. This could also promote local networks within Colleges to help share and disseminate good practice.

We believe that more information about the nature of individual student disabilities would help front line staff understand and assist students when they make contact with our Deaneries and Schools. Whilst we understand that there may be confidentiality considerations, the lack of any detail can inhibit staff from providing high quality support.

Recommendation 7: It is recommended that Schools find effective ways to implement a requirement of attendance at regular, relevant training sessions.

In Medicine there is an annual Training session for the University Personal Tutors (PTs) and Clinical Teaching Associates (CTAs) who are the academic staff with a key contact role with students. We also have a dedicated team of support staff who deal with any students in need (MBChB Student Support). The Adjustments Adviser meets with students on an individual basis to discuss Learning Profiles and Reasonable Adjustments. The Student Support team are invited to go on any training needed and our Student Experience Officer did go on a number of training courses around this topic. Some of our PTs/CTAs are NHS employees and at present the only mandatory training for them is an induction session; through our joint leadership of this group of staff we will highlight the benefit of ongoing training.

One of the means of implementing a requirement for training is the development of systems to better record and map training needs. The current University HR Transformation Programme provides an opportunity to include a system solution which will support this objective, which will benefit not only training and development in this area but across a whole range of subjects. In the meantime work is being taken forward in College HR to develop a matrix mapping of core training requirements against the responsibilities of different types of jobs to allow line managers to target opportunities to relevant members of staff. This would be cascaded within the College management structure for implementation by Heads of School/Deans.

College of Science and Engineering's response

Recommendation 6:

Comment: As noted above, clarifying the role of Coordinators of Adjustments is a priority for the College QA Committee in 2016/17. Ensuring regular meetings between SES and CoAs in Schools will be incorporated into these discussions.

		<p>Proposed Actions for 2016-17: The College will discuss roles and responsibilities with School Coordinators of Adjustment.</p> <p>Recommendation 7:</p> <p>Comment: Clarification received from the Internal Review team regarding this recommendation has confirmed that the recommendation is not for the Schools to take responsibility for ensuring staff attend training, but to provide advice and support to SDS on how best to engage with colleagues.</p> <p>Proposed Actions for 2016-17: The College will discuss this matter with Coordinators of Adjustments (as part of its 2016/17 project to review the roles and responsibilities of Coordinators of Adjustments) in the first instance, and then with Directors of Teaching as part of College Learning & Teaching Committee, and with Heads of Graduate School as part of College Research Training Committee.</p> <p>Following these discussions, the College will liaise with SDS and Schools as appropriate to recommend ways to increase attendance at relevant training sessions.</p>	
<p>Recommendation 8: The Review Team recommends deeper School engagement between Schools and Timetabling, ensuring that Schools are clear on their role in relation to responsibilities for ensuring accessibility for disabled students, and that Advisors know the buildings that are to be accessed</p>	<p><u>Student Disability Service Response</u></p> <p>March 2017</p>	<p><u>Student Disability Service's Response</u></p> <p>Sheila met with Scott Rosie from Timetabling Unit to explore the workability (or otherwise) of this recommendation. Possible options going forward – SDS representation at the Timetabling Operations meeting(s) in January/February 2016. Timetabling suggest exploring whether all teaching rooms can be surveyed (not just those which are centrally managed).</p> <p>SDS Director has been asked (as of 6/05/16) to join the University's Space Strategy Committee.</p> <p><u>College of Humanities and Social Science's Response</u></p> <p>Although the College would consider that the engagement between Timetabling and its Schools is significant, there are challenges: much of our estate in the central area is</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p>

inaccessible. There are also some issues arising from the Timetabling Unit timetabling students with disabilities and not alerting relevant Schools to this. This applies to exam timetabling as well as to teaching. There were some difficulties in November 2015 in relation to allocating responsibilities between Student Administration and Schools for exam rooming for students with special examination arrangements.

There are persistent problems with lifts and the contractors who are maintaining them, which can render otherwise accessible teaching spaces inaccessible: please refer to the response to Recommendation 11.

The College acknowledges that the review group will report on progress in this area from the perspectives of SDS and the Timetabling Unit and will be happy to engage in further discussion.

College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine's response

The Review Team recommends deeper School engagement between Schools and Timetabling, ensuring that Schools are clear on their role in relation to responsibilities for ensuring accessibility for disabled students, and that Advisors know the buildings that are to be accessed

At present only parts of the College use the central timetabling system, with the remainder (based at Little France, Easter Bush and the Western General Hospital) making use of a bespoke room booking system which provides access to both University and, where applicable, NHS bookable spaces. Staff who provide administrative support for the system will help with access arrangements when instances are brought to their attention and Teaching Organisation staff also deal with disabled students' needs on a case by case basis via Learning Profiles, organising the rooms themselves to ensure they are accessible.

In the longer term there is an aspiration to accommodate all College bookings within the University's central timetabling system which will provide a consistent and common approach. One area already using the central system has

		<p>highlighted the potential for improvement as they report that the access requirements of any disabled students is left entirely to them. Neither the Student Disability Service, nor the Timetabling Unit have made contact about the requirements of disabled students. It is suggested that the Student Disability Service provide basic information (a check list for example) to ensure everything is covered, which might include contacting the Timetabling Unit to alert them to the needs of any students. There is recognition that ultimately the responsibility to ensure that disability access and services are in place is for the local area, but better communication between the Student Disability Service, the Timetabling Unit and the Deanery/School would help.</p> <p><u>College of Science and Engineering's Response</u></p> <p>Comment: The College has received clarification on this recommendation and understand that it is about the problems that are connected with finding accessible rooms – particularly at the start of the semester when students sign up for courses. It is not clear at this stage whether this is an issue for students in CSE given there are fewer optional courses available – however the College will be discussing this matter with School Coordinators of Adjustments, to identify whether this is a CSE issue or not.</p> <p>Proposed Actions for 2016-17: The College will discuss this matter with Coordinators of Adjustments to identify whether this is a CSE issue or not, and liaise further with SDS as necessary.</p>	
<p>Recommendation 9: The Review Team recommends that <i>Estates and Buildings</i> considers an audit of disabled access to buildings so that priorities for improvements can be identified and progressed, where reasonable.</p>	<p><u>Student Disability Service Response</u></p> <p>N/K – E and B lead</p>	<p><u>Student Disability Service's Response</u></p> <p>SDS Director has been asked (as of 6/05/16) to join the University's Space Strategy Committee.</p> <p>It is hoped that this issue will be further investigated and addressed via the "Disability Review".</p>	<p>June 2016</p> <p>Timetable not yet confirmed</p>
<p>Recommendation 10: The Review Team recommends as a matter of urgency completion of the review of the PEAPs process (by Estates and Buildings) to ensure responsibility for</p>	<p><u>Student Disability Service Response</u></p>	<p><u>Student Disability Service's Response</u></p>	

<p>developing and monitoring PEAPs, both in Schools and the wider University, is clarified.</p> <p>Recommendation 11: The Review Team strongly recommends that there is clearer definition of roles and responsibilities in Schools in relation to fire evacuation.</p>	<p>N/K – VP People and Culture lead</p>	<p>Prof Jane Norman is leading a small working group looking at this issue. The group is due to report in June 2016.</p> <p>The PEAP process from the point of view of the Fire Safety Unit/H&S Department has been worked out in detail and is kept under constant review.</p> <p><u>Health & Safety Department’s Response to Recommendation 10</u></p> <p>We liaise closely with appropriate Estates and other colleagues on this issue, via the following forums:</p> <p>H&S/E&B Fire Liaison Group (monthly) Central Area Building Opening Hours (short life working group) PEAPS/Disability issues Group (convened by Jane Norman - quarterly)</p> <p>We have assisted recently in dealing with a student complaint regarding her PEAP; this has been satisfactorily resolved for now by the implementation of a mobile trained Recovery Team covering her activities between certain hours, funded by CSG. This approach provides a possible, though expensive, model for wider dissemination across the University.</p> <p>There are 2 main aspects to the PEAP process - (a) physical/building aspects - access and (especially emergency) egress - these fall to Estates, (b) procedural aspects, where the Fire Safety Unit (FSU) come in.</p> <p>FSU colleagues tell me that the vast majority of student PEAPs which they have helped to formulate are entirely successful and acceptable to the individual students, with the sole exception of the formal complaint, which centred around building aspects.</p> <p>As noted above, we consult, liaise with and assist Estates colleagues with these issues on an ongoing basis - the work of the Fire Liaison Group is key to this, as it considers resources to install disabled passenger lifts, deaf evacuation systems, and other building-related modifications.</p>	<p>Not known – VP lead</p>
---	---	--	-----------------------------------

Jane Norman's group has identified a number of routes to enhance the current system, by regularising the roles and procedures at School level, and involving Room Bookings - this is still a work in progress.

College of Humanities and Social Science's response to Recommendation 11

The background to any question of fire evacuation is the availability of trained individuals: roles are voluntary and attract no incentive, in contrast with those of first aiders. Even when there are teams in place in larger areas, the teams may be small, and even with regular training slots, these can be difficult for staff to attend with other duties. The College is in the early stages of considering whether it should be implementing a shared evacuation team for the areas around George Square, with a level of co-ordination which would help maximise the impact of those staff who volunteer.

There is an ongoing lack of clarity across the university about what PEEPs/PEAPs involve and who has responsibility for their oversight and this has been a cause for concern for Directors of Professional Services (DoPS), in particular. Several DoPS have had to make ad hoc arrangements for staff to be present in buildings after-hours for research seminars attended by PGR students who are wheelchair users, for example. There is a high level of awareness in the College's Schools, but the College looks forward to the outcome of the PEEPs/PEAPs working group to identify any specific recommendations for College staff and for staff in Support Groups, to take account of locally and centrally managed rooms.

Related to this recommendation, there have been serious problems in recent months with the operability of lifts in several of the buildings occupied by the College, compromising access and egress for staff and students with and without mobility impairment. In the last two weeks, there have been two incidences of lift users being trapped as the lift malfunctioned. The Director of Estates is aware of these incidents and has initiated meetings with the relevant supplier.

College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine's response to Recommendation 11

The Review Team strongly recommends that there is clearer definition of roles and responsibilities in Schools in relation to fire evacuation.

The College provides comprehensive information about the arrangements for building emergencies where individuals have mobility impairment. Because of the distributed geographic nature of our activities health and safety management is organised around our campuses, with the local Health and Safety Managers responsible to the relevant Heads of School/Deans as appropriate. The Little France Health and Safety Manual has a specific chapter on "MOBILITY IMPAIRMENT AND BUILDINGS EMERGENCIES", with dedicated online training staff can access. Similar documentation is available at WGH and at Easter Bush specific instructions have been prepared dealing with "Fire Procedures for disabled persons in event of Fire". In other areas the [University's Health and Safety Policy document](#) is used as a basis for local arrangements. There is a good understanding among the local Health and Safety Managers of the requirements for Personal Emergency Assistance Plans, with several in place for named individuals with corresponding named people designated and trained to support them in the event of a building emergency. In addition training events have been held in the use of evacuation chairs to ensure sufficient staff have been trained in their use.

The College has taken the opportunity afforded by this exercise to remind Heads of Schools/Deans and Directors of Teaching and the College Teaching Organisations about the existing procedures in place to deal with fire evacuation.

College of Science and Engineering's response to Recommendation 11

Comment: The College has been advised that this recommendation is connected with recommendation 10 and that there was a lack of clarity across the university about what PEEPs involved, and who had responsibility for PEEPs – which has resulted in a short-life working group

		<p>being established to work through the issue of PEEPs/PEAPs.</p> <p>Proposed Actions for 2016-17: Schools will await the outcome of the PEEPs/PEAPs working group to identify any specific recommendations for Schools – but in the meantime the College will discuss with School Coordinators of Adjustments, mechanisms for raising awareness within Schools of PEEPs and responsibility for PEEPs.</p> <p>Recommendation for Internal Review team: Given many rooms in buildings that are occupied by Schools are managed centrally and not the responsibility of Schools, CSE would suggest that this recommendation is also assigned to Estates to ensure that evacuation requirements and roles are clear in all buildings.</p>	
<p>Recommendation 12: In relation to pressures of space, the Review Team recommends Schools liaise with SDS to flag up any suitable additional available space they have.</p>	<p><u>Student Disability Service's Response</u></p> <p>Ongoing</p>	<p><u>Student Disability Service's Response</u></p> <p>SDS continues to work with Schools intermittently to find additional rooms for use by SDS sessional staff.</p> <p>In addition, several SDS staff are now seeing students for evening appointments to maximise 1:1 student support time and existing space.</p> <p><u>College of Humanities and Social Science's response</u></p> <p>As the review team will be aware, space pressures in the College are significant and the nature and availability of all teaching space is made known to colleagues. When difficulties have been experienced in timetabling – as was the case particularly in the central area in September 2015 and, to a lesser extent, in January 2016 – the College worked with the Head of the Timetabling Unit to offer any possible additional space (whose purpose was non-teaching) to alleviate the pressure on the teaching timetable. The College is unaware of any further action it is able to take.</p> <p><u>College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine's response</u></p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

		<p>In relation to pressures of space, the Review Team recommends Schools liaise with SDS to flag up any suitable additional available space they have.</p> <p>Because much of our activity is located outwith the Central Area the College recognises the importance of providing space for student support services across our different locations. During briefing discussions for new buildings one of the issues considered is the aim of providing suitable space; this would generally be shared across a number of services as it is not used 100% of the time by any one service. These considerations also extend to discussions of opportunities to refurbish existing space as part of measures to enhance the student experience. These discussions tend to be led by the Estates Department and they include consulting the relevant support services to ensure that the type of space on offer meets their requirements.</p> <p><u>College of Science and Engineering's response</u></p> <p>Comment: The College has been advised that the intent of this recommendation was suggesting proactive engagement across the University with the challenges posed by limited space, rather than extensive or specific action required by Schools.</p> <p>Proposed Actions for 2016-17: The College will discuss with School Coordinators of Adjustments, mechanisms for ensuring that Schools alert colleagues in Timetabling of a student (on a specific programme) with disabilities when organising room buildings.</p> <p>Recommendation for Internal Review team: Given many rooms in buildings that are occupied by Schools are managed centrally and not the responsibility of Schools, CSE would suggest that this recommendation is also assigned to Estates to ensure that disabled lifts and access are clear in all buildings.</p>	
<p>Recommendation 13: The Review Team recommends that the Student Disability Service</p>	<p><u>Student Disability Service's Response</u></p>	<p><u>Student Disability Service's Response</u></p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

<p>management team monitors the impact of the restructure on students and staff in the Service.</p>	<p>Academic year 2016-17</p>	<p>The restructure has been implemented and a follow up review has now taken place.</p> <p>Further discussion and additional training for Advisors is ongoing and planned for the summer, to ensure that generic approach becomes fully embedded.</p>	
<p>Recommendation 14: The volume of adjustments at the start of academic year is high, which can put additional pressure on the Service. The Review Team therefore recommends provision of short-term staff to help reduce pressures in this area</p> <p>Recommendation 15: It is recommended that more resource, both in terms of time and space, is allocated for the area of mental health mentoring provision.</p>	<p><u>Student Disability Service's Response</u></p> <p>Current/semester 1 2016-17</p>	<p><u>Student Disability Service's Response</u></p> <p>SDS successfully recruited a sessional Needs Assessor to assess students for financial support under the UK Disabled Students Allowance (DSA) support provision. She has worked throughout academic year 2015-16. We are about to appoint a second sessional needs assessor, with potentially one more.</p> <p>An additional cohort of sessional Mental Health Mentors were appointed for academic year 2015-16 and worked at 4 sites throughout the University estate. Due to staff turnover, further recruitment will take place to ensure no loss of MHM hours for academic year 2016-17.</p>	<p>Done, but also ongoing</p> <p>Done, but ongoing</p>
<p><u>College of Humanities and Social Science: Overall Comment</u></p> <p>The College Registrar has been asked to provide an update against four specific recommendations contained in the report which followed the March 2015 review of the Student Disability Service. These were recommendations 7,8,11 and 12. There were other recommendations contained in the report which required the involvement of College or School staff upon which the Registrar was not asked to comment but which are nonetheless addressed in brief, for completeness; these are recommendations 1 and 6.</p> <p>General Comments</p> <p>The substantial gap between the review fieldwork and the subsequent distribution of the report arising from it has meant that limited time has been available to those charged with actions to</p>		<p><u>Summary and points forward</u></p> <p>The College observes that several of the most persistent difficulties experienced by students are, on the face of it, not those which require very complex solutions. Establishing and maintaining a single point of contact for a student with a disability would seem the most straightforward means of ensuring that the student does not have the burden of co-ordination him- or herself and of making certain that there is a feedback loop for students who often report that they receive no further communication on actions taken relating to problems they raise. This is enshrined in the original report (section 3.6) but does not appear yet to be the experience of our students.</p> <p>The College notes the intention to establish a further review group to be convened by Professor Jane Norman to consider the University's current arrangements to support students with disabilities. This is welcome, particularly given some specific and difficult cases which have emerged in the College in the last year, most of which have arisen from lack</p>	

<p>execute these. Having said that, the College has taken forward a number of associated actions in relation to the recommendations and in addition to them: for instance, introducing Support for Study Panels under the Support for Study policy. The panels, of which there have been eight to date, seek to find a constructive way forward when Schools consider that they have exhausted all available options to support a student who continues to cause them concern. In many cases, the problematic behaviour may be the result of health or disability issues - either confirmed/diagnosed or strongly suspected.</p>		<p>of co-ordination of services across the University and/or from lack of clearly defined responsibilities. The College will be very glad to play its part in any effective remedial measures taken across the institution.</p> <p>Finally, the College would be keen to see the extension of this work to staff members, particularly where mobility impairment is the main issue. While we acknowledge that staff and students have different experiences, in many ways, their experiences are also strikingly similar in others. In fact, there are likely to be as many differences between an undergraduate student and a postgraduate research student as between a student and a staff member.</p>	
<p><u>College of Science and Engineering: Overall Comment</u></p> <p>Unfortunately limited progress has been made on progressing the recommendations assigned to Schools, as CSE Schools had not seen the report and recommendations from the Periodic Review of Student Disability Service until January 2016, and on reviewing the recommendations had a number of queries which were clarified in March 2016.</p> <p>The College QA Committee had already identified clarification of the role of Coordinators of Adjustments, a priority for 2016-17 academic year, and these recommendations have been incorporated into that project.</p>		<p><u>Specific actions being taken</u></p> <p>Provide copy of SDS Periodic Review document to next College QA Committee meeting, with this document and remit for Coordinator of Adjustments meeting(s) to occur to discuss/address recommendations.</p> <p>Responsibility: College Academic Affairs (QA) team</p>	
<p>Please report on steps taken to feedback to students on the outcomes of the review</p>	<p>Student Disability Service Response:</p> <p>Reported in the SDS annual report available on the website at http://www.ed.ac.uk/student-disability-service/about/annual-reports/annual-report-2014-2015</p>		