

The University of Edinburgh
The Moray House School of Education
School Postgraduate Studies Committee

Minute of the meeting held at 9.30am on 22 August 2016 in Room 2.03 Charteris Land

Present: Dr A Hancock (Convener), Dr S Beames, Dr E Boeren, Ms S Chapman Ms S Colegrove, Ms N Gilbert, Dr A Kennedy, Dr J MacAllister, Dr A Macpherson Ms R O'Neill, Dr S Phillips, Ms R Rennie, Dr G Robinson, Dr C Sinclair Dr J Telford, Dr D Torrance and Dr C Valentin.

In attendance Ms L Rowand, Mrs D Scott, Dr K Cebula, Ms R Forrester, Dr A MacDonald, Dr T Macintyre, Dr A Rae, Dr L Reid and Professor J Robertson.

Apologies Dr H Christie, Mr R Easton, Dr R Ewins, Dr E Christie, Dr A Emejulu, Dr S Fawkner, Dr D Fry, Dr A Niven, Dr S Psycharakis Dr G Reid, Dr C Rosenhan, Dr P Sangster, and Ms W Timmons

1. Welcome and apologies

The Convener welcomed all to the meeting, in particular those members who were attending for the first time. Apologies were as noted above.

2. Minute of the meeting held on 4 May 2016

The minute of the meeting was approved as an accurate record.

3. Matters Arising (not considered elsewhere on the agenda)

There were a number of matters arising in the minute with which the previous Director of Postgraduate Studies had been dealing. These would be addressed in due course by the new Director.

The following actions had been addressed:

Item 3.3 Dissertation writing course for PGT students: the Convener had passed on the committee's thanks to Cathy Benson and the English Language Teaching Centre;

Item 3.7 School Academic Misconduct Matters: the Depute Director (PGR) and School Academic Misconduct Officer had contacted College regarding the Graduate School's proposal to use Turinitin at various points during a PGR student's period of study. The College Officer was very supportive of this proposal and had indicated that it wished this approach to be used as a pilot for potential wider use across the University. The Depute Director and SAMO were working on some of the final aspects of the proposal and would update committee members at a future meeting of SPGSC.

4. Convener's Business

4.1 Appointment of new Programme Director

Interviews were to be held shortly for the post of Programme Director of MSc Language Teaching.

4.2 College Postgraduate Studies Committee

The first meeting of the academic year of this committee would now be held on Wednesday 19 October.

5. Programme Matters

5.1 MSc in Transformative Learning and Teaching: New programme proposal

Dr Aileen Kennedy, Programme Director for the proposed new programme outlined the background to its development. The proposal aligned with School and University strategy and also with the Scottish government's national trajectory for teacher education policy. The Scottish Government had been clear that it wished initial teacher education (ITE) providers to work together to develop innovative and flexible routes for ITE and that the number of teachers with Masters qualifications should increase. It had confirmed in March 2016 that it would support the development of the programme and also guaranteed the payment of fees for students for its two year period of study. This development was being watched by other University providers of ITE both in Scotland, the wider UK and overseas. However, there were a number of challenges to overcome in order to develop and deliver this programme cost effectively by its proposed launch in September 2017.

Dr Lesley Reid, Director of Undergraduate programmes, explained that the new programme was a logical development of the way in which ITE programmes had been developing within the School of Education. The existing PGDE programmes had gradually been changing to enable students to accumulate more level 11 credits and students on these programmes now graduated with 60 credits at level 11. There was considerable expertise within the staffing which meant that the School had the capability of launching this degree programme and potentially leading a nationwide shift in the way in which teacher education was delivered and undertaken.

In line with the College's guidance for new programme proposals, an external assessor had been appointed to review the documentation. He had raised a number of issues. The programme team was currently reviewing and refining the proposal in light of these comments. One of the most significant matters was the development of site based learning and the establishment of corresponding partnerships. Work on this had inevitably been stalled by the schools' summer holidays but the programme team were in contact with Local Authorities and should be able to progress further with these discussions now that the school year had started.

In discussion regarding the proposal following points were raised:

- The innovation of graduates from the programme being qualified to teach either Nursery – Senior 3 or Primary 5 – Senior 6. Graduates would be qualified to teach across the primary/secondary transition. This would give more flexibility in the workforce, which was consistent with the Scottish government's aims, but from an ITE providers point of view would be more complex to deliver;
- SPGSC suggested it would be helpful to have a visual representation of the pathways and how students would move through the programme. The programme team had already anticipated this request and was in the process of developing an appropriate diagram;
- The GTCS did not have a stipulated number of days students were required to be placed in schools simply because this was the first programme of this type. However, the programme team had worked on the basis of the number of days the GTCS required students on existing programmes to be in schools and had increased it proportionally in accordance with the length of the programme;
- It was confirmed that students would be able to exit after one year of the programme with a Postgraduate Diploma assuming they had accumulated sufficient credits. This award would not carry a teaching qualification;
- Outdoor Education would be incorporated into the Developing Teaching Professionalism courses. SPGSC suggested this be more explicit;

- Although members of the committee supported the idea of many of the course assessments being negotiated with students, there was concern about the inevitable increased workload for tutors resulting from this. The programme team explained that it did not envisage one to one negotiations for every individual student but that it would be done on a group basis, stressing the collaborative nature of the discussions and emphasising that compromise was necessary within the group. It was recognised that initially at least this would place a heavier burden on the programme director and course organisers but it was believed there was a real will to introduce this innovation within this programme;
- The programme contained some elements of assessment which were radical in their approach. For instance, individual or group negotiations may result in students on the same course submitting assignments using different modes of assessment. In order to ensure fairness and consistency such assignments will require extremely clear rubric and marking schemes. The “Assessing What Matters” courses would run throughout the two years of the programme. These two courses would facilitate students in applying their experiences of themselves as learners within their own teaching. The UG Director had confidence that the programme team was equipped to deliver and support these innovative practices. They would also be working with Professor Susan Rhind, Vice Principal for Assessment and Feedback who had responsibility for the strategic leadership for assessment and feedback developments across the University and who was very supportive of the team’s approach to developing new forms of assessment.
- It was clarified that the cluster tutors would be Local Authority appointees;
- The two Developing Teaching Professionalism courses were the equivalent of the dissertation element of the programme. Final assessment of these would be by the submission of a portfolio of evidence and a professional viva. It was discussed whether there could be variation in this format just as elsewhere in the Graduate School there was a movement away from the standard dissertation format and increasingly students had a degree of choice in how they undertook this major piece of work. The proposed format for the Masters element as a portfolio/viva was already non-standard and at present the programme team believed that this was the most appropriate way of assessing that both the Masters standard of learning and the professional obligations required of all qualified teachers had been met by the student;
- The committee and the programme team discussed the way in which students would be equipped with the necessary research tools to enable them to undertake the equivalent of Masters level research/practitioner enquiry within the programme;
- Students who had failed a course would still be able to graduate and be GCTS registered provided that they could be awarded a pass in line with the University’s assessment regulations and that they were able to demonstrate (probably at the professional viva) how they had rectified the weaknesses which had led to the failure of the course. Members of SPGSC concluded that this was an exciting and radical development.
- Clarification would be required by central University services such as Recruitment and Admissions and Communications and Marketing regarding how to advise potential applicants on the benefits of each of the different ITE routes and the target market for which each was intended;
- The programme team should ensure that progression and award criteria were in line with the University’s taught assessment regulations;
- Assessment criteria for the Developing Teacher Professionalism courses must articulate with Masters level criteria as well as with professional criteria;
- SPGSC noted that the English entry requirement for the proposed programme was lower than that required for the existing initial teacher education programmes. Some students may be able to commence the programme without Higher English on entry. The purpose of this was to support students who may have another first language and who have a degree, e.g. a person with Urdu as their first language who has not yet achieved Higher English. This could improve diversity in those recruited to the teaching profession. It would also offer other possibilities such as the recruitment of deaf British Sign Language

users being able to enter the teaching profession, even though it would likely be in small numbers.

- The programme team should check whether or not the GTCS required entrants to primary education programmes to have a pass in a Language Higher
- A formal response to the External Assessor's report would be required to be attached to the documentation and the programme team was currently working on this;

Following discussion, members of SPGSC agreed to support the programme proposal and that it be forwarded to the Board of Studies on 1 September 2016 for further consideration and approval. If approved by Board of Studies the final paperwork in support of the proposal was required to be submitted to the College Office by 31 October 2016. If it was submitted after this date then it was unlikely that approval would be given for the programme's launch in September 2017. **[Action: Forward to Board of Studies]**

5.2 MSc Education: Report of the Programme Review Panel

A programme review of MSc Education had taken place on 26 April 2016. The review documentation had included a proposal for the introduction of seven new pathways. The pathway model was intended to be low risk as it was built from existing courses and would enable courses to run in the future, which on their own, were not currently viable. The pathway model would build on the Graduate School's strengths whilst also giving the MSc Education programme more of an identity and focus. It was also hoped that the new pathway model would attract students from a greater diversity of countries.

The seven proposed pathways were as follows:

- MSc Education
- MSc Education (Research)
- MSc Education (Learning in communities)
- MSc Education (Physical Education and Well-being)
- MSc Education (Comparative education and international development)
- MSc Education (Philosophy of Education)
- MSc Education (Child and Adolescent Psychology)

In response to one of the recommendations from the review panel, the number of courses which would be made available as an option on any of the MSc Education pathways had been rationalised. It was hoped that in time, if the programme grew, these courses could be reintroduced.

It was commented that there could be more variety and innovation in the assessments across the programme. At present there was an over reliance on the traditional 4000 word essay or group presentations. The programme team was aware of this and at its recent away day had begun discussing how to introduce more diverse tasks to the assessment portfolio of the programme.

The documentation contained a section on accessible learning but it was advised that this should be expanded to explain how the requirements of students' schedules of adjustment would be incorporated within assessments.

SPGSC thanked the programme director, programme team and programme secretary for the work that had been undertaken in order to develop these pathway proposals. The committee endorsed the recommendation of the review panel to support the introduction of the new pathways and forwarded the documentation to the Board of Studies for consideration and approval. If approved by Board of Studies the final paperwork in support of the proposal was required to be submitted to the College Office by 31 October 2016. If it was submitted after this date then it was unlikely that approval would be given for the programme's launch in September 2017. **[Action: Forward to Board of Studies]**

5.3 Masters by Research: proposal for revised programme

Discussion of this proposal was postponed to a future meeting of the committee.

5.4 Schedule of programme reviews

SPGSC noted the schedule of reviews which had been undertaken and those which were due to take place. It was current practice for all programmes to have a programme review every five years. This was a thorough process and had many merits, but was also a time consuming and expensive process.

It was noted, however, that there was no requirement under College or University regulations for programmes to be reviewed in this way. Within the College's Graduate School, Education and Sport appeared to be the only School which operated a cycle of individual periodic reviews for programmes.

The University conducted internal subject reviews (Teaching Programme Reviews for undergraduate and Postgraduate Programme Reviews for PG). The University's Quality Framework (<http://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/annualmonrevrepguidance.pdf>) also stated that all programmes must be monitored and reviewed annually. Consequently annual programme reviewing can take place through a variety of ways, for instance by holding a special meeting of SPGSC, a series of programme team meetings throughout the year, an annual team away day, or pairing programme directors to peer review each other's annual review. It was agreed that it would be helpful if the School Director of Quality Assurance prepared some School guidance on the annual monitoring required to be undertaken by each programme together with how this should be recorded within the School. **[Action: Director of Quality Assurance].**

Members of SPGSC had found the input of review panels to be very useful in the past. It was agreed that if a programme team wished to undertake a major restructuring, it in those circumstances it may still be most effective to hold a review panel meeting and include external experts within its membership.

It was agreed that the Convener would meet with the Directors of MSc Outdoor Learning/MSc Outdoor Environment and Sustainability Education, MSc Digital Education and EdD to discuss their planned programme reviews. **[Action: Convener and Dr John Telford and Dr Christine Sinclair]**

It was further noted that the existing course monitoring form was to be shortened and simplified. Course monitoring forms for semester two of 2015/16 were now due and reminders would be sent to all those who had yet to complete these.

The University timetable for completing key annual quality documents had been changed. In future programme reports would be due in May and the School Quality report would be required in August. This would mean more timely reporting of any issues, although it would not be possible to report on issues raised during the dissertation/Masters stage of PGT programmes until the following year. This new timetable would be introduced from academic year 2016/17.

6. **Course Matters**

6.1 Revisions to MSc TESOL Degree Programme Table (DPT)

SPGSC homologated this paper which proposed a change to the current DPT of MSc TESOL in order to bring the course list up to date and add flexibility to the selection of optional

courses within the programme. The change had been approved on behalf of SPGSC by Convener's Action and on behalf of the Board of Studies by Convener's Action.

6.2 Revisions to MSc Language Teaching Degree Programme Table (DPT)

SPGSC homologated this paper which proposed a change to the current DPT of MSc Language Teaching in order to create two bespoke pathways within the programme. The change had been approved on behalf of SPGSC by Convener's Action and on behalf of the Board of Studies by Convener's Action.

6.3 Revision to DPT: Additional Support for Learning (visual impairment) PT

SPGSC homologated this paper which proposed a more flexible DPT for existing part time Postgraduate Diploma students. The change had been approved on behalf of SPGSC by Convener's Action and on behalf of the Board of Studies by Convener's Action.

6.4 MSc Physical Activity for Health: Minor amendment to assignment specification

SPGSC homologated this paper which proposed the amendment of the assignment specification and learning outcomes for one of the compulsory courses on this programme. The change had been approved on behalf of SPGSC by Convener's Action and on behalf of the Board of Studies by Convener's Action.

6.5 MSc Inclusive Education/MEd Additional Support for Learning: Change to assessment arrangements for courses relating to visual impairment and deafness

SPGSC homologated this paper which proposed the amendment of the pass mark for eight courses taken by teachers of deaf and visually impaired children to 50% in line with recommendations made by the external examiner and in line with practice in other UK universities offering this qualification for teachers. The change had been approved on behalf of SPGSC by Convener's Action and on behalf of the Board of Studies by Convener's Action

7. **Library Report**

SPGSC welcomed this report from the Library. It noted that the College had made significant changes to its budget allocation method and that its Library budget was now being allocated according to resource type rather than School. The report clearly identified actions which required to be undertaken by Schools. There was concern within SPGSC that the lack of a School Library committee meant that some of these necessary actions may be overlooked and that there was no forum for discussing individual requests for the purchase of research materials or other Library related matters. **[Action: Convener, secretary and Librarian to consider whether to have a standing item on Library resources at each meeting of SPGSC]**

It was further noted that in response to student feedback, the Director of Library and University Collections and the Head of School had met to review library and study space provision within the context of the changes on the Holyrood campus. The intention was to submit a proposal to redevelop the library site in order to enhance and improve the study environment and the experience of all users. Members of the committee, in particular the student representatives, were asked to forward any comments on study space needs to help inform this discussion. It was suggested that this could be a topic included in Staff-Student liaison committees **[Action: All members of SPGSC. Programme Directors and student representatives to note for SSLC meetings]**. However, if approved, this redevelopment was likely to take a number of years.

The committee also briefly discussed the opening hours of the Moray House Library. Library staff were trying to establish if the demand for earlier opening hours from students actually

arose from a desire to have access to printing services rather than access to the Library's collection. Students could access printing services in computer labs before the library opened at 9am.

All new courses should be signed off by the Library to ensure that the resources needed for it are available by the time it commences.

The report also drew attention to Lynda.com which was an online skills development service offering an extensive library of high quality video courses designed to develop individual's digital, technology, creative and business skills. Lynda.com was available to all staff and students via MyEd.

8. Examination Boards Autumn 2016 and review of operation of Boards of Examiners

There were a number of Board of Examiner meetings for Autumn 2016 yet to be scheduled and a number of convener and regulations expert vacancies. It was noted that a small number of Boards of Examiners had almost been inquorate at the May/June diet. Members of SPGSC were reminded that all members of a Board of Examiners are expected to attend all meetings of the Board. Memberships were noted on the spreadsheet held in the Graduate School Office.

SPGSC discussed the joint boards which had operated during the May/June diet of Boards of Examiners. It was observed that the nomenclature "joint boards" was an inaccurate description as in several instances the programmes grouped together shared no common courses and other than a shared convener and regulations expert there was no overlap in the business of the boards. However, members agreed that there were efficiencies gained from having these meetings take place consecutively. It was agreed that the groupings would remain in place for future Board of Examiner meetings. Dates of meetings should be set a year in advance so that all members, including external examiners, would be available. It was noted that for at least one meeting (MSc Outdoor Education/Outdoor Environmental and Sustainability Education/Learning for Sustainability/Dance Science and Education/Sport Policy, Management and International Development) programme team and external examiner availability may mean that the meetings could not be held on the same day at the October 2016 diet. **[Action: Programme Directors to liaise with Conveners, regulations experts, examination board secretaries and external examiners to coordinate future Board of Examiner meeting dates].**

9. Attendance and engagement monitoring: School wide introduction of electronic registers

The College Office required the School of Education to move to electronic register taking in 2016/17. A number of courses within the Graduate School had used the electronic registers in 2015/16 and generally feedback from tutors had been very positive. The Graduate School was required to move fully to this system from September 2016. The Undergraduate Office was being permitted to undertake the move more gradually.

The Graduate School Office and Engagement Monitoring Assistant were still trying to ensure that there was an entry on every PGT student's EUCLID engagement tab in May/June 2016 showing that they had met with their dissertation tutor during that period. This was one of the six contact points the School was required to satisfy in order for the University to remain compliant with the terms of its Tier 4 sponsorship status.

10. Use of the week between teaching blocks 3 and 4 in Academic Year 16/17 and 17/18: Guidance for Schools

In January 2016, Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) agreed to end Innovative Learning Week (ILW) in its current form. LTC agreed that in Academic Years 16/17 and

17/18 the University should hold a “Festival of Creative Learning”. This festival will be spread throughout the academic year rather than focusing on a single week. Schools had to decide how to utilise the week between teaching blocks 3 and 4 which had previously been used for ILW. Schools were to be encouraged to use the week in the way that best suited their staff and students. Schools may choose to contribute to a curated, week-long programme of events forming part of the broader Festival of Creative Learning. Alternatively Schools might allow students to use the week for reflection and consolidation. Schools will be asked to share their plans for this week during Semester 1. **[Action: Members of SPGSC to consider the best use of this time. To be discussed at future meeting of SPGSC]**

11. AOCB

11.1 Staff Student Liaison Committee minutes

Currently, SSLC minutes were held at a local level but it was not always clear who had responsibility for retaining these. Therefore the School Director of Quality Assurance was working with the Technology Enhanced Education Unit to create a repository for SSLC minutes which would be hosted on the Moray House intranet. All SSLC minutes should be uploaded to this site from 2016/17 onwards. SSLCs were not required at course level but were required at programme level. There should be at least one meeting of a SSLC each semester.

11.2 Student Representatives

Currently one eighth of the University’s student representatives came from the School of Education. This was a disproportionately large number of student representative roles. The School Director of Quality Assurance was developing guidance on how many representatives should be put forward from each course/programme. This would be circulated at the start of semester and once student representatives had been chosen, entered into the Student Representatives/SSLC Intranet square.

11.3 Welcome Week

The Depute Postgraduate Director (PGT) outlined the plans for Welcome week. The general PGT welcome session would be run twice this year as the reduced capacity of G1 meant it was no longer possible to deliver this to all PGT students in a single session. Programme Directors were requested to check that their programme specific sessions did not clash with both of these sessions or with any of the University’s major welcome events (e.g the Principal’s Welcome at the Festival Theatre or the activities and societies fair). Blackwells bookshop would have a “pop up” book stall in the Nursery Visitors Room open from 10am – 4pm throughout Welcome Week. Programme Directors were asked to promote this to their new students at their welcome event and also to liaise with Blackwells to ensure that core texts were available in the “pop up” book stall. **[Action: Programme Directors]** Programme Directors were also requested to ask students for feedback on Welcome week and induction later on in the semester. **[Action: Programme Directors]**

11.4 Recruitment issues: targets, closing dates, methods of communications

Dr Sinclair raised this matter for inclusion in a future agenda of SPGSC. There had been some issues this summer regarding recruitment targets and staff workload capacity. **[Action: Convener/Secretary to note for future agenda]**

Ms Lesley Rowand
Secretary, School Postgraduate Studies Committee