Meeting of the Senatus Researcher Experience Committee
to be held on 12 April 2016 at 2.00 pm
in the Board Room, Vets School, Easter Bush Campus

AGENDA

1. **Minutes of the previous meeting**   Enclosed

2. **Matters Arising**
    2.1   Regulations Review
    2.2   CROS and PIRLS
    2.3   Space Enhancement Management Group Paper
    2.4   PPLS Tutoring Policy
    2.5   Flexible PhD Task Group Report
    2.6   PGR start dates

3. **Convener's Communications**
    3.1   LERU Doctoral Summer School
    3.2   Universitas 21 Joint PhD Agreement

FOR DISCUSSION

4   **Tutoring and demonstrating**

5   **New student survey**   REC 15/16 4A

6   **ELIR report – plan response to PGR issues raised**
     Outcome report

7   **Maximising survey value: Postgraduate Research Experience
     Survey (PRES)**

8   **Strategic Plan 2016-21: measuring success**   REC 15/16 4B

9   **Associated Institutions Policy**   REC 15/16 4C

10   **Internal Review Themes 2014/15**   REC 15/16 4D

11   **Committee priorities for 2016/17**   REC 15/16 4E

12   **Postgraduate Research Experience Project: PREP**

FOR INFORMATION

13   **HR Excellence Award 6 year review**

14   **Enhancement Themes update**

15   **Any Other Business**
     16.1   Conferences and events

16   **Date of next meeting**:
     17 May 2016, Hodgson Room, Weir Building, King's Buildings

Susan Hunter
Academic Services
5 April 2016

The University of Edinburgh

Senatus Researcher Experience Committee

12 April 2016

PGR New Student Survey Findings (2015)

Executive Summary

Issues:

This paper summarises key findings of the 2015 New Student Survey pertaining to learning and teaching for Postgraduate Research students. Headlines, related issues and recommendations are outlined for discussion.

Those wishing to gain a more detailed insight into the whole survey can view the full analysis, including individual School reports, on the following wiki page:

https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/display/SEPROJ/Student+Feedback+2015

Please note: issues relating to recruitment and admissions matters, which are covered in the early questions within the survey, will be reported separately to the Recruitment and Admissions Strategy Group (RASG). UG and PGT Student findings were presented to the Learning and Teaching Committee on 16 March 2016.

Context:

The New Student Survey was introduced in 2013 and covers many aspects of a new student's pre-arrival, on arrival and first weeks' experience. It is undertaken as a collaboration between Pre-arrival and Induction, EUSA, Communications and Marketing and the Student Surveys Unit.

Following the completion of the Student Experience Project in August 2015, Court approved embedding the Pre-arrival and Induction (PAI) team into Student Recruitment and Admissions (SRA), but with a significant reduction in resource allocation going forward. Whilst the PAI team is resourced to provide consultation services for Schools who wish to enhance their induction practices, any associated activity must be implemented by Schools or other relevant services.

How does this align with the University / Committee's strategic plans and priorities?

This work is being developed to support the delivery of an **outstanding student experience**.

Action requested

The Committee is asked to endorse the recommendations from the 2015 Survey data as outlined below and to oversee their implementation.   It would be useful if REC College representatives could take ownership of liaising with Schools to have oversight of actions

taken and report back to the Committee in due course. If agreed we ask that this approach be approved by the Committee and repeated annually, following dissemination of future survey reports and recommendations

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

The PAI Team have communicated overall survey and School results directly with our key contacts within each School (January 2016). We now require the Committee's input on how this data and endorsed recommendations and actions will be communicated and monitored.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. **Resource implications (including staffing)**

   The paper outlines recommendations that could have limited resource implications. However, since the paper does not seek approval for specific proposals, it does not have any direct resource implications at the current time.

2. **Risk assessment**

   This work falls under the 'Education & Student Experience' heading of the University of Edinburgh Risk Policy and Risk Appetite.
   As this paper suggests enhancements to current practice we do not foresee any negative impact on students, staff or the reputation of the University.

3. **Equality and Diversity**

   Key aspects of the work of Pre-arrival and Induction Team have already been Equality Impact Assessed. Since this paper makes recommendations for enhancements to current practice it is unlikely to have any major equality impacts.

4. **Freedom of information**

   *This Paper is **open***

Key words
New Students, Student Surveys, Student Data, Student Experience

Originator of the paper

Jenni Murray, Kristin Sargeant and Ian Sutherland.
The Student Induction Team, Student Recruitment and Admissions 23.03.2016.

2015 New Student Surveys Results

1   Background

This paper focuses on headline data relating to Research students and makes recommendations we would like the Committee to discuss and action.

Those wishing to gain a more detailed insight into the whole survey (or wishing to see the at a glance graphics) can view the full analysis, including individual School reports, on the following wiki page:

https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/display/SEPROJ/Student+Feedback+2015

The summary PowerPoints and the individual School reports which were introduced this year, have been distributed to the Pre-arrival and Induction (PAI) team's key School and professional service colleagues. We now ask the Committee to endorse the recommendations and oversee their implementation. Additionally, we seek the Committee's input regarding the future procedure for ensuring the survey's findings are acted upon.

2   Headline Results – Postgraduate Research Students

2.1   School focussed

1. **97%** felt they **had the necessary information to make an informed choice** to choose to attend the University
2. **Just over a third** of PGR students would have liked **more course related information** in the immediate pre-arrival period.
3. In response to the statement beginning 'As a result of attending welcome events and activities organised by my School/research centre':
    a. **65%** responded positively to 'I now **understand what is expected of me** as a research student at the University'
    b. **66%** had **meet with and understood the role of their supervisor**
    c. **67%** said 'I consider **myself a member of my School/research centre community'**
    d. Only **7%** stated that they did not attend any School/research centre based welcome events.
4. Students were generally satisfied with the number and type of events hosted during Welcome Week, although **24% would have welcomed more School/research centre activities**. This ranged from **0%** of Business students to **63%** of PPLS students (requesting more School-based events).
5. Only around **1 in 5 students attended Library and IS welcome sessions**, those who did rated them highly (identical finding for PGT and UG).

2.2   General (PGR)

1. **Satisfaction with Welcome Week was 91%** (24% very satisfied, 67% quite satisfied). UK students were more likely to be 'very satisfied' compared to International students (33% vs 26%).
2. **'Managing your PhD supervisor'** (EUSA event) was attended by **35%** of PGR students and **65%** of them **rated it useful**.

3. Students were most likely to report **feeling excited (69%) and confident generally** (**52%**) after starting University. However only **41%** indicated they were **'confident I can cope with the academic demands of my studies'**, a decrease from 2014 (47%).

4. As a result of attending September Welcome events (central, School-based and EUSA), **43% reported knowing how to access support** and **45% felt motivated to make their time at University outstanding.** Students with disabilities were **more** likely to agree that they felt confident about transitioning into the university community (opposite from UG).

5. **99% were satisfied with their experience of University so far**, with UK students more likely to be very satisfied compared to international (**49% vs 40%**)

6. **35% of PGR respondents attended the Welcome Ceremony** (compared to 51% of PGT and 37% of UG). Responses were broadly similar to UG and PGT, with scope for significant enhancements. It scored low on various ratings (inspiring 23%, useful 35%, sociable 33%, interesting 35%, enjoyable 19%, none of these 11%).

3   Summary

Overall satisfaction with both Welcome Week and with the first few weeks of University are high and have remained consistently so in recent years. The data indicates however that there is still scope for further enhancements to the pre-arrival and initial induction period for new PGR students (as there is for UG and PGT).

It is worth noting that some larger University-wide changes for Welcome Week may be reflected in work that Assistant Principal Liz Grant is leading about addressing a 'Culture of Compassion' during Welcome Week.

This report has focussed on aspects of the data which will be of most relevance to School colleagues, other actions will be addressed by the PAI team, in consultation with colleagues in central services. There are sometimes quite significant variations in School level data, reflecting the different experiences of PGR students across the University during Welcome Week.   The recommendations below are based on the University average data and should therefore be reviewed on a School basis before further actions are taken/prioritised locally. We recommend that colleagues consider this report alongside individual School reports.

4   Recommendations

The Committee is asked to endorse the recommendations from the 2015 Survey data as outlined below and to oversee their implementation.   It would be useful if REC College representatives could take ownership of liaising with Schools to have oversight of actions taken and report back to the Committee in due course. If agreed we ask that this approach be approved by the Committee and repeated annually, following dissemination of future survey reports and recommendations. Learning and Teaching Committee have been asked to adopt a similar approach regarding UG and PGT recommendations and actions.

Schools/Research Centres should consider the implications of their School-level reports. It is evident from the data that students would benefit from:

a. Schools/Research Centres ensuring that all new PGR students meet with and understand the role of their supervisors.
b. Increased interactions with a broader range of staff within Schools/Research Centres (in addition to Supervisors). The enhancement of School/Research Centre based social activities and events during and beyond Welcome Week is often cited as a way for the University to enhance the initial induction period. This could further increase the proportion of PGR students reporting that they feel part of their new School/Research Centre community.
c. Schools focussing on expectations to ensure that new students are being helped to understand what is expected of them. This could also impact on confidence levels.
d. Schools collaborating with IS/Library colleagues to enable higher numbers of new students to benefit from IS/Library inductions. There could be more pre-arrival signposting to current IS videos through School communications and more School-based IS inductions during the first weeks.

Additionally, Schools and Central Services should consult the [Student Induction Framework](#) when reviewing their current Welcome/induction provision as it outlines the importance of building a strong sense of community and social contacts within Schools.

REC 15/16 4B

Strategic Plan 2016-21: measuring success

Executive Summary

The University's new Strategic plan 2016-21 will be published this summer. Governance and Strategic Planning are developing a new 'performance measurement framework' to allow 1) monitoring of the plan by Court and 2) monitoring of associated management information by CMG. REC are invited to suggest appropriate measures to include in this framework.

How does this align with the University / Committee's strategic plans and priorities?

This paper is about assessing the Research elements of the next Strategic Plan 2016-21.

Action requested

REC is asked to advise on suitable measures of success for the next strategic plan.
How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

REC's recommendations will form part of the advice to PSG, CMG and Court on the performance measurement framework in May and June 2016.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. **Resource implications (including staffing)**
   If recommended success measures are not currently collected, there would be resource implications in creating this collection.
2. **Risk assessment**
   Failure to grow and diversify sources of research income, and to respond to external drivers such as REF2021 and changes in the regulatory infrastructure for research, have been identified as risks in the University's risk register. Identifying appropriate measures of success will enable us to monitor this risk and improve our chances of mitigation.
3. **Equality and Diversity**
   Measures of success for the University Strategic Plan 2016-21 will include monitoring of equality and diversity. The proposed measures of success will need to be evaluated to ensure that they do not introduce perverse incentives.
4. **Freedom of information**
   Open

Key words

Strategic Plan; Research; Performance Measurement; KPI; Target; Measures of Success

Originator of the paper

Pauline Jones, Head of Strategic Performance and Research Policy, Governance and Strategic Planning, 31 March 2016.

Strategic Plan 2016-21: measuring success

Background on the new Strategic Plan and Research Strategy

1. University staff and students were recently completed a consultation on the University Strategic Plan 2016-21. At the same time, the VP Planning, Resources and Research Policy is leading on the drafting of a connected but separate Research Strategy, and these two documents will complement each other.

2. The 2016-21 Strategic Plan will be approved at the 20 June 2016 Court, for publication in September 2016. The draft plan is available in full on the Strategic Plan 2016-21 wiki page:

   https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/display/govstratplan/Strategic+Plan+2016-2021

3. An open consultation on this document has now closed and the next draft will incorporate the comments from the consultation responses.

4. One of the key principles in the new strategic plan is to reduce the apparent silos between learning and teaching related activity on the one hand, and research on the other, and to illustrate how both activities contribute to overall benefits to society. As such there are references in several parts of the plan which are relevant to this committee's remit.

5. Some of the references of particular relevance are:

   - 'We will continue to support and develop early career and established researchers of the highest quality, and sustain a research environment of the highest calibre.'

   - 'Support and develop research leaders: from undergraduates to professors.'

   - 'Provide the best research environment that we can for researchers at all levels: from appropriate PhD funding and support, to training and development for early career researchers, to creating an estate with space for research leaders to carry out research programmes that will deliver results and expanded opportunities for interdisciplinary work.'

   - 'Involving students in the research process: developing students' research skills and a mind-set of enquiry and questioning.'

   - 'Research informing teaching and training: for the next generation of researchers, and for all students' learning practices.'

   - 'We will equip our graduates with the skills and knowledge they need to be responsible global citizens with a sensitive and intelligent approach to their own life choices and their careers.'

   - 'Our students and staff are independent, critical, creative thinkers whose innovations develop the character of the university and its influence on the world.'

   - 'Our people share a learning culture and a supportive environment in which they develop their individual potential and skills.'

6. Some specific areas of feedback we have received on the plan are:

   - increase the emphasis on certain areas (especially equality, diversity and inclusion);

   - need to make the section of the plan 'What makes us Edinburgh' more emotionally accessible;

   - A specific comment that 'Support and develop research leaders: from undergraduates to professors' suggests that this is a desired career path, which isn't always the case

- As well as emphasising skills as an attribute, we should emphasis other attributes that are wider than skills as important to the wider student experience

- More reference to student wellbeing

7. We will be responding to the feedback received in our next draft.

Measures of success

8. In developing the 2016-21 Strategic Plan we have identified that there is a need for a more nuanced 'performance measurement framework' which will have a different model for measures of success from the 2012-16 plan.

9. The 2012-16 plan had a mixture of: KPIs – mainly described as measures where we were expected to maintain performance within a certain tolerance; and targets – where we expected to achieve a certain absolute or relative level of performance. This included 3 measures directly linked to the strategic goal of 'Excellence in Research' and a further six measures that directly or indirectly relate to research performance (see Annex B for the list). These measures are monitored annually.

10. At the same time, we also have 'unofficially' treated other measures as performance indicators within the University over the past several years. This includes our performance in the REF2014 in a variety of ways; the levels of research income, applications and awards received in number of categories; and our ability to attract research stars through the Chancellor's Fellows and similar schemes.

11. For the 2016-21 plan we intend to have a more holistic performance measurement framework, which will allow a line of sight between the measures of success directly relating to our strategic plan, and other indicators which are used elsewhere. It would be impractical to assume that this would capture everything, but the intention is to allow the framework to be flexible enough for new measures to be introduced or for it to be used to drill down to different reporting levels. This will also encompass measures which are not numeric – such as the achievement of particular milestones, or the delivery of projects essential to the overall objectives of the plan.

12. We need to consider whether the measures that we choose should have targets set against them. In some cases, what we are trying to achieve is to maintain our current levels of success. This will still be an achievement in itself since our competitors will also be trying to do the same and the external environment is constantly changing.

13. In early considerations of this we are attempting to link the aims laid out in the current draft strategic plan to the objectives we will try to achieve and identify what input and output measures could be used to indicate directions of travel. Outputs and inputs are not perfect measures, but can be proxies for the objectives we are trying to measure.

14. Some of these are more 'key' success measures than others and would be more appropriate for a Court reporting tool; while others help to indicate direction of travel and would be more appropriate for a management monitoring tool such as could be used by the Central Management Group.

Research measures of success

15. The measures being focussed on in this paper relate to research, and we are interested in your views on which are appropriate. Further conversations are needed on evaluating our performance in learning and teaching.

16. We will need to give further consideration to how Edinburgh is distinct from other universities in relation to its performance. For example, as we are emphasising the connections between research and teaching are emphasised in the current plan, we could use proxy measures such as the number of contact hours between professors and undergraduates, or the number of academics who have had time bought out from teaching, to capture these connections.

17. The links between how we measure success in research and how we measure success in impact also need to be considered. This is another area in which Edinburgh's approach will differ from some other institutions. For example, we need to ensure that

the interplay between the impact of research reflects blue skies research as well as research that is close to market.

18. For some metrics, benchmarking against competitors is possible using publicly available data sets such as HESA. We will also potentially be able to take advantage of the launch of the Snowball Metrics Exchange later this year to share information with selected partners, which allows benchmarking on a 'mutual sharing' basis on a specific set of 'Snowball metrics' developed by a sector-led group. More information on snowball metrics is available here http://www.snowballmetrics.com/metrics/ and a full list of the Snowball Metrics developed to date is given in Annex C. Metrics below that could use

Snowball Metrics are marked as ❄

19. Finally, the report 'Characteristics of High Performing Research Units' http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/rereports/Year/2015/highperform/Title,107168,en.html contains several indicators of successful research departments which are worth considering. The headlines of this report are outlined in Annex D.

20. **Researcher Experience Committee members are invited to:**

- **Consider whether these suggested metrics are appropriate to use to build measures of success relating to researcher development;**

- **Advise on any metrics which are missing;**

- **Consider how we could make better links between these measures and Edinburgh's distinct approach to research;**

- **Consider which metrics are the most important; and**

- **Advise to what extent should these have targets associated with them and which should simply be monitored to ensure that performance does not deviate markedly from the current position;**

- **Advise on sources of information from which these metrics could be derived.**

21. In summary, the proposed metrics to explore further so far are:

Outputs:

- Research staff hires and number of academic staff per discipline, relative to norms for discipline (including international hires per total hires)

- Applications per vacancy and/or PhD (including international applications)

- Collaborations between researchers (across disciplines or institutions) - potentially measurable with co-authored outputs ❄, joint applications for grants and awards of grants

- Creation of new disciplines

- PhD numbers – overall and per research/academic staff FTE

- PhD completions – overall and per research/academic staff FTE

- PhD destinations – percentage PhD graduates in employment after graduation

- Bibliometrics: research outputs and citations, absolute and per FTE❄, and citations per output ❄ (across variety of categories eg interdisciplinary, collaboratively with partners, at different discipline levels – including filed-weighted citation impact ❄)

- Researcher views (including PhD) – for example from the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey, or research staff surveys

- Partnerships with organisations including international universities and non-university institutions (possibly using Academic-industry leverage of income ❄)

- 'Esteem' indicators at individual and organisation level (eg Nobel prizes, Athena Swan)

- Percentage staff submitted to REF

- Measures of reputation/quality – for example, REF results; League tables; discipline specific

- Impact on other disciplines (using outputs and citations)

- Impact beyond academia (for example through relative success in REF impact, or income gained from or with industry metrics , or using altmetrics)

Inputs:

- Research income and market share of whole sector research income , applications and awards (across different sources, including industry, charity, EU and Research Council) per FTE and over time; potentially also including application success rate (a under development)

- University systems improvements (including processes such as workload allocation, and Information Systems)

- REF environment scores

- Support structures (research grant applications, HR, training, library systems)

- Investment in facilities and space

22. Not all of these are easy to measure numerically using currently available data and considerable work on this is still required. In addition, as noted above, there will be other ways of evaluating our performance using qualitative information that may help us judge success against some of our objectives.

23. The linkages between these, and the aims of the 2016-21 Strategic Plan, are outlined in detail below in Annex A.

Pauline Jones

Head of Strategic Performance and Research Policy

Governance and Strategic Planning

28 March 2016

Annex A

Linkage between measures of success and Strategic Plan

The draft of the 2016-21 strategic plan includes a strategic objective of Leadership in Research. The

---

We are renowned for our world-leading research but aim to create ever better knowledge, culture and discoveries. We will continue to support and develop early career and established researchers of the highest quality, and sustain a research environment of the highest calibre.

Support and develop research leaders: from undergraduate to professors

Support deep partnerships with academic peers and industry from across the globe

Enable interdisciplinary working to create new disciplines and research without boundaries

Continue to support research across the broad range of subjects in which we currently excel and support new endeavours, for example in agriculture and food security, data science, area studies and intelligent commerce

Optimal infrastructure: from physical spaces, to digital research services, to high-quality equipment and facilities

Provide the best research environment that we can for researchers at all levels: from appropriate PhD funding and support, to training and development for early career researchers, to creating an estate with space for research leaders to carry out research programmes that will

---

text of this currently reads as follows. The delivery of research is also explicitly linked to the delivery of impact for society. (Please note that this is a draft and will continue to be refined, to align with the research strategy under development)

Simplifying this further, we are aiming to achieve the following five broad aims:

- Enabling interdisciplinary working
- Supporting a broad range of subjects
- Optimising infrastructure
- Supporting partnerships
- Supporting researchers

The diagram below shows how these map to objectives we will try to achieve to meet our aims and to the outputs that help to deliver these. Not all connections are fully drawn out, as there is a 'many to one' relationship between inputs and outputs, inputs and objectives, outputs and objectives and objectives and aims.

Aims	Objectives	Outputs	Inputs
Enable interdisciplinary working	Better quality: • Research outputs • Impacts • Links across disciplines	• Staff related: Research staff hired; Applications per vacancy; academics per discipline; Researcher 'satisfaction' surveys; Percentage staff submitted to REF	Research grant related: Research income; Research grant applications; Research grant awards; market share of research income; research awards to applications ratio.
Support broad subject range	Subject range as broad in 2021 as now Maintain or enhance reputation: • At subject level • Across the whole university • Of partners • For training of PhDs	• Bibliometrics: Research output publication; Citations • Collaborations between researchers (using citations or grant awards) • Measures of reputation and quality: REF; League tables; discipline specific measures	University systems improvements: • Processes – such as workload and resource allocation • Information Systems: PURE, Worktribe, Research data • Support structures: HR; Training; library; peer and cohort support; ERI; Research support office; International Office; college/school research offices; finance
Support researchers	Create better opportunities for staff and students PhD successes Researcher and academic success	• Partnerships with other organisations: Universities; Industry and other sectors • Esteem indicators eg Individual prizes; Institutional awards (Athena Swan)	Investment in: Facilities; lab space; big scale equipment; estates; Space REF environment scores
Optimise underpinning infrastructure	Improve working conditions to create: • Happy researchers • Knowledge • More impact	• Research student related: PhD numbers; Research student satisfaction (PRES); Doctoral degrees awarded; PhD graduate destinations	

Support partnerships	Have sustainable:	• Impact on other disciplines (eg using outputs and citations)	
	• Research		
	• University	• Impact beyond academia (eg using altmetrics, REF impact or industry income)	
	Have increased impact		

Annex B

KPIs and targets, 2012-26 Strategic Plan

SUMMARY OF KPIs AND TARGETS

SUMMARY

36

STRATEGIC GOALS

	KPIs	TARGETS
EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION	1.0 Proportion of leavers achieving a successful outcome (degree, transfer or other award)	1.1 Increase student satisfaction with academic and pastoral support 1.2 Increase student satisfaction with the opportunities and support for developing their graduate attributes and employability
EXCELLENCE IN RESEARCH	2.0 Russell Group market share of research income (spend)	2.1 Increase our average number of PhD students per member of academic staff to at least 2.5 2.2 Increase our score (relative to the highest scoring institution) for the citations-based measure in the THE World University Rankings to at least 94/100
EXCELLENCE IN INNOVATION	3.0 Knowledge exchange metrics: number of disclosures, patents, licences and new company formations	3.1 Achieve at least 200 public policy impacts per annum 3.2 Increase our economic impact, measured by GVA, by at least 8%

ENABLERS

	KPIs	TARGETS
PEOPLE	4.0 Proportion of staff who have had an annual review within the previous year, incorporating the identification of objectives and development needs	4.1 Achieve the institutional Athena SWAN Silver award 4.2 Increase our number of international applications for academic posts
INFRASTRUCTURE	5.0 Total income per square metre of GIA	5.1 Increase the proportion of our building condition at grades A and B on a year-on-year basis, aiming for at least 90% by 2020 5.2 Increase student satisfaction with learning resources (library, IT resources, study space and equipment) to at least 85%
FINANCE	6.0 Operating surplus as % of turnover (aim for 3%)	6.1 Increase our total income per staff FTE year-on-year, aiming for an increase of at least 10% in real terms 6.2 Increase our ROCE

STRATEGIC THEMES

	KPIs	TARGETS
OUTSTANDING STUDENT EXPERIENCE	7.0 Proportion of graduates (undergraduate and postgraduate) in graduate-level employment or further study	7.1 Increase the level of overall satisfaction expressed in responses to the NSS, PTES and PRES student surveys to at least 88% 7.2 Increase the number of our students who have achieved the Edinburgh Award to at least 500 7.3 Create at least 800 new opportunities for our students to gain an international experience as part of their Edinburgh degree
GLOBAL IMPACT	8.0 Proportion of international students from beyond our five most well-represented countries	8.1 Increase our headcount of non-EU international students by at least 2,000 8.2 Increase our research grant income from EU and other overseas sources so that we enter the Russell Group upper quartile 8.3 Increase our number of masters students on programmes established through our Global Academies by at least 500
LIFELONG COMMUNITY	9.0 Physical and virtual footfall	9.1 Increase the number of active alumni engagements with the University via the Alumni Services website, social media and e-newsletters
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY	10.0 Carbon emissions per £ million turnover	10.1 Reduce absolute CO_2 emissions by 29% by 2020, against a 2007 baseline (interim target of 20% savings by 2015)
PARTNERSHIPS	11.0 Number of our research publications which are internationally co-authored	11.1 Increase our number of PhD students on programmes jointly awarded with international partners by at least 50%
EQUALITY AND WIDENING PARTICIPATION	12.0 Undergraduate entrants from under-represented groups	12.1 Converge on our participation benchmarks for under-represented groups 12.2 Increase the proportion of female academic staff appointed and promoted to lecturer, senior lecturer, reader and professor levels, and reduce the gender pay gap for University staff

Annex C

Snowball metrics

1. Snowball metrics have been developed by a consortium of eight universities to arrive at a sector-led framework for benchmarking performance in research and knowledge exchange. The principles behind the approach is that institutions can decide which metrics to share and with whom, and that no underlying data need be shared – only the metric calculated with the data.
2. Some of the metrics which are part of the framework can be calculated already using widely available data (mainly from HESA), but others can only be calculated if institutions are willing to share information. The framework also allows institutions to agree to share information more frequently and earlier than is possible using HESA alone. In addition, the partners in the project have been working with international partners, especially those in the US, to expand the framework to allow comparisons outwith the UK – something which is currently very difficult for most metrics.
3. The Snowball metrics partners will shortly be launching a Metrics Exchange which will facilitate the sharing of metrics. Institutions will then be able to identify which universities they wish to benchmark against and seek agreement with those institutions with whom they want to share information, before sharing this information across the platform.
4. Most metrics can be calculated at different levels – HESA Cost centre, or by funder type) and the most typical denominator is staff FTE, which is also defined.
5. The Snowball Metrics developers have launched a 'recipe book' with instructions on how to calculate the metrics, and a new version is expected later this year. The full list of 'recipes' currently available is below. Others – especially those relating to research postgraduate students – are expected to be added in due course.

	Research Inputs	*Research Process*	*Research Outputs and Outcomes*
Research	**Applications Volume** **Awards Volume**	**Income Volume** **Market Share**	**Publications & citations** • Scholarly Output (enhanced) • Citation Count • Citations per Output • *h*-index • Field-Weighted Citation Impact • Outputs in Top Percentiles • Publications in Top Journal Percentiles **Collaboration** • Collaboration • Collaboration Impact • Academic-Corporate Collaboration • Academic-Corporate Collaboration Impact **Societal impact** • Altmetrics • Public Engagement
Enterprise Activities/ Economic Development	• Academic-Industry Leverage • Business Consultancy Activities	• Contract Research Volume	• Intellectual Property Volume • Intellectual Property Income • Sustainable Spin-Offs • Spin-Off-Related Finances

6. The Snowball Metrics website has a wealth of information and can be found http://www.snowballmetrics.com/ ; the current (March 2016) recipe book can be downloaded from http://www.snowballmetrics.com/wp-content/uploads/snowball-recipe-book_HR.pdf

Annex D

Characteristics of High Performing Research Units

1. The Higher Education Funding Council for England commissioned the Policy Institute at King's College London and RAND Europe to conduct a preliminary analysis of the characteristics of high-performing research units within UK higher education institutions (HEIs), focussing on those shared between departments whose submissions in the Research Excellence Framework (REF) 2014 scored highly in the areas of research and impact. As the report stresses, 'this report focuses on the broad characteristics of research units or departments and therefore has a wider remit than performance in the REF per se.' (p3)

2. The high level characteristics identified by the report are:

   'A. In high-performing research units more of the staff have PhDs, professorial positions, international experience and externally funded salaries
   B. High-performing research units are focused on recruiting the best and retaining them
   C. High-performing research units provide training and mentorship programmes to develop staff, while offering rewards for strong performance
   D. Staff within high-performing research units display a distinct ethos of social and ethical values
   E. The leaders of high-performing research units have earned 'accountable autonomy' within their higher education institution
   F. High-performing research units have strategies that are real, living and owned, and more than merely a written document
   G. High-performing research units receive more income per researcher than the average research unit
   H. High-performing research units enable and encourage researchers to initiate collaborations organically as opposed to using a top down approach' (p8)

3. The report can be found online at
   http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/rereports/Year/2015/highperform/Title,107168,en.html

REC 15/16 4C

<u>The University of Edinburgh</u>

Senatus Researcher Experience Committee

12 April 2016

Associated Institution Policy

<u>Executive Summary</u>
The paper invites REC to replace the University's *Criteria for According Associated Institution Status* and *Associated Institution nomination, approval and monitoring procedure* by an *Associated Institutions Policy*, which is presented in Appendix 1.

<u>How does this align with the University / Committee's strategic plans and priorities?</u>
This work links to the current strategic goals of Excellence in Education and Excellence in Research and the strategic theme of Partnerships.

<u>Action requested</u>
Committee members are invited to discuss and approve the *Associated Institution Policy*.

<u>How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?</u>
Once agreed, the *Associated Institution Policy* will be communicated to key stakeholders as part of Academic Services' new and revised policies updates.

<u>Resource / Risk / Compliance</u>

1. **Resource implications (including staffing)**
   This will be done within existing resources. The main documentation work will be done by Academic Services, Legal Services and GaSP, with input from College Offices, who support the work.

2. **Risk assessment**
   We aim to have comprehensive, current information, to reduce potential risks and to ensure that compliance and due diligence work is recorded and archived appropriately.

3. **Equality and Diversity**
   No equality issues arose from updating the previous equality impact assessments.

4. **Freedom of information**
   Open

<u>Key words</u>
Associated Institutions

<u>Originator of the paper</u>
Sara Welham, Academic Services
24 March 2016

Associated Institution Policy

Description

1. At its last meeting REC agreed that the University should review its documentation on the criteria and procedures for considering requests for Associated Institution (AI) status.

2. REC is invited to note that the new documentation that will be available on the University's Collaborative Activity website includes:
   a. A template Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) for collaboration with an Associated Institution;
   b. A template Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) for a Single Award PhD, with joint supervision by the University and an AI;
   c. A user guide for completing the MoA; and
   d. Once agreed, the Associated Institution Policy.

3. This will accompany the existing and updated documentation, e.g. the MoA sign-off checklist, the Delegated Authority Schedule, Signatures and Seals on behalf of the University Court, and the Taxonomy/Definitions of collaborations at the University of Edinburgh.
   www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/governance-strategic-planning/collaborative-activity

4. As part of this work, the University's *Criteria for According Associated Institution Status* and *Associated Institution nomination, approval and monitoring procedure* have been considered. This paper proposes that they are replaced by an *Associated Institutions Policy*, which is presented in Appendix 1.
   www.docs.sasg.ed.ac.uk/AcademicServices/Policies/Associated_Institution_Criteria_for_According_Status.pdf
   www.docs.sasg.ed.ac.uk/AcademicServices/Policies/Associated_Institution_Procedure.pdf

Action requested

5. Committee members are invited to discuss and approve the *Associated Institution Policy*.

Associated Institution Policy

6. Appendix 1 includes the draft *Associated Institution Policy* and highlights new and changed text. Text which is not highlighted has been taken from the University's *Criteria for According Associated Institution Status* and *Associated Institution nomination, approval and monitoring procedure*. The policy also includes relevant information from documents in the collaborative activity website, for example *Approval Processes for Jointly Awarded PhD* Programmes.

7. The changes are:

   a. Inclusion of a definition and roles and responsibilities of an Associated Institution, as discussed in REC 15/16 3E-Closed;
   b. Clarification that there will be a Memorandum of Understanding with each AI, as agreed by REC's last meeting;
   c. References to the Schedule to the MoA, where details about academic and financial arrangements are provided;
   d. Additional information on due diligence, to mirror that provided in other documents;

e. Clarifying the approval process and bringing it in line with other collaborative activity approval processes, which ensures criteria are checked by the Virtual Collaboration Group, and expanding the list of Vice Principals who may approve proposals;

f. Reference to the Delegated Authority Schedule, to ensure that MoUs and MoAs are signed by those with the relevant authority;

g. Removal of details on what is included in the agreements since this information is now provided in greater detail in the template MoA and its Schedule;

h. Clarification of monitoring arrangements; and

i. Removal of duplication and of references to "normally".

8. REC is invited to note that Academic Services developed the policy with advice from Governance and Strategic Planning and Legal Services. The University has endorsed the changes to the approval process. These changes are also being checked with the Finance Department. Associated Institution MoU and MoA templates have been drafted with Legal Services and have been circulated to the REC Convener and to Colleges.

Communicating, implementing and evaluating Senate committee decisions

9. College Offices and School PG Research Directors, or their equivalents, have been informed about the Associated Institution work. Academic Services is working with College Offices and Schools to update existing documentation and, where needed, bring it in line with the templates on an appropriate timescale. When appropriate, the University will contact relevant AIs and liaise on MoUs and MoAs. Once agreed, the AI Policy will be communicated to key stakeholders as part of Academic Services' new and revised policies updates.

10. As agreed by REC, the outcome of the AI review will be an updated list of AIs with relevant documentation stored in the Collaborative Activity repository. The list will continue to be available on the web. www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/associated-institutions

Resource, risk and equality and diversity implications

11. The review and update will be done within existing resources. The main work will be done by Academic Services, GaSP and College Offices, who support the proposed work.

12. Having comprehensive, current information will reduce any potential risks of not having, or not being able to retrieve, documentation, and will ensure that compliance and due diligence work is recorded and archived appropriately. It also enables the University to take account of changes to the external compliance environment.

13. The previous equality impact assessments have been updated and no equality issues arose.

Sara Welham, Academic Services
24 March 2016

Associated Institution Policy

THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Purpose of Policy

This policy, and the associated Memorandum of Understanding and Memorandum of Agreement templates for Associated Institutions, aims to ensure that:

- The University has a standard, robust process for the nomination, approval and monitoring of Associated Institutions.
- The academic standards of the University of Edinburgh are maintained.
- Appropriate pastoral and academic support for students are considered and provided.
- The legal responsibilities of the University of Edinburgh are met.

Overview

The University recognises that collaboration offers value to the University, its staff and students. The University's Strategic Plan aims to develop long-term productive partnerships and collaborations that deliver major benefits for society and augment the local and international standing of the University.

An Associated Institution is a non-commercial, non-degree awarding organisation with which the University collaborates to promote cooperation in teaching, research and service to the community by working together on activities and projects where there is alignment of strategy and objectives.

To be an Associated Institution, the partner needs to be of recognised standing, concerned with research and/or education, and be of a complementary nature to the University, with a compatible mission statement.

Scope: Mandatory Policy

This policy covers all Associated Institutions and applies to all Colleges and Schools involved with Associated Institutions.

Contact Officer	Susan Hunter	Academic Policy Officer	Susan.Hunter5@ed.ac.uk

Document control

Dates	Approved: TBC	Starts: 01.08.16	Equality impact assessment: 28.03.16	Amendments: n/a	Next Review: 2019/20

Approving authority	Researcher Experience Committee
Consultation undertaken	Original consultation: Quality Assurance Committee, Colleges, Governance & Strategic Planning, International Office, the University Secretary; this synthesis of the superseded policies: REC, GaSP and the University Secretary's Office
Section responsible for policy maintenance & review	Academic Services
Related policies, procedures, guidelines & regulations	Collaborative Provision: www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/governance-strategic-planning/collaborative-activity/overview Taught Assessment and Research Assessment Regulations
UK Quality Code	UK Quality Code Chapters B10 and B11
Policies superseded by this policy	The Policy on Criteria for According Associated Institution Status and the Associated Institution Nomination, Approval and Monitoring Procedure
Alternative format	If you require this document in an alternative format please email Academic.Services@ed.ac.uk or telephone 0131 650 2138.
Keywords	Associated Institution; partnership; collaborative provision

Associated Institution Policy

Definition

1. An Associated Institution (AI) is a non-commercial, non-degree awarding organisation with which the University collaborates to promote cooperation in teaching, research and service to the community by working together on activities and projects where there is alignment of strategy and objectives.

2. To be an Associated Institution, the partner needs to be of recognised standing, concerned with research and/or education, and be of a complementary nature to the University, with a compatible mission statement.

Roles and responsibilities

3. Collaboration with an Associated Institution includes a variety of activities:
   - Sharing information, experience and skills
   - Joint research and publication
   - Providing teaching or research supervision for a University of Edinburgh degree programme.

4. Depending on the activities, different regulatory frameworks apply, e.g. research collaboration protocol, relevant Memoranda of Understanding and Agreement, and the University's degree programme regulations[1]. Information is available on the Collaborative Activity webpages. www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/governance-strategic-planning/collaborative-activity

Criteria for Associated Institution status

5. Listed below are the academic and financial criteria against which an institution is ~~should be~~ judged to be accorded Associated Institution status.

   Academic criteria

   a. The Institution should ~~normally~~ be a non-commercial, non-degree awarding body of recognised standing concerned with research and/or education, of a complementary nature to the University.

   b. The mission statement of the Institution must be compatible with that of the University.

   c. There should be mutual benefit for the University and the Associated Institution.

   d. The staff of the Associated Institution should normally engage in collaborative research and publication with University staff.

   e. The Associated Institution must meet the University's requirements under its policies of health and safety, and data protection.

---

[1] As an AI does not award degrees, all degrees programmes on which they collaborate, e.g. by supervising research students, are University of Edinburgh awards and go through the usual University approval routes.

f. The Associated Institution and the University will have, or will enter into, a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). The MoU sets out the broad principles on which it is intended that the relationship will proceed, and helps guide and focus discussion regarding proposed specific collaborative activities The MoU is not legally binding and specific activities and projects may be governed by formal, legally binding agreements between the University and the Associated Institution.

g. Where an Associated Institution provides supervision of students registered in the University, the following conditions must apply:
  i. the Associated Institution must meet the University's requirements for quality assurance;
  ii. staff involved in supervision must be appropriately qualified ~~and either be experienced in supervision~~ and receive training from the University;
  iii. accommodation and relevant equipment must be of a standard comparable to those in collaborating departments in the University;
  iv. a Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) setting out the arrangements for a collaborative PhD for each research student must be in place.~~, and where appropriate this should be accompanied by a Memorandum of Understanding~~

Financial criterion

h. The Institution should ~~normally~~ be wholly financially independent of the University.

Financial implications

6. Where an Associated Institution contributes to the teaching of postgraduate courses, payment for such teaching services will be negotiated between the relevant School/College and that Institution; funding for such payments will be the responsibility of the School/College. Details will be included in the Schedule to the Memorandum of Agreement.

Nomination procedure

7. Associated Institutions~~, which will normally be non-degree awarding, non-commercial institutions,~~ are nominated by a School or College. A School/College lead person will be identified (normally the Head of the relevant School) to liaise with the Associated Institution and take responsibility for the nomination, any subsequent agreement and its monitoring. The lead is responsible for ensuring due diligence is carried out before submitting a nomination to the Researcher Experience Committee (REC). The lead is also responsible for ensuring that risk management and due diligence is performed in line with standard University procedures.

Due diligence

8. A College/School wishing to collaborate with a partner will perform the checks, including site visits, necessary for the University to endorse them as a partner and satisfy itself of the good standing and legal capacity of the partner.
  • This might include: current/future world rankings or league tables; other indicators of quality at institutional or departmental level, compatibility with the University's mission and vision; governance and financial stability; and political sensitivities.

- ~~Where the partner~~ Since the Associated Institution is not a University, Due Diligence may need to be adapted as appropriate, and should be undertaken in more detail, ensuring that the AI
  - has the necessary academic expertise and capacity to deliver their contribution to the collaboration
  - has an effective management system suited to assuring the quality of research programmes;
  - offers an ethos and environment for research students appropriate to UK higher education and to the proposed collaboration;
  - has appropriate arrangements for monitoring the proficiency of its staff; and
  - where relevant, appropriate Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Bodies are content with the proposed arrangements.

- ~~In the case of any~~For International Partnerships staff should follow the Global Partnerships Policy ~~Protocol, including the Checklist in section 5 of the Protocol~~. www.ed.ac.uk/about/edinburgh-global/partnerships/new-partnership

9. Due Diligence must include a statement of rationale for any proposed collaboration which should link to the College's strategic plan. This statement will form part of a business case for programmes and other forms of collaboration. For collaborative programmes this will follow the established approach in the relevant College.

Nomination approval process

10. Associated Institution nominations will ~~normally~~ be approved at College level before submission to REC.

11. When submitting a nomination to REC, the School/College should include
    - the reasons for the nomination;
    - a brief description of how the institution meets the criteria for according Associated Institution status;
    - due diligence;
    - risk management report;
    - ~~The submission should also state~~ the review period for monitoring the agreement and time limit to the agreement;
    - Supervisory arrangements, where relevant, should be included in the submission. Where staff at Associated Institutions will act as supervisors, they are required to attend University supervisor training sessions, as is required of University staff supervisors.

12. The University Secretary on behalf of the Central Management Group, will be responsible for considering the case for award of Associated Institution status, on the advice of the Virtual Collaborations Group (VCG) and Researcher Experience Committee (REC). The VCG will ensure the case meets the Associated Insrtitution criteria, consulting relevant parties as appropriate, before it is considered by REC ~~, on the academic advice of the Researcher Experience Committee~~ for academic advice~~, and on the advice of the Directors of Finance and/or Planning, as appropriate~~. Once a nomination for Associated Institution status is endorsed by REC it will be submitted for final approval by the Senior Vice Principal ~~External Engagement~~.

13. Under the University's Delegated Authority Schedule, only certain University office-holders have authority to sign of MoUs and MoAs for collaborative programmes.

The agreementMemoranda and monitoring

14. The agreement Memorandum of Understanding and any Memoranda of Agreement will be drawn up between the School/College University and Associated Institution. Agreements Memoranda will be time-limited and subject to review[2]. The relevant School/College will and determine and put in place appropriate and proportionate safeguards to manage the risks of the arrangements. Agreements should include
    - the provision of supervisor training (as appropriate)
    - how the agreement will be monitored
    - when monitoring will be carried out (for example annually)
    - the term of the agreement.

15. The agreementMemoranda will be monitored by the relevant School/College to ensure that the Associated Institution continues to meet the criteria set out in the Universitythis policy on Criteria for According Associated Institution Status, and that it continues to meet due diligence and risk management checks and any additional conditions of the agreement. The University will also review its collaborative arrangements periodically, at strategic, operational and academic levels.

16. More information on collaborative provision and agreements, including template Memoranda and the Delegated Authority Schedule, is available on the Governance & Strategic Planning website:
    www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/governance-strategic-planning/collaborative-activity

Collaborative arrangements will be monitored and reviewed periodically at strategic, operational and academic levels, as far as possible by existing procedures.
Further information is available in the Strategic Policy on Collaborative Provision.

Date

---

[2] The AI MoU template includes a length of five years, which can be extended by agreement. The AI MoA template suggests a time limit of the length of the student's degree programme.

The University of Edinburgh

Senatus Researcher Experience Committee

12 April 2016

Internal Review Themes 2014/15

Executive Summary

Extract from paper identifying good practice and key themes for development arising from internal subject reviews held in 2014/15. This paper was submitted to Quality Assurance Committee on 3 September 2015, and the extract comprises items remitted to REC:

- Training and support for postgraduate tutors and demonstrators and external tutors
- Postgraduate research student progression milestones

How does this align with the University / Committee's strategic plans and priorities?

The paper is relevant to the University's Strategic Plan Goal of Excellence in Education and Theme of Outstanding Student Experience; and the Committee's strategy to enhance postgraduate research student experience and ensure training for employability; and the Committee's priority to enhance annual progression review process.

Action requested

REC is invited to discuss the paper and consider appropriate action.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Implementation will be identified by the committee for any actions arising. Communication will be undertaken by REC members and by Academic Services in the annual communication on policy and regulation updates as appropriate.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. **Resource implications (including staffing)**
   The paper is for discussion, however there may be resource implications for Schools arising from actions identified.

2. **Risk assessment**
   No risk assessment is included, but the themes identified related to education and student experience and fall within the medium to higher willingness range in the University's statement on risk policy and risk appetite.

3. **Equality and Diversity** None identified

4. *Freedom of information* *The paper is **open***

Originator of the paper

Dr Linda Bruce
Academic Services, 17 August 2015

Internal Review Themes 2014/15
Areas for further development

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

As in the 2013/14 cycle of reviews, all Postgraduate Programme Reviews held in 2014/15 identified scope for enhanced training and support for postgraduate tutors and demonstrators. The theme was also evident in the Teaching Programme Reviews held in 2014/15. Recommendations aimed at developing this area covered increased peer mentoring by more experienced postgraduate tutors, particularly for PhD students from different higher education systems who lack experience of the tutorial system; the introduction of structured training and review of the workload allocation model, including allocation of set hours within tutors' contracts for engagement with students and more widely in the school; recognition within the pay structure that preparation time is required for some demonstrating work; annual reporting on performance of postgraduate tutors, based on tutor-specific evaluation forms; training for tutors on administrative processes and clarity on tutors' rights and responsibilities as staff members. Some postgraduate tutors were of the view that systematic feedback to tutors could encourage more PhD students to become involved in teaching; consistency of induction and training for postgraduate tutors within each school.

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

Remit to: Senate Researcher Experience Committee

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

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

2.2 Postgraduate research student progression milestones

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

Remit to: Senate Researcher Experience Committee

REC 15/16 4E

The University of Edinburgh

Senatus Researcher Experience Committee

12 April 2016

Senate Committee planning for 2016-17onwards

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

This paper sets out the framework for Senate Committee planning for 2016-17 onwards, and invites the Committee to suggest high priority projects for 2016-17, and to discuss how to approach planning in the longer-term. It also provides an update on the Committee's progress against its plans for 2015-16.

Action requested

The Committee is invited to:

- Discuss high priority projects for 2016-17
- Confirm whether it is content with a proposed approach to future planning cycles

Communication and Implementation

On 27 April 2016, the Senate Committees Symposium will discuss the four Senate Committees' ideas for 2016-17. Academic Services will then submit the plans to Senate on 1 June 2016, and will then communicate them more widely using the Senate Committees' Newsletter. College representatives on the Committee are encouraged to discuss the plans with their Schools.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? Yes. The paper will assist the University to use its resources strategically.

Risk Assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? No. Since the paper aims to generate ideas rather than to recommend a specific course of action, it is not necessary to undertake a risk analysis.

Equality and Diversity

Has due consideration been given to the equality impact of this paper? No. Since the paper aims to generate ideas rather than to recommend a specific course of action, it is not necessary to undertake an equality and diversity assessment.

Freedom of information

For inclusion in open business

Tom Ward, Director of Academic Services, 10 March 2016

Senate Committee planning for 2016-17 onwards

This paper sets out the framework for Senate Committee planning for 2016-17 onwards that the Learning and Teaching Policy Group has agreed, and invites the Committee to suggest high priority projects for 2016-17. It also invites the Committee to comment on a proposed approach to planning for future sessions

Background - Update on progress against 2015-16 plans

At its meeting on 3 June 2015, Senate endorsed the Committees' plans for 2015-16, see Paper E at:
www.docs.sasg.ed.ac.uk/AcademicServices/Committees/Senate/2014-15/20150603AgendaAndPapers.pdf

An update on the Committee's progress against its plan for 2015-16 is attached as Annex A.

Process for developing the plans for 2016-17

- The four Senate Standing Committees are invited to discuss priorities for 2016-17 at their meetings in March / April 2016, taking account of the priorities of Colleges / Schools / EUSA, the University Strategic Plan, the recommendations from the 2015 Enhancement-led Institutional Review, and the availability of resources.

- The annual Senate Committees Symposium on 27 April 2016 will then have an opportunity to comment on the plans.

- Senate will be invited to endorse the agreed plans at its meeting on 1 June 2016.

Resources available to support the plans

In order to take forward their projects, the Senate Committees rely on the capacity of Schools, Colleges and EUSA to engage, and on professional support from Academic Services, Student Systems, Information Services Group, the Institute for Academic Development and the Careers Service / Employability Consultancy. These resources from relevant support services will enable all the Senate Committees to undertake a reasonable volume of projects activities. If the Senate Committees wish to undertake new projects with substantial resource requirement, they may need to bid for additional resources via the University planning round (although in practice there is no scope to introduce any new items into the planning round for 2016-17).

In planning for 2016-17, it is necessary to retain sufficient headroom to address high priority issues that emerge (for example as a result of external developments) during the session.

For discussion - priorities for 2016-17

Some projects already underway will continue into 2016-17, and several other projects are likely to be required due to external factors. These activities (set out in Annex B) are the starting point for planning for 2016-17. ***The Committee is invited***

2

to identify any additional projects that may be required for 2016-17 and their rationale.

Possible approaches to future planning cycles

The recent Light-touch Governance Review of Senate and its Committees indicated that, while the Senate Committee members were broadly satisfied with the approach to planning, that Review also identified a potential disconnect between the timing of prioritisation of Senate Committee activity and the timing of the University's annual planning processes. The Learning and Teaching Policy Group proposes that, from next session, the Senate Committees' planning would involve two distinct stages:

- In the latter part of Semester One, the Committees would be invited to identify any major strategic developments that may require additional resources, which could then be considered during the planning round; and

- In Semester Two, the Committees could undertake a broader discussion of priorities for the coming session.

The Committee is invited to confirm if it is content with this approach.

ANNEX A – Researcher Experience Committee Progress on Priorities 2015/16

Committee Achievements

The Committee's priorities were confirmed in the annual report of the four Senate Standing Committees to Senate in May 2015. Committees seek to deliver as many of their priorities as possible, while adjusting them as necessary to take account of any changes in the internal and external environment.

In order of priority:

1. Enhance annual progression review process - oversee implementation of the new EUCLID system tools for supporting the online annual progression review process and encourage Schools to use them; review guidelines for postgraduate research student annual progression review.

    Progress: REC worked with Student Systems who developed the system tools. The online annual progression review system was launched in September 2015. REC has agreed the system will be mandatory for all postgraduate research student progression reviews from the start of 2016/17.

    Impact: delivers enhancements to business processes and management of postgraduate research students.

2. Develop a clearer idea of what an Edinburgh PhD should be, through benchmarking, consultation, and alignment with broader thinking in the University (for example, the development of the Strategic Plan, work regarding collaborative provision).

    Progress: REC consulted with Colleges and Schools through a discussion paper and received a report on results and sector benchmarking at its January 2016 meeting. The Committee will hold a working group meeting in April to provide an outward facing statement on the Edinburgh PhD and confirm regulation parameters.

    Impact: ensuring Edinburgh is leading the sector in PhD study and provide enhanced and robust support framework for postgraduate research students.

3. Review supervisor selection and training arrangements.

    Progress: Proposed for inclusion in Postgraduate Research Experience Project (PREP) – awaiting planning round outcome.

    Impact: delivers enhancements to business processes and management of postgraduate research students.

4. Explore options for a Mentoring role.

    Progress: Proposed for inclusion in Postgraduate Research Experience Project (PREP) – awaiting planning round outcome.
    Impact: delivers enhancements to business processes and management of postgraduate research students.

5. Explore concept of Distance / Flexible Learning PhDs.

    Progress: REC set up the Flexible PhD Task Group to review options for PhD study by distance. The Task Group's final report and recommendations were approved at the March 2016 REC meeting. REC to review progress on implementation in Semester 1 of 2016/17.

    Impact: ensuring Edinburgh is leading the sector in PhD study and provide enhanced and robust support framework for postgraduate research students.

6. Support/promote career development planning for Early Career Researchers.

    Progress: A paper, drawing of work by the REC Early Career Researcher Task Group, was submitted to University People Committee in June 2015. REC discussed results of the CROS and PIRLS surveys in January 2016 and agreed IAD will submit proposals on survey options to a future REC meeting.

    Impact: delivers enhancements to the early career researcher and postdoc career development strategy

7. Doctoral Training Centres – monitor development of new centres and feed into the development of proposals for central coordination and support.

    Progress: A discussion paper will be submitted by IAD to a future REC meeting.

    Impact: ensuring robust research training provision and enhanced student experience.

8./

8. Postgraduate Research Space – identify priorities / recommendation for policy development by Space Enhancement and Management Group (SEMG).

    Progress: REC received feedback from Maths and Divinity at its September 2015 meeting. The Committee also strengthened communication with SEMG and representatives from SEMG attended a discussion at the January 2016 REC meeting.
    Impact: ensuring consideration of appropriate postgraduate research training facilities and an enhanced student experience.

Other activity

- Regulations review – REC provided steering for the Postgraduate Degree Regulations and Assessment Regulations for Research Degrees review in January 2016.

    Impact: ensuring a robust academic governance framework for postgraduate research students.

- Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES) – REC received College responses to PRES results in January 2016. Further discussion on maximising value from surveys will be held in April 2016.

    Impact: ensuring an enhanced postgraduate research student experience.

Annex B – Senate Committee projects already underway which are likely to continue into 2016-17, and related projects planned for 2016-17

Learning and Teaching Committee

- Transitions Enhancement Theme –institutional coordination and oversight (broadly focussed on maximising the benefit of the Theme for current priorities)

- Leading Enhancement in Assessment and Feedback (LEAF) / Transforming the Experience of Students Through Assessment (TESTA) Project

- Implement changes to academic year structure (subject to outcome of review)

- Task Group on Innovation in Teaching and Learning

- Oversee development of Continuing Professional Development for Learning and Teaching

- Implement changes to Innovative Learning Week

- Refine Academic Support / Personal Tutor system

Curriculum and Student Progression

- EUCLID Assessment and Progression Tools project

- Further phase of piloting and evaluation of Student-led individually-Created Courses (SLICCS).

- (Subject to the outcomes of the Special Circumstances Task Group, and subject to a bid for funding), developing systems and EUCLID business processes for Special Circumstances*

- Developing policies and processes (eg around curriculum approval) to ensure compliance with Competition and Marketing Authority guidelines

Quality Assurance Committee

- Enhancement-led Institutional Review – develop and oversee implementation of plan of action in response to ELIR (likely to involve engagement from all Senate Committees)

- Implement and monitor effectiveness of those changes resulting from review of quality assurance framework introduced for 16/17, and further develop and implement changes for 17/18

- Roll-out of Evasys course evaluation tool

7

- External Examiner Project – further monitoring of the implementation of the External Examiner Reporting system and the revised External Examiner Policy.

Researcher Experience Committee

- Postgraduate Research Enhancement Project*

- Enhance annual progression review process – monitoring the full implementation of the new EUCLID system tools for supporting the online annual review process

- Implement recommendations of task group on Distance PhDs

- Address regulatory issues regarding MSc of Research programmes, and the status of students during the writing-up period

Cross-cutting activities

- National Student Survey- continued coordination and support for activities to address issues raised by NSS.

- Engage with proposed Teaching Excellence Framework

- Develop and roll-out student data dashboards*

- Move towards wider use of online assessment

- Work on 'Simplification' of practices and processes regarding learning, teaching and assessment

- Activities to enhance assessment and feedback

- Activities regarding community engagement and experiential learning

- Activities regarding digital education

- Activities regarding reaching performance (eg work on annual review arrangements, CPD for teaching staff)

- Senate and Senate Committees Effectiveness review - undertake externally-facilitated review and implement recommendations.

- Policies and Codes - Programme of review of policies including equality impact assessments

*Seeking funding via planning round