

The University of Edinburgh

**Meeting of Senate Learning and Teaching Committee
to be held at 2.00pm on Wednesday 13 March 2019
in the Raeburn Room, Old College**

A G E N D A

1.	Welcome and Apologies	
2.	Minutes of the Meeting held on 23 January 2019	LTC 18/19 4 A
3.	Matters Arising	
4.	Convener's Communications	
5.	For Discussion	
5.1	Review of Senate and its Standing Committees: 5.1.1 Externally-Facilitated Review of Senate – Update 5.1.2 Review of the Structure of the Senate Committees – Initial Proposals for Consultation	Verbal Update LTC 18/19 4 B
5.2	Final Report of Task Group on Using the Curriculum to Promote Inclusion, Equality and Diversity	LTC 18/19 4 C
5.3	Student Support Review	LTC 18/19 4 D
5.4	Senate Committee Planning: 5.4.1 Progress to Date with 2018/19 Committee Priorities 5.4.2 Senate Committee Planning 2019/20	LTC 18/19 4 E LTC 18/19 4 F
5.5	Teaching and Academic Careers Project - Update	LTC 18/19 4 G
5.6	Potential Curriculum Review Project – Relevant Areas of Work	LTC 18/19 4 H
5.7	Service Excellence Programme - Update	Presentation
5.8	Student Experience Action Plan – Update	LTC 18/19 4 J To follow
6.	For Information and Noting	
6.1	Report from Knowledge Strategy Committee (Meeting 18 January 2019)	LTC 18/19 4 I
7.	Any Other Business	

Draft minutes – for approval at meeting to be held on 13 March 2019

**Minutes of the Meeting of the Senatus Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC)
held at 2pm on Wednesday 23 January 2019
in the Board Room, Chancellor's Building, Little France**

1. Attendance

Present:

Professor Rowena Arshad	Head of Moray House School of Education (Co-opted member)
Professor Sian Bayne	Director of Centre for Research in Digital Education (Co-opted member)
Professor Stephen Bowd	Dean of Postgraduate Studies (CAHSS)
Ms Megan Brown	Edinburgh University Students' Association, Academic Engagement Co-ordinator (Ex officio)
Ms Rebecca Gaukroger	Director of Student Recruitment and Admissions (Ex officio)
Professor Iain Gordon	Head of School of Mathematics (Co-opted member)
Ms Shelagh Green	Director for Careers and Employability (Ex officio)
Professor Judy Hardy	Director of Teaching, School of Physics and Astronomy (CSE)
Professor Tina Harrison	Assistant Principal (Academic Standards and Quality Assurance)
Dr Sarah Henderson	Acting Director for Postgraduate Taught (CMVM)
Ms Melissa Highton	Director of Learning, Teaching and Web Services Division (Ex officio)
Professor Charlie Jeffery (Convener)	Senior Vice-Principal
Dr Velda McCune	Deputy Director, Institute for Academic Development (Director's nominee) (Ex officio)
Ms Diva Mukherji	Vice President (Education), Edinburgh University Students' Association (Ex officio)
Professor Graeme Reid	Dean of Learning and Teaching (CSE)
Dr Sabine Rolle	Dean of Undergraduate Studies (CAHSS)
Professor Mike Shipston	Dean of Biomedical Sciences (Co-opted member)
Professor Neil Turner	Director of Undergraduate Teaching and Learning, (CMVM)
Mrs Philippa Ward (Secretary)	Academic Services
Mr Tom Ward	University Secretary's Nominee, Director of Academic Services (Ex officio)

Apologies:

Ms Nichola Kett	Academic Governance Representative, Academic Services
-----------------	---

In attendance:

Ms Sarah-Jane Brown	Student Surveys Unit
---------------------	----------------------

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

LTC approved the minutes of the meeting held on 14 November 2018.

3. Matters Arising

3.1 National Student Survey (NSS) 2019: Bank and Institutional Questions

The Committee noted that after the 14 November meeting, members had agreed to include the bank of employability-related questions and an institutional question about the Personal Tutor System in the 2019 NSS. They had also agreed to omit students' union and learning community-related questions.

3.2 Senate Committee Input into the 2019-22 Planning Round

Following the 14 November meeting of LTC, members were given the opportunity to comment by correspondence on issues for the 2019-22 Planning Round. The following priorities were highlighted by members:

- work around Teaching and Academic Careers (TACs)
- the Student Experience Action Plan
- employability and support for personal, professional and career development, both centrally and at School-level.

4. Convener's Business

4.1 Senate Committee Governance Activities

The Convener advised members that an external review of the effectiveness of Senate and its Committees would be undertaken in the current academic year by Jennifer Barnes, a consultant from Saxton Bampfylde. Concurrently, an internal review of the structure of the Senate Committees would be carried out. This would be convened by the Senior Vice-Principal, and LTC would be given an opportunity to comment on a set of proposals at its March meeting.

4.2 Vice-Principal Students Post

Members were advised that the closing date for applications for the post had now passed and a long-list would be received from the recruitment agency the following week.

5. For Discussion

5.1 Student and Staff Experience Action Plan

The Convener advised the Committee that the version of the Plan being considered had been produced in November 2018. Whilst significant progress had been made since then, a more recent iteration of the paper was not yet available.

Progress made since November 2018 included:

- agreeing that a holistic approach would be adopted, with both the staff and student experience being integral to the Plan;
- further developing the 'Communications' section of the Plan;
- and developing the 'Leadership' section of the paper (the Convener advised members that expectations for those in leadership positions were likely to change as a result of the Plan).

The overall aim of the Plan was to ensure that students felt cherished and staff energised by their contributions. Prioritisation going forwards would be through logic modelling and financial cost-benefit analysis.

In discussing the Plan, members agreed that expectation management would be important when communicating about the Plan. There would be value in identifying 'quick wins' for those students who would not benefit from longer-term changes. The Committee also discussed the relationship between the Action Plan and Service Excellence, and noted that projects that were already underway would not stop, but would instead be understood in the broader context provided by the Plan: the Plan would align with, not duplicate existing activity.

5.2 Curriculum Issues

5.2.1 Near Future Teaching – Co-Designing a Values-Based Vision for Digital Education at the University of Edinburgh

LTC was advised that the Near Future Teaching project was entering its final phase. Members noted that the co-design approach to the project had been time-consuming but highly effective, and had engaged large numbers of staff and students. A number of short to medium-term actions had arisen from the project. In addition, the project lead was discussing ways in which the outputs of the project would feed into the longer-term trajectory by informing other areas of work, including the Student and Staff Action Plan.

Members discussed:

- The impressive creativity of the project
- The fact that the project aligned well with both Service Excellence and the Student and Staff Experience Action Plan
- The fact that, up to this point, the scope of the project had been limited to digital education. However, LTC held the view that the outputs of the project could influence all aspects of learning and teaching
- The value of developing the paper to:
 - Highlight the technology and staff resource that would be needed to take the project forward over the next 5 to 10 years (this would be discussed with the Director of Learning, Teaching and Web Services)
 - highlight concrete actions;
 - make linkages with other areas of work clear;
 - build more about reach and significance into the document;

- and to provide more information about outcomes eg. how the work described mapped to graduate attributes and employability.

Action: Assistant Principal Digital Education to amend the paper as discussed and to consider the technology and staff resource needed to deliver the project's outputs with the Director of Learning, Teaching and Web Services.

5.2.2 Curriculum Conversations

The paper was presented by Professor Judy Robertson, Moray House School of Education. She advised members that the proposed publication, 'Teaching Bite', aimed to provide a resource in book format that gathered together the University's collective wisdom on learning and teaching. Input from staff and students would be essential, and it was hoped that the forthcoming University Learning and Teaching Conference would generate useful material for inclusion. Members discussed possible themes for the book. Suggestions included:

- curriculum for the 21st century
- curriculum review
- use of lecture recording
- use of the Virtual Learning Environment (VLE)
- decolonising the curriculum
- blended learning
- transition from University to career
- teaching staff workload (which could include discussion around pedagogy and assessment which may allow staff to use their time more effectively)

Members also discussed:

- the format of the publication, noting that it would be important to offer the material in more than just book format;
- the relationship of 'Teaching Bite' and the 'Teaching Matters' website, and the importance of avoiding duplication;
- the potential for outputs from the Student and Staff Experience Plan to inform the publication's content.

Members were asked to contact Professor Robertson or the Director of the Institute for Academic Development (IAD) if they were interested in joining the Steering Group for the publication, or had suggestions of others who might be interested.

Action: Members to contact Professor Robertson or the Director of IAD to express interest in joining the Steering Group.

5.3 Update on Task Group on Using the Curriculum to Promote Inclusion, Equality and Diversity

The Director of Academic Services advised members that this was an interim report from the Group. The Group had developed a set of draft principles to guide its work and initial ideas about institutional actions. Members discussed:

- the importance of the project having ‘teeth’ - the need to ensure that action was taken by Schools as a result of the Task Group’s work without it becoming a box ticking exercise. Clear and visible leadership across all Schools, without being overly prescriptive, would be required.
- the need to ensure that members of staff were clear about the purpose of the work
- the benefit of providing examples of what change might look like, particularly for Schools within the College of Science and Engineering;
- the importance of managing expectations among current and prospective students when promoting the Principles.

5.4 Update on Research into Undergraduate Non-Continuation

The Director of Academic Services reminded members that research into undergraduate non-continuation had been discussed at the Committee’s November 2018 meeting. Since that meeting, potential areas for additional research had been identified, and work had been undertaken by Governance and Strategic Planning (GASP) to scope and cost this additional activity. GASP had concluded that further research into prior attainment or entry qualifications and engagement with societies or extra-curricular activities were most likely to prove beneficial.

Members supported undertaking additional research in these areas, but noted that using aggregate UCAS tariff scores (priority 1 in the paper) and highest qualification on entry for Scottish students (priority 3) as an indicator of prior attainment may not give clean data.

The Department of Peer Learning and Support was keen to undertake further research into the impact of Peer Support. The Director of Academic Services would discuss this further with Peer Learning and Support.

Action:

- 1) Director of Academic Services to meet with Peer Learning and Support to discuss areas for further research.
- 2) GASP to take forward the proposed research on prior attainment and engagement with societies or extra-curricular activities, subject to securing resources.

5.5 Teaching and Academic Careers

5.5.1 Teaching and Academic Careers (TACs) Project - Update

The Committee noted that this was a strand of the Student and Staff Experience Action Plan. A set of guiding principles had been developed by the group leading the work following widespread consultation, and the project was now moving into phase 2. This phase was expected to involve 3 main strands of activity:

- A technical review of HR policies and procedures to identify whether changes would be required to ensure alignment with the principles
- A technical review of support and expectations for professional development in teaching to identify whether changes would be required to ensure alignment with the principles
- A technical review of the way in which the University evidenced excellence in teaching

The task group was aiming to complete most of the work by the end of the semester, but some areas of work, particularly the review of HR policies, would take longer.

Members agreed that communication and culture change would be key to the success of the project: staff members needed to believe that excellent teaching would be recognised and rewarded.

5.5.2 Update on Continuing Professional Development (CPD) Framework for Learning and Teaching

The Deputy Director of the Institute for Academic Development advised LTC that good progress was being made with the Framework, with participation increasing steadily, and positive feedback being received from participants. The impact of academic workloads on possibilities for participation in professional development for learning and teaching was discussed.

5.6 Resource Lists Framework – Update

LTC formally supported the introduction of the Resource Lists Framework. It discussed ways in which use of the Framework might be encouraged including:

- producing more information about use of the Framework in different disciplines;
- raising awareness of the Framework amongst Course Organisers and Programme Directors;
- reassuring staff members that a resource list does not need to be comprehensive (this would involve making students aware that resource lists were only a starting point, and that wider reading was expected);
- and making systems changes to allow a resource list to be set up as part of the course creation process.

5.7 Enhancement-Led Institutional Review (ELIR) 2020 – Update and Discussion of Contextualised Themes

The Committee noted that the next ELIR would take place in October and November 2020. The Contextualised Themes were the priorities the institution wished to focus on. LTC was broadly supportive of the 4 Themes proposed, but noted that it would be important to ensure that Postgraduate Research provision was given appropriate attention in the context of those Themes. Members noted that the way in which the Themes were described and presented would develop over time.

5.8 MOOC Programme Summary 2018

LTC approved a proposal that the MOOCs Strategy Group develop a strategic approach to expanding the University's MOOC portfolio in line with priorities around Distance Learning at Scale, City Deal, the Learning and Teaching Strategy and student recruitment. This would include a targeted call for the development of new MOOCs.

Members discussed:

- The need to ensure that any strategic review of MOOCs also closed MOOCs where appropriate;
- The changing nature of MOOCs, including reduced use of MOOCs terminology within the sector; and
- The opportunity provided by MOOCs for the University to learn more about serving large numbers of students online.

6. For Approval

6.1 Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey

6.1.1 Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES) 2019: Institutional Questions

Members approved the proposed institutional questions on academic community, Personal Tutor, employability and a free text question. They also agreed that questions on the dissertation and free text comments should remain in the questionnaire and not be hidden.

6.1.2 Update on Potential Future PGT Survey

Members noted the update and that there had been limited progress since the previous year.

6.2 Establishment of a Task Group to Review the Operation of the Higher Education Achievement Report (HEAR)

The Committee approved the establishment of a short-life task group to review the operation of Section 6.1 of the HEAR.

7. For Information and Noting

The following items were noted:

7.1 University of Edinburgh Learning and Teaching Conference 2019 – Update

7.2 Careers and Employability Update

7.3 Report from Learning and Teaching Policy Group

7.4 Lecture Recording Opt-Outs

LTC was advised that as compared with January 2018, 62% more lectures were being recorded, and viewings had increased by 98%.

The Lecture Recording Policy had come into operation on 1 January 2019. Since this time, only around 15% of those courses with lectures that could have been recorded had opted out, resulting in a higher than sector average proportion of lectures being recorded. Opt-out was not evenly distributed across the University. Heads of Schools had been provided with information about courses that had opted out in their Schools, and the University Executive would receive data for all Schools. Members agreed that Information Services Group should provide Heads of Schools with opt-out data for all Schools to allow them to see how their School compared.

LTC: 13.03.19
H/02/25/02

LTC 18/19 4 A

Philippa Ward
Academic Services
27 January 2018

The University of Edinburgh

Senate Learning and Teaching Committee

13 March 2019

Review of the Structure of the Senate Committees - initial proposals for consultation

Executive Summary

The Principal has agreed that the University should review the structure of the Senate Committees. A task group convened by the Senior Vice-Principal is managing this review. This paper sets the scope of the review, and the task group membership and planned approach to the review. It also sets out the task group's initial proposals for changes to the structure and membership of the Senate Committees, and invites the Committee to comment. The task group plans broader consultation with stakeholders about the proposals in April / early May 2019.

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

Effective academic governance supports the University in delivering all its strategic plans and priorities.

Action requested

For discussion.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

The paper sets out the task group's plans for consulting on the proposals for changes to the Committee structures. Academic Services would take responsibility for coordinating the implementation of any approved changes.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

Academic Services will support the review. The operation of the Senate committee structure has resource implications both for the secretariat (provided by Academic Services) and for the members of the Committees. Were the review to lead to an increase or decrease in the number of committees, this would have a commensurate impact on resources.

2. Risk assessment

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

3. Equality and Diversity

The task group will consider equality and diversity issues when developing its recommendations.

4. Freedom of information

Open

Key words

LTC: 13.03.19
H/02/25/02

LTC 18/19 4 B

Originator of the paper

Tom Ward, Director of Academic Services
5 March 2019

University of Edinburgh
2019 review of the Structure of the Senate Committees
Initial proposals for consultation

The Principal has agreed that the University should review the structure of the Senate Committees. A task group convened by the Senior Vice-Principal is managing this review.

This paper sets the scope of the review, and the task group membership and planned approach to the review. It also sets out the task group's initial proposals for changes to the structure and membership of the Senate Committees, and invites the Committee to comment.

1 Summary of options* for consultation

Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (see 4.1)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Status quo - no change to current LTC remit and membership
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Extend the membership of LTC to include some or all Heads of Schools (or their designated representatives)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Establish a joint Senate / Court committee with responsibility for the broader student experience (while the Learning and Teaching Committee continues to focus on learning, teaching, assessment and student support)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Transfer the Researcher Experience Committee's responsibilities for strategic PGR student matters into LTC
Senate Researcher Experience Committee (and broader research matters) (see 4.2)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Status quo - no change to current REC remit and membership (other than clarifying who will convene the Committee on an ongoing basis), and modest changes to CSPC's membership so that it has greater depth of expertise on PGR matters to assist it to fulfil its existing role on PGR policy and regulations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Merge REC's responsibilities for strategic PGR matters into LTC, and incorporate responsibility for Early Career Researcher matters into Research Policy Group
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Extend RPG's remit to incorporate both PGR and Early Career Researcher matters, and change Research Policy Group's reporting lines so it reports to Senate (while retaining strong links to the University Executive)

LTC: 13.03.19
H/02/25/02

LTC 18/19 4 B

- Clarify the roles of REC and other relevant Committees (eg Student Recruitment Strategy Group and Fee Strategy Group) in relation to the governance of PGR scholarships

Senate Quality Assurance Committee (see 4.3)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No specific proposals for changes to QAC's remit and membership.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Explore ways to strengthen the links between QAC and the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee, so that the University's quality review processes inform strategic discussion of learning and teaching issues.
Senate Curriculum and Student Progression Committee (see 4.4)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Amend CPSC's membership so that it has greater depth of expertise on PGR matters to assist it to fulfil its existing role on PGR policy and regulations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Change CSPC's name to 'Student Regulations and Curriculum Frameworks Committee'
Other issues for consultation (see 4.5)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Formalise the requirement for the Committees to review their remit and membership each year to ensure they have expertise across all relevant aspects of the University's increasingly diverse portfolio of taught and PGR provisions
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review the role of the Student Disability Committee and (if it continues to operate) establish clearer reporting lines to the University formal governance structures

* Note that in some cases the options presented for each Committee are not mutually exclusive.

2 Background

Senate has delegated most of its powers to its committees – and, beyond holding strategic discussions on specific issues, its decision-making role is limited to a small number of formal issues – for example, approving the award of Honorary degrees and the appointment of Emeritus Professors, and commenting on Court resolutions. The University's academic governance therefore relies heavily on Senate's committees.

Senate established its current committee structure in 2009-10, following a review of academic governance. Its four standing committees are:

- Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC)
- Researcher Experience Committee (REC)
- Quality Assurance Committee (QAC)
- Curriculum and Student Progression Committee (CSPC)

The remit and membership of these committees are available at:

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

It is timely for the University to review these committee structures:

- It is now ten years since the University established these committee structures, and over that period the University's portfolio of taught and research programmes, the size and shape of its student population, and the external policy and regulatory environment, have all changed considerably.
- During that period, the University has also changed some other aspects of its committee structures (eg the establishment of University Executive), and Colleges will have made some changes to their committee structures – it is therefore appropriate to ensure the Senate committee structures continue to align with other committee structures.
- In order to fulfil the requirements of the Scottish Code for Good Higher Education Governance, the University has commissioned a consultant (Dr Jennifer Barnes) to undertake an externally-facilitated review of the effectiveness of Senate and its Committees. This review is considering a range of issues, including: the operation and effectiveness of Senate; the effectiveness of the communication between Senate, its committees and their stakeholders across the University; and how Senate can encourage discussion and debate, and provide effective governance. Dr Barnes has now concluded her review and is writing up her report with a view to reporting to Senate 29 May 2019 meeting. The task group will take account of any recommendations she may make which have implications for the Senate Committee structures.
- In 2020, the University will introduce major changes to the composition of Senate in order to comply with the 2016 Scottish Higher Education (Governance) Act. As a result, Senate's membership will reduce (from c.800 to c. 300 members), and the membership will become predominantly elected. These changes in the composition could contribute to changes to the format and role of Senate, which would in turn have implications for the Senate Committees.

3 Task group approach and timescales

The task group scope and membership is set out in the Annex. The task group plans the following approach:

February 2019	Task group held first meeting to develop some initial proposals for changes to Committee structures and membership (taking account of approaches at comparator institutions, and emerging findings from the externally-facilitated review of Senate)
March / April 2019	Initial proposals to the Senate Committees for consultation

April / early May 2019	Broader consultation with stakeholders (eg University Executive, Research Policy Group, Heads of Schools and Colleges, Students' Association) regarding the proposals
Senate 29 May 2019	Present final proposals for committees structures and membership
Summer 2019	Task group to develop detailed Terms of References for revised committee structure
September 2019	E-Senate to approve detail of Terms of Reference for revised Committee structure
Start of 2019-20	Implement revised committee structures

4 Initial proposals for changes to the Senate committee structures

4.1 Senate Learning and Teaching Committee

4.1.1 *Governance of the broader student experience.*

It is becoming increasingly important for the University to have effective strategies and policies for aspects of the 'student experience' beyond the more traditional Senate focus on learning, teaching, assessment and academic support. At present, while LTC's terms of reference focus on those more traditional Senate functions, it has nonetheless provided direction and approved policy on broader issues, for example student mental health. There may be a case for formalising LTC's role in relation to the broader student experience.

While some comparator institutions do have Senate committees covering the broader student experience, extending LTC's remit would raise some challenges:

- How to define the demarcation lines between Senate and its Committees, and other University committees, in relation to the 'student experience';
- The Committee's membership would need to include expertise on relevant issues (implying a substantial expansion of membership to an already-large committee); and
- The Committee's typical meeting agendas are already long and demanding, and it may be necessary for the Committee to meet more frequently in order to manage a broader remit.

Since many student experience issues (eg transport) have direct resource implications, the Committee's effectiveness would be constrained unless it had an appropriate level of accountability for resources (which it does not have at present). One potential way of addressing this issue would be to establish a joint Court / Senate Committee which could include leaders for key functions (eg Estates) who would have authority over resources.

4.1.2 Effective implementation of decisions

Effective and consistent implementation of policies and strategies approved by Senate Committees often relies on action (and, sometimes, reallocation of resources) at School level. This can be a particular issue for LTC, since it is responsible for the more strategic aspects of the Senate Committees' work (the implementation of which can lead to particularly extensive change at School level). Extending the membership of LTC to include some or all Heads of Schools (or their designated representatives) would assist LTC to take account more explicitly of School-level resourcing issues when determining policy and strategy, and to increase School management buy-in for Senate Committee decision-making. It could however diminish the role of Colleges and their Deans in overseeing and supporting their Schools to implement institutional policy and strategy. In addition, the Committee may become too large to be effective if all 20 Heads of Schools are members, along with key College and professional services staff, and student representatives.

4.1.3 Alignment of different levels of study

Since 2009-10, Senate has structured its committees so that LTC considers UG and PGT matters together, and REC considers PGR matters separately, whereas previously Senate separated Undergraduate and Postgraduate matters into different committees. While Colleges currently have different approaches to UG and PGT matters (Science and Engineering consider UG and PGT matters in one Committee, whereas the other Colleges consider them in separate committees), the task group has not identified any case for returning to the pre-2009 position and dividing up UG and PGT matters into different Senate committees. The task group is however consulting on possible options for overseeing PGR matters, one of which might be to incorporate strategic PGR matters into LTC (see 4.2 below).

Options for consultation:

- Status quo - no change to current LTC remit and membership;
- Extend the membership of LTC to include some or all Heads of Schools (or their designated representatives);
- Establish a joint Senate / Court committee with responsibility for the broader student experience (while the Learning and Teaching Committee continues to focus on learning, teaching, assessment and student support);
- Transfer REC's responsibilities for strategic PGR student matters into LTC.

4.2 Senate Researcher Experience Committee (and broader research matters)

4.2.1 Location of governance for PGR and Early Career Researcher matters

At present, REC is responsible for postgraduate research degree training, higher degrees and training provision for other early career researchers. Research Policy Group (established in 2008, at the same time as the current Senate Committee structure), discusses University research policy issues, helps manage cross-College activities and promote interdisciplinary research, plays a key role in formulating the University's strategy and policy for REF 2021, and oversees good research practice and stewardship of University wide research policies that relate to research ethics and integrity. See: www.ed.ac.uk/governance-strategic-planning/research/rpg

In recent years, REC's ability to deliver its remit has been constrained by changes in academic leadership. However, it is also not clear whether the way that the Committee's responsibilities are configured is assisting it to fulfil its remit.

There are persuasive arguments for locating governance of PGR matters alongside with taught student governance, and Early Career Researcher matters alongside research policy, like some comparator institutions:

- In addition to the University's MSc by research programmes (which combine taught and research elements), an increasing number of PhD programmes (eg Integrated PhD programmes) combine taught and research elements. This makes it problematic to handle taught and research student provision entirely separately in policy development and governance terms.
- Many academic policies and regulations apply equally to both taught and research students, with only a relatively small number of documents specific to PGR. Of the policies and guidelines managed by Academic Services, roughly twice as many are applicable to both PGR and taught students as are solely about PGR matters.
- It is not clear whether broader 'student experience' issues (such as student mental health and wellbeing) are so distinct for PGR students from taught students that the University should handle them separately in governance terms.
- Early career researchers are key contributors to the University's research capability, as reflected by the University's strategic investments in Chancellors' Fellows, and in the external funding that the University is able to secure for ECRs. Considering ECRs alongside the University's broader research priorities may assist the University to develop a more strategic framework for their development.

However, given the much larger volume of taught students and programmes / courses, there would be a risk of diminishing the focus on PGR issues by locating them in the same committee as taught student matters.

Alternatively, the University could consider incorporating both PGR and Early Career Research into the committee responsible for Research policy, which would enable the University to take an integrated perspective on its research activities the staff and students contributing to them.

4.2.2 *Senate responsibilities for governance of research matters*

At present, Research Policy Group's formal reporting line is to the University Executive. During the externally facilitated review of Senate (see Section 2, above), some colleagues have suggested that there may be merits in Research Policy Group having a formal reporting line to Senate. This model appears common at comparator institutions, and would be consistent with Senate's formal responsibilities (set out in the 1889 Universities (Scotland) Act), which incorporate 'promoting' the University's research.

4.2.3 *Responsibility for policy and regulation on PGR matters*

At present, the Curriculum and Student Progression Committee has responsibility for approving policy and regulation for PGR as well as taught student matters. In practice, this means that REC advises on changes to policy and regulation on PGR matters and then passes them to CSPC for approval. CSPC has a co-opted member with expertise on PGR matters to provide a link between discussions at REC and CSPC.

While this overlap in functions is suboptimal, there would be significant practical issues to separating out policy and regulation for PGR students from that for taught students because many policies and regulations apply equally to both taught and research students and programmes. For example, of the policies and guidelines managed by Academic Services, roughly twice as many are applicable both to PGR and taught students as are solely about PGR matters. In part, this reflects the existence of the MSc by Research and Integrated PhD provision that incorporates taught and research elements (see above).

4.2.4 *Responsibility in relation to the development of PGR scholarships*

Some PGR scholarships (unlike scholarships for taught programmes) are accompanied with conditions or entitlements which affect students' programmes of study. For example, the Enlightenment Scholarships involve students undertaking a programme of teaching development or broader professional development alongside undertaking their research and producing their thesis. As a result, REC has inputted into the development of some PGR scholarships. The recent development and implementation of the Enlightenment Scholarships suggests that there may not be sufficient clarity regarding the respective roles of the Senate Researcher Experience Committee, and other University committees (eg Fee Strategy Group, FSG, and Student Recruitment Strategy Group, SRSG) in relationship to the development and oversight of PGR Scholarships.

Options for consultation:

- Status quo - no change to current REC remit and membership (other than clarifying who will convene the Committee on an ongoing basis), and modest changes to CSPC's membership so that it has greater depth of expertise on PGR matters to assist it to fulfil its existing role on PGR policy and regulations;
- Merge REC's responsibilities for strategic PGR matters into LTC, and incorporate responsibility for Early Career Researcher matters into Research Policy Group;
- Extend RPG's remit to incorporate both PGR and Early Career Researcher matters, and change Research Policy Group's reporting lines so it reports to Senate (while retaining strong links to the University Executive);
- Clarify the roles of REC and other relevant Committees (eg SRSG and FSG) in relation to the governance of PGR scholarships.

4.3 Senate Quality Assurance Committee

It remains necessary for the University to have a committee to provide governance for the quality assurance issues that it is responsible for (eg the University's framework of annual and period quality review, and the University's preparation for and responding to Enhancement-led Institutional Reviews). QAC also has a key role in sharing good practices identified via the quality review processes, and feeding key insights from quality review processes into institutional strategic planning. While some institutions (eg Bristol) combine this quality assurance work with policy and regulatory work, this is unlikely to be workable at Edinburgh without significant change since both QAC and CSPC already have very full agendas.

Options for consultation:

- No specific proposals for changes to QAC's remit and membership.
- Explore ways to strengthen the links between QAC and the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee, so that the University's quality review processes inform strategic discussion of learning and teaching issues.

4.4 Senate Curriculum and Student Progression Committee

The University needs to develop and maintain a framework of academic policy and regulation for its taught and research student activities. While it needs to be informed by strategy, the work involved in developing this framework requires careful scrutiny and discussion by stakeholders who have a detailed understanding of how policy and regulation impacts on individual students and courses/programmes. There is therefore a good case for continuing with the current arrangements, in which responsibility for approving policy and regulation is separate from broader strategic discussions on learning and teaching (the responsibility of LTC). The Committee's name does not articulate its core responsibilities (which relate to policy, regulatory and curriculum frameworks) sufficiently clearly however.

Options for consultation:

- Amend CPSC's membership so that it has greater depth of expertise on PGR matters to assist it to fulfil its existing role on PGR policy and regulations (see 4.2);
- Change CSPC's name to 'Student Regulations and Curriculum Frameworks Committee'.

4.5 Other issues for consultation

4.5.1 Governance of an increasingly diverse portfolio

The composition of the Senate Committees is based primarily on staff representing organisational units (eg representatives from Colleges and relevant support services). This will tend to lead to the Committee membership having expertise in relation to the most common forms of provision and students (eg on campus UG and PGT). However, the University's provision is becoming increasingly diverse, for example with Online and Distance Learning provision, collaborations with other institutions, Executive Education, and Continuing Professional Development becoming significant parts of the University's portfolio. It is important that the Senate Committees take account of the distinctive features of these different types of provision and learners, for example when developing policy. At present, Conveners of Committees can add expertise on an ad hoc basis by co-opting additional members. However, it may be helpful to take a more structured view on the types of expertise required on each Committee.

Options for consultation:

- Formalise the requirement for the Committees to review their remit and membership each year to ensure they have expertise across all relevant aspects of the University's increasingly diverse portfolio of taught and PGR provisions.

4.5.2 Student Disability Committee

While the Student Disability Committee's formal reporting line is to the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (having previously had a formal reporting line to the Senate Quality Assurance Committee), in practice it is not currently reporting to LTC.

Options for consultation:

- Review the role of the SDC and (if it continues to operate) establish clearer reporting lines to the University formal governance structures.

4.5.3 Assessment and Feedback Enhancement Sub-Group

In 2016-17 the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) establish an Assessment and Feedback Enhancement Sub-Group to advise the Assistant Principal (Assessment and Feedback), and to advise and guide the Leading Enhancement in Assessment and Feedback (LEAF) project, and to act as a forum for discussing broader assessment and feedback activities. This is an opportune time for LTC to review the role of the Sub-Group, since the Assistant Principal (Assessment and Feedback) has concluded her period of office, and the LEAF project no longer requires the same level of guidance.

Options for consultation:

- Review the role of the Assessment and Feedback Enhancement Sub-Group

4.5.4 Governance of collaborations with other institutions

When introducing joint taught or research student programmes with other institutions, it is necessary to go through normal academic approval processes, and also to undertake some additional due diligence activities, prior to development and sign-off of a Memorandum of Agreement. Since collaborations with other institutions can involve academic ways of working that differ from normal University practices, and can have significant risk profiles, the University needs to have effective academic governance in place to provide direction regarding the types of academic collaboration that the University should consider undertaking, and to support and scrutinise proposals for specific collaborations. There are however limitations to the University's current academic governance structures regarding collaborations (both with UK and EU / international institutions).

While the Senate Curriculum and Student Progression Committee (CSPC) has responsibility for considering non-standard academic arrangements for collaborations (eg assessment regulations different to the normal University arrangements, dual award arrangements), in practice this means that CSPC only considers very specific elements of proposals rather than taking a broader view on the academic merits of the proposals. The University also has an International Ventures Group (reporting to University Executive) to provide advice and guidance on certain types of strategic collaboration (not only taught and PGR collaborations, but also research and commercial collaborations). However, IVG does not currently have any remit over academic or student experience matters.

Since taught and research student collaborations with other institutions can have significant non-academic implications (eg HR, legal, financial), it is important to take account of both academic and corporate dimensions when developing governance structures. The Deputy Secretary (Strategic Planning) is developing potential options for enhancing oversight and support structures. If these have implications for the Senate Committees, the task group will take account of them when submitting its proposals to Senate in May 2019.

In addition to considering the formal governance for joint taught or research student programmes, it would also be helpful to clarify the Senate Committees' role in relation to the governance of student exchange arrangements.

Options for consultation:

- No specific proposals at present

4.5.4 Learning and Teaching Policy Group (LTPG)

The Senior Vice-Principal established LTPG in 2015-16. It has operated as an advisory body with a particular role in coordinating and prioritising the work of the four Senate standing committees and the Vice- and Assistant-Principals with responsibilities for learning and teaching, and in connecting Heads of Colleges' and

LTC: 13.03.19
H/02/25/02

LTC 18/19 4 B

Heads of Schools' priorities with institutional strategic priorities on learning and teaching. Since the number of Assistant Principals with responsibilities for learning and teaching is likely to reduce, it would be appropriate for the new Vice-Principal (Students), once appointed and in post, to review the future of LTPG.

Options for consultation:

- No specific options

5 *Practical issues regarding the Committees' Terms of Reference (ToRs)*

Since Senate established the four Standing Committees in 2008, Senate has agreed some minor changes to the committees' ToRs (eg to amend a detailed point regarding a Committee's membership), but has not reviewed the ToRs more generally. The ToRs's statements of purpose and remit are a bit opaque for some of the committees. In addition, the ToRs do not address some operational issues, for example defining a quorum for the committees or explaining how the committees would make decisions in the absence of full consensus (for example, arrangements for voting). The task group will review and revise the Committees' ToRs during summer 2019, once Senate has agreed any changes to the overall structure and membership of its Committees.

Annex – scope of the review, and membership of task group

1 Scope

- Review the current structure, memberships and terms of reference of the four Senate standing committees (currently the Learning and Teaching Committee, Researcher Experience Committee, Quality Assurance Committee, Curriculum and Student Progression Committee)
- Recommend changes in order to ensure they:
 - Provide effective governance of the University’s learning and teaching, and student and early career researcher, matters;
 - Enable the University to take an effective and strategic approach to enhancing the student experience, developing the University’s taught and research student portfolio, and maintaining academic standards and quality assurance;
 - Take account of the planned 2020 changes in the composition of Senate; and
 - Are aligned to the University’s other committee structures, and to the Colleges’ committee structures.
- Review the current levels of devolution of authority from Senate to the Senate Committees, and, if appropriate, recommend changes.
- Out of scope:
 - Current levels of devolution of powers from Senate and its committees to Colleges;
 - Detailed working methods of the Committees and their task groups;
 - Arrangements for induction / training of Committee members;
 - Arrangements for communication and consultation regarding the business of Senate and its Committees;
 - The operation of Senate itself;
 - The governance role of Senate and its committees in relation to any current projects (eg Service Excellence);
 - Resourcing for projects sponsored or led by Senate or its committees;
 - The arrangements for other Senate Committees - Appeals Committee, Student Discipline Committee, Honorary Degrees Committee, Chaplaincy Committee; and
 - The arrangements for joint Senate – Court Committees (eg Knowledge Strategy Committee).

2 Task group membership

- Convener - Professor Charlie Jeffery, Senior Vice-Principal
- Conveners of the four Senate Committees

- Prof Charlie Jeffery (Learning and Teaching Committee)
- Prof Tina Harrison (Quality Assurance Committee)
- Prof Alan Murray (Curriculum and Student Progression Committee)
- Dr Paddy Hadoke (Director of Postgraduate Research, College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine – co-convener of Senate Researcher Experience Committee)

- Senior Academic Administrators from each College
- Dr Lisa Kendall – Head of Academic and Student Administration, College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (CAHSS)
- Claire Vallance – College of Science and Engineering
- Philippa Burrell – College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine

- One Dean from each College (aiming that between them, they cover UG / PGT and PGR)
 - Dr Sabine Rolle (CAHSS Dean of Undergraduate Studies)
 - Dr Linda Kirstein (CSE Dean of Education Quality Assurance and Culture)
 - Dr Sarah Henderson (Director of Postgraduate Taught provision, CMVM)

- Director of Academic Services – Tom Ward

- Students Association Vice-President (Education) – Diva Mukherji

- Professional services support for the group - Theresa Sheppard (Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services)

The University of Edinburgh
Senate Learning and Teaching Committee
13 March 2019

Final report of Task Group on Using the Curriculum to Promote Inclusion, Equality and Diversity

Executive Summary

At its meeting on 23 January 2019, the Committee discussed the task group's interim report, and provided a steer on some specific issues.

This paper contains the task group's final report. The report includes information on its mapping of existing practices within the University, and the outcomes of external benchmarking and engagement with staff and students. It also includes a proposed set of Principles, a set of recommendations and an implementation plan.

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

This activity will support implementation of the current Learning and Teaching Strategy and inform future curriculum development.

Action requested

The Committee is invited to:

- Discuss the outcomes of mapping, benchmarking and engagement with staff and students;
- Approve the Principles, recommendations and associated implementation plan; and
- Discuss how to communicate with stakeholders regarding the outcome of the task group's work and next steps.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

The task group's final report includes an implementation plan, which incorporates some communications actions. If the Committee approves the implementation plan, Academic Services will liaise with the Convener of the Task Group, and the Convener of the Learning and Teaching committee, to agree plans for launching the plan.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

While the task group has not costed the implementation plan, the main direct resource implications are for central support services (eg Academic Services, Institute for Academic Development), and it should be possible to address them

within existing resources. Where the plan asks or encourages Schools to take steps, it provides them sufficient flexibility to allow it to address many of them as part of activities it would already be undertaking. The plan does however seek a modest amount of funding for a PhD intern to undertake some further benchmarking work, in order to accelerate progress on some specific issues.

2. Risk assessment

Lack of coherent action in this area exposes the University to risk that its curriculum is not relevant to its increasingly diverse student body. The recommendations in this paper will assist the University to address this risk.

3. Equality and Diversity

The purpose of the task group's recommendations is to promote equality and diversity within the University. The task group does not think that any of the recommendations have the potential to create any adverse issues for any protected characteristic groups. Since the recommendations focus on leadership and practice sharing to enhance existing practices and prepare the ground for a potential institutional curriculum review, rather than on making significant changes to policy, it is not necessary to undertake a formal Equality Impact Assessment on the plan. It would however be necessary to undertake an EqlA depending on how the relevant Committees decide to implement the recommendations (for example, if the Senate Quality Assurance Committee decides to make substantive changes to arrangements for Teaching Programme Reviews or Postgraduate Programme reviews).

4. Freedom of information

Open

Originator of the paper

Tom Ward, Director of Academic Services

22 February 2019

Update on task group on using the curriculum to promote inclusion, equality and diversity

1 Background

At its 14 March 2018 meeting, the Committee (LTC) agreed to set up a task group to explore how institutional action can assist in promoting inclusion, equality and diversity in the curriculum. The group membership is attached as Annex A. The remit is set out at:

www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/projects/promoting-inclusion-equality-diversity-curriculum/remit-of-task-group

In line with the remit, the group has focused predominantly on undergraduate study, although it is possible that many of its recommendations will also be relevant for PGT study.

The task group has met three times (July and September 2018, and February 2019).

The group's remit relates specifically to the curriculum. The Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC) is overseeing a related project, a 'thematic' review of Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) students' experiences of University support services.

2 Mapping current practices

The group has mapped current practices in the University, in order to assist it to stimulate discussion about different ways to approach these issues. It has identified about forty examples from across the three Colleges, the Students' Association, the Institute for Academic Development (IAD), and the Library and Collections. These include:

- Student-led activities;
- Professional development and practice-sharing activities (including activities run by IAD, and School-level activities);
- Pilot projects supported by the Principal's Teaching Awards Scheme;
- Curriculum audits;
- The development of new courses focussing on aspects of equality and diversity (for example on gender and race equality);
- Embedding perspectives on inclusion, equality and diversity within other courses (for example, considering the equality dimensions of applying Information

Technologies, and highlighting the health needs of people with particular backgrounds or characteristics); and

- Projects exploring how the University's collections represent or do not include people with particular backgrounds or characteristics.

Some specific examples are set out in Annex B.

Student Recruitment and Admissions plans to provide some case studies relating to the relationship between the curriculum and students from widening participation backgrounds.

3 Benchmarking of other institutions

The group has benchmarked the approaches of c. 20 institutions within the UK and United States of America, including the University of Cambridge, University of Leeds, University College London, Birmingham City University, Harvard University, and Princeton University.

In the UK, recent initiatives to promote inclusion, equality and diversity in curricula have been influenced by the global Rhodes Must Fall campaign (focusing on debates about decolonisation) and the Nation Union of Studies' 'Why is My Curriculum White' campaign. Some institutions have also connected their activities to broader action to address attainment gaps for Black and Minority Ethnic students. The response of institutions across the HE sector has been varied (and seemingly dependent on the strength of local student campaigning), but with quite a lot of common features, for example:

- Consultation processes - with staff and students (including conferences, workshops, and student focus groups and surveys) followed by an institutional plan;
- Guidance – clear and authoritative institutional guidance for staff building inclusion, equality, and diversity into their curricula;
- Sharing Good Practice – academic development departments producing resources (eg case studies etc.) and hosting events for staff to share good practices;
- Reading Lists – subject areas committing to review reading lists and increase the diversity of texts;
- Websites – creating central online resources to support academic staff building inclusion, equality, and diversity into their curricula;

- Speakers and Seminars – hosting high profile events to promote academic discussion and engagement with issues of inclusion, equality, and diversity in the curriculum;
- Inclusivity, Equality, and Diversity Officers – appointing roles to provide guidance and support in specific academic areas or across whole institutions;
- Courses - a commitment to developing optional courses.

Institutions in the United States are engaging with similar issues but typically from a more diverse starting point in terms of their student populations and the wider population of the USA. In this more diverse demographic context, some of the leading research intensive Universities have taken a more proactive approach to promoting inclusion, equality and diversity in their curricula, for example:

- In contrast to the UK, leading research intensive Universities in the USA sometimes have a central department or office, led by a senior academic, with specific remit to promote and drive inclusion, equality and diversity across all aspects of the institution.
- Requiring all undergraduates take a compulsory general course that addresses the intersections of culture, identity, and power.

3 Consultation and engagement activities

The group developed a set of draft Principles and an initial set of recommendations, and during Semester One 2018-20 engaged with staff and students about these documents and the agenda more generally:

- Asking Heads of Schools / Directors of Teaching for their thoughts on how the University should approach this issue, and to identify any recent or current projects and any other institutions that the University could learn from;
- Discussion with the Institute for Academic Development's Experienced Teachers Network;
- Students' Association-facilitated discussions with a group of School student representatives, members of the Students' Associations' liberation groups, and a group of students from the 'Students Panel'; and
- College-led discussions with relevant Committees (eg Learning and Teaching Committees).

The main messages from these consultation and engagement activities are:

Staff

- General points about staff views on the agenda:
 - There appears to be broad support in the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (CAHSS) for addressing issues of inclusion, equality and diversity in curriculum and assessment design, and a reasonable degree of academic staff understanding of how to address the issues in different disciplinary contexts.
 - In contrast, while staff in the College of Science and Engineering (CSE) and Medicine and Veterinary Medicine (MVM) are also generally supportive in principle, feedback suggested that staff are less likely to be clear how to engage with this agenda in their disciplinary contexts.
 - In practice, it is unclear what proportion of academic staff will be able to treat this as a high priority issue, given common concerns about workloads and competing priorities.
- Comments on approaching communications regarding the issue
 - There can sometimes be a tendency among staff to think that 'decolonising' efforts can somehow degrade the academy or politicise something that should be pursued objectively. We should challenge this position and argue that, as in the best tradition of the Enlightenment, the University should not base research and teaching on ideas that we collectively believe and act on for non-evidential reasons.
 - We need to be very clear in communications that we are taking a broad view of 'curriculum' in this context - more than reading lists or content, but also about the learning environment, approaches to assessment, and other aspects of the student learning experience.
 - In order to engage with staff beyond those who already have an active interest in the issue, staff suggested approaches such as having slots at broader sessions (eg College Committees, the L&T Conference), and using a range of media (eg podcasts, videos).
- In some respects it can be more challenging to engage with this issue in professionally-accredited programmes, since (for example) the content of (at least some parts of the programme) can be highly prescribed, and oriented towards local requirements (eg UK / European professional practices). However, some professional bodies are actively encouraging and enabling institutions to engage with the issue.
- There is some support in some areas for requiring all Schools and staff to address these issues, for example by embedding these issues in procedures for curriculum approval and quality assurance.

- In some disciplinary contexts it can be challenging to diversify reading lists, for example because, in some science courses, the lecturer's notes are the main source of reference for students.
- The University should consider how to approach assessment – for example the balance of continuous assessment and examinations may have implications for students from some backgrounds.
- In general staff appear supportive of taking co-creation approaches – with suggestions for supporting co-creation including staff facilitation of these activities in order to ensure that all students' perspectives are taken into account, and supporting students to understand where there is and is not scope to develop the curriculum.
- The University should link work around of inclusion, equality and diversity in the curriculum to broader student-related projects (for example the implementation of the WP Strategy, and any institutional curriculum review), and to HR issues.

Students

- Students at the focus groups had expected the University to be more diverse than it is (eg had expected a higher proportion of working class Scottish students, students of colour, and female academic staff).
- The curriculum should reflect the University's diverse international intake of students in order to stimulate them while they are here and prepare them for the rapidly changing and demographically diverse world into which they will move as graduates. For example, students would like more global perspectives when employability is addressed in the curriculum.
- The historically rooted 'canon' can dominate disciplines and can lead to a narrow and restrictive approach to the curriculum.
- Some students indicated that, while it can be positive for students to work with staff to identify new ways to diversify the curriculum, in some cases academic staff can be reluctant to address the issue – and that students can feel exposed if they raise the issue.
- It is important that the academic and professional staff have a diverse range of backgrounds and characteristics. Students also felt that having staff with the backgrounds and experiences similar to them could assist them to challenge micro-aggressions, provide role models and leaders to challenge feelings of isolation, marginalisation, alienation and exclusion sometimes experienced by students from under-represented groups.

- Students made some specific suggestions for School-level or institutional action, including:
 - Developing first year core courses reflecting on the social origins and context of the discipline;
 - Raising academic staff awareness of and engagement with the large and diverse University archive and how it can be used to diversify the content of courses and programmes;
 - Involving students at the earliest stage of course and programme design;
 - Including more diverse secondary readings lists (assuming that primary reading lists are dominated by 'canon' authors) allowing students to explore issues of diversity within the prescribed curriculum;
 - Student-Led, Individually-Created Courses (SLICCs) could offer students a safe framework to pursue their specific academic interests; and
 - Inviting a more diverse range of guest speakers and lecturers.

4 Feedback from Senate Learning and Teaching Committee meeting 23 January 2019

Feedback from the benchmarking and consultation with staff and students suggested that one of the key issues for the task group is the appropriate balance between the following approaches:

- Consistency – Should the University take steps to ensure that these issues are addressed (in discipline-appropriate ways) across all the University's provision, rather than only in areas in which staff have a particular interest in the issues? For example, should it require all proposers of new courses and programmes to demonstrate that they have considered the issues?
- Facilitation – Should the University instead focus on building on the enthusiasm that already exists among many staff and students by focusing on encouragement and facilitation (for example, sharing practices events, non-mandatory training and development)?

At its meeting on 23 January 2019, the Committee discussed the task group's interim report and advised that the task group should develop recommendations that would:

- Lead to clear and visible leadership across all Schools, without being overly prescriptive, would be required;
- Assist staff to understand the purpose of the work;
- Provide examples of what change might look like, particularly for Schools within the College of Science and Engineering;
- Manage expectations among current and prospective students.

5 Principles

The draft Principles appear to cover the main issues and priorities highlighted by staff and students, and consultation respondees made very few specific suggestions for changes to the Principles. Staff feedback suggested that the Principles should be more explicit that 'curriculum' is broader than reading lists or the syllabus – the task group has added an entry to the Principles to address this.

Some staff also emphasised the importance of accompanying the Principles with a clear rationale for making this issue a high priority –VP Prof Jane Norman (task group convener) and Diva Mukherji (Students' Association VP Education) have produced videos (which are available at: www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/projects/promoting-inclusion-equality-diversity-curriculum) to address this.

While feedback from staff in particular emphasises the importance of providing greater clarity on what this agenda means in practice in particular disciplinary contexts, it is unlikely that a single institutional set of Principles can provide more clarity.

This paper therefore invites the Committee to approve the Principles attached as Annex C.

6 Recommendations for institutional action

Since the issues regarding inclusion, equality and diversity in the curriculum will vary between disciplines, it is likely that discipline-level activity will be more important than institutional activity. However, LTC asked the task group to identify some relatively modest potential steps at institutional level which would support and add value to local discipline-specific projects.

Taking account of the internal and external benchmarking activities, and student and staff engagement, the group has prepared the suite of recommendations (with accompanying implementation plan) set out in Annex D.

The following are key points about the recommendations:

- The proposed approach is broadly in line with the approach of similar UK higher education institutions.
- Given the steer from LTC, and the feedback from staff, the recommendations emphasise the importance of practice sharing, to assist staff to understand ways to engage with this agenda in particular disciplinary contexts.
- Given that it is necessary to address these issues in a range of different discipline-specific ways, and that (particularly in areas of CSE and MVM) staff have varied levels of understanding about appropriate ways to engage, it would not be appropriate at this stage to embed inclusion, equality and diversity into curriculum approval in a prescriptive way. To do so would not only risk a

mechanistic 'tick-box' approach, but would also be problematic since the University could not explain exactly what it requires Schools to do. Instead, at this stage, it is more appropriate to focus on training and development for key staff involved in curriculum development and approach (eg Directors of Teaching, Conveners of Boards of Studies), and exploring ways to address these issues through collaborative curriculum design approaches.

- For the same reasons, it is not appropriate at this stage to embed the issue into annual quality assurance. However, the task group is proposing that the standard remit for Teaching Programme Reviews and Postgraduate Programme Reviews should provide a more explicit opportunity to explore how review areas are approaching the issue. It also suggests that at a future point, once the University is able to provide greater clarity about how to address these issues across different disciplinary, the University should incorporate the issue into annual quality assurance.
- While the recommendations in Annex D will make a valuable contribution to this agenda (in conjunction with local disciplinary activities), institutional success in developing a curriculum that delivers the Principles is dependent on broader institutional issues. For example, the recommendations would have greater impact when implemented within a broader institutional curriculum review process. It is also important that academic work allocation models allow staff sufficient time to review and develop the curriculum, and that the University's staff profiles are diverse.
- While the recommendations assign responsibilities to particular departments and to particular School staff office-holders, all academic staff, along with staff in relevant professional services roles, have a responsibility to engage with this agenda.
- Since the issues regarding inclusion, equality and diversity in the curriculum will vary between disciplines, it is more appropriate to evaluate the impact of this activity at School than institutional level.

7 For discussion

The Committee is invited to:

- Discuss the outcomes of mapping, benchmarking and engagement with staff and students;
- Approve the Principles (Annex C); and
- Approve the recommendations and implementation plan (Annex D)

Tom Ward

LTC: 13.03.19
H/02/25/02

LTC 18/19 4 C

Director of Academic Services

Annex A - membership of task group

- Vice-Principal People and Culture - Prof Jane Norman (Convener)
- Professor Rowena Arshad (Head of Moray House School of Education)
- Katrina Castle -Acting Head of Widening Participation
- Dr Jeni Harden (Senior Lecturer, Usher Institute of Population Health Sciences)
- Rachel Hosker- Archives Manager and Deputy Head of Special Collections Centre for Research Collections
- Dr Velda McCune - Deputy Director, Institute for Academic Development
- Professor Nasar Meer (School of Social and Political Sciences)
- James Mooney (Access and Outreach Development Director in Centre for Open Learning)
- Diva Mukherji - Students' Association Vice-President Education
- Dr Niamh Shortt (Dean of Diversity and Inclusion, College of Science and Engineering)
- Tom Ward - Director of Academic Services

Annex B – examples of current practices in the University College of Humanities and Social Sciences

- In 2018-19 the School of Design in **ECA** has launched an interdisciplinary course on Introduction to Queer Studies
- In 2016 Dr Catriona Ellis (**History, Classics and Archaeology**) undertook a Principal's Teaching Awards Scheme (PTAS) project to produce material in a variety of learning formats to enhance teaching in History. In a Teaching Matters blog she reflected on how this project had assisted her to reflect on how to make the classroom more inclusive: <http://www.teaching-matters-blog.ed.ac.uk/?p=1188>
- **History, Classics and Archaeology** undertook a 2018 Principal's Teaching Awards Scheme (PTAS) project on Archaeology at the Centre for Open learning (COL): developing an accessible and inclusive pedagogical approach to fieldwork: <https://www.ed.ac.uk/institute-academic-development/learning-teaching/funding/funding/previous-projects/year/march-2018/archaeology-col>
- **Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities (IASH)** is hosting the GenderEd project, which aims to create a virtual space to showcase excellence in teaching, research and KEI in gender and sexuality studies at University of Edinburgh, and to promote connectivity and interdisciplinarity. See <https://www.iash.ed.ac.uk/gendered>
- The **School of Law**'s suite of Honours options courses includes a range of courses engaging with aspects of equality and diversity, for example: Gender and Justice; Asylum and Refugee Law and Policy; and Slavery in Eighteenth-Century Scotland.
- In 2018 **Moray House School of Education** is undertaking a Principal's Teaching Awards Scheme (PTAS) project on Lecture recording for inclusive education. This project aims to devise ways of utilising lecture recording to facilitate inclusivity in teaching and learning, in response to increasing student diversity at the University of Edinburgh: <https://www.ed.ac.uk/institute-academic-development/learning-teaching/funding/funding/previous-projects/year/oct-2017/lecture-recording-inclusive-education>
- **Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences** undertook a Principal's Teaching Award Scheme (PTAS) project on 'Diversity Reading List project in Philosophy'. (www.ed.ac.uk/institute-academic-development/learning-teaching/funding/funding/previous-projects/year/october-2015/diversity-reading)
- During 2014-15 and 2015-16, EUSA worked with staff and students in the **School of Social and Political Sciences (SPS)** to develop a new pre-Honours undergraduate course on 'Understanding Gender in the Contemporary World: Key

Concepts, Controversies and Challenges'. This course enrolled c. 140 students in its first year (2016-17) and c. 190 enrolments in 2017-18.

- **SPS** is currently developing a University-wide course on race, taking account of feedback from students (including a series of College-wide symposia planned for autumn 2018 with EUSA and LiberatED). The plan is to launch the new course in 2020-21.

College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine

- An informal review of the **MBChB (undergraduate medicine)** curriculum indicated that very limited attention was given to the health needs of LGBT+ patients. To address this gap the College recruited a group of 6 medical students to work with on a project which involved developing learning resources (eg interviews with LGBT+ volunteers), a pilot event involving a Q&A session with LGBT+ individuals, and embedding teaching sessions on the topic into the year one curriculum. The College plans further work in this area, including reinforcing the year 1 learning outcomes relating to the health needs of LGBT+ patients in the clinical years of the curriculum, and embeddin LGBT+ patients as clinical case examples beyond contexts when their LGBT+ status is the focus.
- The third-year **Biomedical Sciences** course "Health, Illness and Society 3" for students of the BSc Medical Sciences programme teaches social aspects of health and medicine, drawing on the disciplines of medical sociology, medical anthropology, epidemiology and bioethics. It includes content on health inequalities related to socio-economic status, ethnicity, and gender and sexual orientation.
- **The Medical School's** MSc in Clinical Education includes a course called 'The Curriculum', which, in addition to covering the theory and mechanics of curriculum design, asks participants to consider the 'hidden curriculum', and the wider socio-political context in which the curriculum sits (who are the stakeholders and who has influence over what goes into the curriculum). This includes a specific session on Equality & Diversity in the Curriculum.

College of Science and Engineering

- The **School of GeoSciences** offers a range of courses addressing aspects of equality and diversity (eg taking decolonial perspectives), for example: Development and Decolonization in Latin America; Divided Cities, Researching with Media: Ordinary, Popular and Indigenous People's Knowledges; and Geographies of Health (which explores gender and income inequalities in health).
- The School of Informatics' third year course on professional issues addresses issues regarding discrimination in IT (for example, how digitisation can discriminate against particular groups).

- The **School of Physics** undertook a project on understanding the influence of gender on academic achievement in physics: www.ed.ac.uk/institute-academic-development/learning-teaching/funding/funding/previous-projects/year/january-2011/gender-in-physics

Edinburgh University Students' Association

- In recent years, Student Association sabbaticals have expressed a commitment to promoting diversity in the University's curriculum, learning and assessment, expressing this in terms of 'liberating' the curriculum. The Student Association has established an initiative called LiberatEd, to assist it to take forward these issues: <https://www.eusa.ed.ac.uk/liberated>

Institute for Academic Development

- In the Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice (aimed at new academic staff) all participants are required to watch a video which contains guidance about inclusive course design among other topics. They are then asked to write in a discussion board about the most important thing they learned from the video. The majority of the participants pick out the material on inclusive design as the most important topic for them. They are given this reading on inclusive design in the course reading list and many refer to it in their assessments: https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/resources/introduction_and_overview.pdf

Library and collections

- The **Edinburgh Centre for Research Collections** is undertaking a project funded by the Scottish Graduate School for Arts and Humanities (SGSAH). The project is looking at the University of Edinburgh's archive catalogues to explore the description, language and surfacing of women, cultures, communities and diverse groups in these catalogues. http://www.sgsah.ac.uk/e&t/i&ar/internships/headline_600445_en.html
- In 2017-18 **Libraries and University Collections (L&UC)** teams worked with Diva Mukherji (then EUSA BME representative and now EUSA Vice President Education) to put on two collection displays in the Main Library Building. A display in October 2017 celebrated Black History Month and in February 2018 a display celebrated LGBT+ History Month. The Library also created Resource Lists to accompany the displays (Black History Month <https://eu01.alma.exlibrisgroup.com/leganto/readinglist/lists/15348587770002466?auth=SAML> and https://eu01.alma.exlibrisgroup.com/leganto/public/44UOE_INST/lists/17228914570002466?auth=SAML)
- The **Edinburgh Centre for Research Collections** have had an intern for 8 weeks cataloguing the collection of a misrepresented female composer from the

LTC: 13.03.19
H/02/25/02

LTC 18/19 4 C

19th century to raise her profile and make the collection available for dissertations and study. The Centre hopes to do more of this type of project - the archive projects team have prioritised how women are described in collections and are reviewing best practice for future cataloguing

- The **Edinburgh Centre for Research Collections'** Modern Apprentice produced an event for LGBTQ week on its collections and is producing information for webpages on its collections.

Annex C Draft principles regarding promoting inclusion, equality and diversity in the curriculum

The curriculum

- The curriculum is broader than reading lists and resource lists, and encompasses the aims and objectives of the course or programme, the learning environment, teaching methods, teaching and learning materials, and all other aspects of the student learning experience.

Sources of ideas

- Within higher education, new and existing knowledge and ideas come from a range of sources and are not limited to white, male, Western thinkers and researchers from privileged socio-economic backgrounds;
- Not all sources of knowledge and new ideas have been equally propagated and valued within higher education – where relevant to course learning outcomes, the curriculum should encourage students to reflect on the reasons for this, and should expose our students to a range of perspectives from thinkers with a range of different cultures, backgrounds and identities;

Relevant and engaging

- Including perspectives from thinkers with a range of different cultures, backgrounds and identities will make our curriculum relevant and engaging to the University's increasingly diverse student community (including all those groups under-represented in the University), and to prepare all students for work and civic life;

Challenging, unconstrained and respectful

- Our curriculum should challenge students to engage with issues wider than their own experiences and assist them to develop a heightened concept of self and others - this will sometimes be challenging and unsettling;
- We should encourage and enable our students to discuss and engage critically with different perspectives on controversial issues in an intellectually stimulating and respectful manner;

Diverse learning, teaching and assessment

- The University should adopt approaches to learning, teaching and assessment that are inclusive of all our diverse range of students, and support all to fulfil their academic potential;

LTC: 13.03.19
H/02/25/02

LTC 18/19 4 C

- The University will engage in teaching and learning that recognises the importance of the diversity of cultures within the classroom;

Academic freedom and excellence

- Encouraging and enabling our academic staff promote inclusion, equality and diversity in the curriculum will assist them in their pursuit of excellence in learning and teaching;
- This agenda is about opening a more diverse range of ideas and fields of knowledge, not closing down avenues for exploration;

Approaches to engaging with students and staff

- The way to engage with this agenda will vary across academic disciplines, but it is relevant to all areas and all staff and should be facilitated by all areas' curriculum development and quality assurance and enhancement processes;
- Student engagement with and co-creation of the curriculum can be a valuable way of opening up debate about how to deliver inclusion, equality and diversity in the curriculum.

LTC 18/19 4 C

Annex D

Recommendations for institutional action

Theme	Proposed activities	Areas responsible for implementation	Timescales	Notes on implementation
Encourage Schools / Colleges to identify staff 'champions'	Highlight this issue in 'launch' communications	Heads of Schools and Colleges	Launch email March / April 2019	Unless Schools prefer to identify an alternate person (eg their Director of Teaching, or a member academic staff with a particular interest and experience in the issue) as their 'champion', it may be appropriate for them to ask their Equality and Diversity Coordinator to fulfil this role.
Support academic staff development and practice sharing on the issue	Develop the IAD Inclusive Curriculum webpages (https://www.ed.ac.uk/institute-academic-development/learning-teaching/staff/inclusive) as a key resource for staff and students, adding new case studies, and promote these resources widely	Institute for Academic Development, and Academic Services	Aim to incorporate case studies on the webpage by end 2018-19, and to undertake further redevelopment work on the site during 2019-20.	Academic Services are engaging with the staff associated with these practices, to encourage some of them to post some of these case studies on the IAD Inclusive Curriculum webpages. Subject to availability of resources, the group suggests that IAD expands the webpages to provide a more extensive resource.

LTC 18/19 4 C

	Undertake further benchmarking work into how other institutions engage with these issues in science, engineering and medical disciplines.	Academic Services	2019-20	Subject to securing funding for a PhD intern to undertake the work.
	Use the Teaching Matters website and blog to stimulate thinking and share practice	Institute for Academic Development, and Academic Services	May / June 2019	IAD have agreed to run a Teaching Matters blog mini-series on the topic in May / June 2019. Academic Services are seeking staff and students interested in participating.
	Make this a key theme for a future University Learning and Teaching Conference, and for strategic discussion at a Senate meeting 2019-20	Institute for Academic Development, and Academic Services	June 2019 (conference) 2019-20 (Senate)	One of the sub-themes for the 2019 University Learning and Teaching Conference is 'inclusive curriculum'. IAD have accepted a proposal for a one-hour conference session to promote the outcomes of this project.
	Use the University's new Edinburgh Network: Growing Approaches to Genuine Engagement (ENGAGE) staff and student network to promote the issue	Institute for Academic Development	2018-19 and 2019-20	IAD held two ENGAGE network sessions on the topic in 2018-19, and there is potential for further sessions on the topic over the next session.

LTC 18/19 4 C

	Utilise the Directors of Teaching network to promote the issue and to train and develop staff	Institute for Academic Development Academic Services	2018-19 and 2019-20	Explore whether there is space to include it in the agenda either in S2 2018-19 or S1 2019-20
	Encourage Schools to undertake local practice-sharing activities, for example utilising School and subject level learning and teaching committees, lunch-time staff workshops, or events with external speakers.	School Director of Teaching	Ongoing	
	Explore ways in which the Edinburgh Teaching Award can increase its emphasis on inclusive curriculum	Institute for Academic Development	By end of S1 2019-20	
	Consider making the theme a priority for Principal's Teaching Awards Scheme funding	Institute for Academic Development	2019-20	
	Promote the sector resources / toolkits on the issue, and consider developing additional resources where required for staff	Academic Services Institute for Academic Development	Launch email March / April 2019	Highlight these resources in the launch email. Depending on feedback consider the case for developing additional resources.

LTC 18/19 4 C

Embed in curriculum design and approval processes	Develop training / guidance for Conveners of Boards of Studies regarding how to address these issues when reviewing curriculum proposals	Academic Services Institute for Academic Development	S1, 2019-20	Planning network session for Boards of Studies Conveners and Administrators for S1 2019-20, ideally with input from Schools that already have structured approaches to considering these issues at their Boards of Studies.
	Explore how collaborative curriculum design approaches such as Edinburgh Learning and Design roadmap (ELDeR) can assist with this agenda	Institute for Academic Development Information Services Group	By end 2018-19	IAD are currently discussion with IAD how to enhance this aspect of the ELDeR methodology, and anticipate that they will have made changes by the end of the session
	Encourage Schools to make this a particular focus when undertaking substantive reviews of their curriculum, utilising co-creation approaches with students where appropriate	School Directors of Teaching	Dependent on the timing of Schools' reviews of their curriculum	
	Ensure academic staff have space in their workload to allow them to reflect on the issue and revise their curricula, for example by encouraging	TBC	TBC	The University plans to explore academic workload allocation modelling as one strand of the Student Experience Action plan.

LTC 18/19 4 C

	Schools to support sabbaticals for staff to address the issue			
	Ensure this issue is prominent within any future University curriculum reform project, for example considering the case for developing a suite of University-wide courses on relevant topics, and exploring whether increasing the ability for undergraduate students to study on a part-time basis would make the University's curriculum more accessible to specific groups.	Vice-Principal (Students) – once appointed and in post	2019-20 onwards	
Encourage co-creation approaches involving students and the local community	Prioritise access to small project funding for the University's Student Partnership Agreement	Assistant Principal (Academic Standards and Quality Assurance) Edinburgh University Students' Association Academic Services	2018-19 onwards	This is one of the priorities for the 2018-19 SPA – with two projects securing funding. Ask Assistant Principal (Academic Standards and Quality Assurance), Students Association, and Academic Services to consider whether to retain this as a priority for 2019-20

LTC 18/19 4 C

	Encourage Schools to support student-led projects, for example by funding students to undertake relevant projects	Heads of Schools	Ongoing	
	Continue to incorporate in student representative training	Edinburgh University Students' Association	TBC	The Student Association's class rep training already covers how student representatives the topic – it may be worth evaluating this aspect of the training
	Where relevant to their curriculum, encourage Schools to engage relevant stakeholders in the local community in developing the curriculum	School Directors of Teaching	Ongoing	
Embed in quality assurance processes	Utilise periodic quality reviews (six-yearly Taught Programme Reviews and Postgraduate Programme Reviews) to explore the strategic approaches that Schools take to promoting inclusion, equality and diversity in the curriculum	Assistant Principal (Academic Standards and Quality Assurance) Academic Services	By end 2018-19	As a next step, ask Senate Quality Assurance Committee to consider amending the standard remit for TPRs and PPRs to address this issue more explicitly.

LTC 18/19 4 C

	Once the University has greater clarity about how to address these issues across different disciplinary, incorporate the issue into annual quality assurance.	Assistant Principal (Academic Standards and Quality Assurance) Academic Services	2020-21	
Maximise the use of the University's diverse Library resources and collections	Build on the various projects underway within the Library and University Collections by encouraging and supporting staff and students to make more use of the University's diverse library resources and collections within the curriculum.	Library and Collections	2019-20?	For example, hold dissertation roadshows to encourage students to think of using the University's collections as the basis for dissertations / projects on topics relating to issues of equality and diversity
Evaluate the impact of these activities	Encourage Schools to consider how to evaluate the impact for their programmes	School Directors of Teaching	Ongoing	
Internal communications plan to support project	Develop project website with information about the project, including links to examples of practices, the Principles, planned actions and external resources	Academic Services	In time for launch March / April 2019	Have created website at: www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/projects/promoting-inclusion-equality-diversity-curriculum Academic Services will further develop it ahead of the

LTC 18/19 4 C

				anticipated launch of the task group's plan.
	Provide effective way of communicating rationale for the project to support implementation	Academic Services	Complete	Have published videos of VP Prof Jane Norman (task group convener) and Diva Mukherji (Students' Association VP Education) on the website.
	Undertake communications activities to launch the task group's plan (once approved by the Committee)	Academic Services	March / April 2019	Academic Services will develop a communications plan, highlighting key messages (eg regarding sector resources) set out in the implementation plan. This plan is likely to include communications to Heads of Schools, Directors of Teaching, Equality and Diversity Coordinators, and other School officers, and an article in the Senate Committees Newsletter. It will seek to make the issue relevant to all disciplines (eg by emphasising that it relates to more than reading lists).

The University of Edinburgh

Senate Learning and Teaching Committee

13 March 2019

Student Support Review

Executive Summary

The University introduced the Personal Tutor (PT) system in September 2012 (UG) and 2013 (PGT). It also mandated the creation of Student Support Teams (SST) in each school to provide administrative support for Personal Tutors. In 2017 and 2018, a number of reviews/surveys identified that, while PT/SST provision is effective in many schools, there remains scope for improvement in the overall provision of support for students. In particular, responses to the National Student Survey (NSS) 2017 and 2018, a UoE Internal Audit on SST in August 2017, and a CAHSS review of Personal Tutoring from September 2018 identified areas to focus on in a review project.

At its meeting in October 2018, University Executive supported a wide-ranging review that considered all aspects of student support. The Service Excellence Programme's Student Administration and Support (SEP SA&S) Board agreed to initiate this project at its meeting in December 2018.

The primary objective of the project is to obtain approval, from both the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) and SEP SA&S, for a recommended model for student support. Depending on the outcomes of the consultation, that model may need to be more than "a one size fits all" approach with built-in flexibility allowing different approaches in schools depending on their specific needs.

The project will report both to the SEP SA&S Board and LTC. This paper sets out the draft scope, milestones and governance for the project. The project design group is due to hold its first meeting in c. April 2019.

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

Aligns with strategic objective of leadership in learning.

Action requested

For comment. The project group will take account of the Committee's comments when it discusses the project plans at its first meeting.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

The project team / design group will be responsible for determining this.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

The SEP SA&S Board has considered the resource implications of the project.

2. Risk assessment

The project team / design group will need to consider risks when developing proposals.

3. Equality and Diversity

No – since the paper does not propose changes to institutional policies or practices. The project team / design group will however need to consider E&D implications when developing proposals

4. Freedom of information

Open

Key words

Originator of the paper

Ranald Swanson, Project Manager, Service Excellence Programme

Tom Ward, Director or Academic Service

Student Support Review – Draft Scope, Milestones and Governance arrangements

1 Scope

In Scope	Comment
Review of Personal Tutor provision	<p>Includes reviews of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roles and responsibilities – Fundamental review of scope of roles, including pastoral, course and career support. • Training <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PT and Senior Tutor general training ○ Specialist training (e.g. MH) • Assessment (effectiveness of the system(s) at school and institutional level) • Current and potential future developments impacting on the role (e.g. increase in student mental health concerns) • Recognition and reward • Workload Allocation Models (WAM) for PT duties – Aligning with SEAP work on WAM • Allocation to tutees (ratios, criteria, school rules) • Leave (research, maternity, sabbatical) and return processes • Individuals’ engagement and oversight • Scheduled meetings – Attendance and recording • Documentation, guidance, policies and user guides
Review of SST/SSO	<p>Includes reviews of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roles and responsibilities including SST and also related roles such as “Directors of Student Experience” • Reporting structures (assessment) • Grade variations • Current and potential future developments impacting on the role (e.g. increase in student mental health concerns) • Staffing – Although usually professional services, some schools (e.g. Maths and Biological Sciences) use academics and/or a mix • Training/specialisation (e.g. MH) • Cross-school networking– sharing best practice
Other services	Scope to include review of how PT/SST services relate to other services (e.g. Careers, Counselling, Student Disability Service)
Physical spaces	Review of suitable environments for PT/SST sessions with students
PT System	Review of PT software system/EUCLID integration – restricted to CSA. Consider possible application of Learning Analytics tools.
Learner analytics	The potential for using learner analytics to support academic and pastoral support arrangements

In Scope	Comment
Best practice review	Review of current best practice both internally and externally, including peer institute fields trips, and consultancy as required.
Options Appraisal	Develop OA (with recommendation) of 3-4 models, detailing benefits, timescales, costs and impacts
Consultation	Specifically the draft Options Appraisal will be widely consulted on
Communications	Aligned with SEP programme, CAM and Senate Sub-Committee communications
Colleges and schools	Scope will cover all schools in all colleges, including joint degrees
Student needs	Review of student needs and expectations, including identifying where “prevention” approach could reduce impact on PT/SST support.
Student types	Review will cover the following student types: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UG (including applicants, joint degree, and student transfer during degree) • PG Taught • Online Learning (including ‘at scale’ provision) • Part-time, intermittent and CPD/PPD students • Visiting students (and students on placements) • Collaborative students (i.e. those where UoE is not host institution)
Detailed design	Options appraisal should recommend a preferred model. Once approved, that will require detailed design, which will form part of a Phase 4 of this project.

Out of Scope	Comment
Implementation	Likewise, implementation of approved model will form part of a follow-up project.
PT IT System	The scope of this project includes a review of how PT IT system used, and any limitations of it. However, it is not recommending any specific actions nor acting as a procurement. Any decisions on the PT IT system will be driven by the outcome of the options appraisal, and may trigger a separate project.
Attendance	The review does not include annual attendance recording, e.g. for visa, fees, etc purposes.
Post-graduate (Research)	Although PG Taught is in scope, PGR is not.

2 Deliverables

Deliverable Code	Deliverable Description
Phase 0: Resource	
D0.01	Project Team recruited
Phase 1: Kick off and Scoping	
D1.01	Project Scope, Governance, Design Group membership and ToR signed-off
D1.02	Design principles agreed
D1.03	EQIA approved
D1.04	High-level plan of work (Phase 2 activities scheduled) approved
D1.05	Phase 1 Completion Approval
Phase 2: Review of Current State	
D2.01	Collation and review of existing internal material (literature review) completed
D2.02	Workshops/interviews with students/staff
D2.03	Field Trips - Comparator institutions
D2.04	Models (4-5) for discussion developed
D2.05	Benchmarking documented
D2.06	Current PT system reviewed
D2.07	Current State Assessment (CSA) finalised
D2.08	Phase 2 Completion Approval
Phase 3: Options Identification	
D3.01	HR and Finance review of models documented
D3.02	Options Appraisal Consultation version drafted
D3.03	Consultation completed
D3.04	Options Appraisal finalised
D3.05	Phase 3 Completion Approval
D4.01	Detailed impact assessment of approved option
D4.02	Detailed Implementation Plan
D4.03	Phase 4 Completion Approval

3 Milestones

Deliverable Description	Target Date
Project Team recruited	11 th March 2019
Project Scope, Governance, Design Group membership and ToR signed-off	11 th March 2019
Phase 1 Completion Approval	11 th March 2019
Current State Assessment (CSA) finalised	24 th May 2019
Phase 2 Completion Approval	24 th May 2019
Options Appraisal Consultation version drafted	5 th August 2019
Options Appraisal finalised	13 th Dec 2019

Deliverable Description	Target Date
Phase 3 Completion Approval	13 th Dec 2019
Detailed Implementation Plan	4 th Feb 2020
Phase 4 Completion Approval	4 th Feb 2020
Project Closure	25 th Feb 2020

4 Governance

The Project Team will be responsible for day-to-day progress of the project, under supervision of the Programme Manager.

As the scope of the Student Administration & Support (SA&S) Programme within SEP already includes student support provided by Professional Services colleagues across the University, the project will report to the SAS Board (which reports to the SEP Board and then through to University Executive). As the project review also affects academic work allocation, it will also report to the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (SLTC).

To avoid confusion in reporting lines, the project Sponsor is establishing a “Design Group” which will act as a Project Board providing governance and reporting to both the SLTC and SAS Board. Accordingly, project governance will be:

Group	Responsibilities	Members	Schedule/Reporting	Escalation
Project Team	Operational delivery of milestones	As per Resource plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular stand-ups JIRA task/issue management Fortnightly meetings Monthly PM report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme Manager Sponsor Design Group
Design Group	<p>Ensure project milestones on schedule</p> <p>Ensure SLTC and SAS Board expectations met.</p> <p>Approve key milestones of phase completion, and recommended model in Options Appraisal.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Charlie Jeffrey (Chair) Gavin Douglas (Sponsor)(Deputy Secretary – Student Experience) Alan Murray (Assistant Principal (Academic Support)) Lisa Kendall (Head of Academic Administration (CAHSS)) Sarah Henderson (Senior academic member of LTC) Iain Gordon (Senior academic members of LTC) Deborah Shaw (Senior Tutor) Neil Heatley (Head of Informatics Student Services) Kai O’Doherty (VP Welfare (Student’s Association)) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6-weekly meetings (to be co-ordinated with SLTC and SAS Board schedules) Responsibilities as per Terms of Reference 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SLTC SAS Board

LTC: 13.03.19
H/02/25/02

LTC 18/19 4 D

Group	Responsibilities	Members	Schedule/Reporting	Escalation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diva Mukherji (VP Education (Student's Association)) • Holly Branigan (HoS PPLS) 		
SA&S Board	The overall design of professional service student support	<u>SAS Board Membership</u>	As per SEP programme schedule	SEP Governance Board
SLTC	Ensure review of academic support and advice services delivered	SLTC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 13 March 2019 • 22 May 2019 	University Executive
SA&S Programme	Overall design of student support (professional service and academic), project management, implementation planning and implementation in due course, subject to resources, and line management		Fortnightly reporting	
The SA&S Programme Sponsor and SEP Programme Director	Establishing line management, project management, and support for methodology as well as operational guidance and support			

Senate Learning and Teaching Committee

13 March 2019

Progress to Date with 2018/19 Committee Priorities

Description of paper

This paper outlines progress to date against the 2018/19 priorities identified for Learning and Teaching Committee in the Annual Report of the Senate Committees taken to the May 2018 meeting of Senate:

<https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/20180530agendaandpapers.pdf> (Paper C)

Action requested

LTC is asked to note the paper.

Discussion

Area of Activity
<i>Activities cutting across the four Senate Standing Committees</i>
Work with the Students' Association to promote and implement the Student Partnership Agreement LTC received an update on the implementation of the Partnership Agreement in September 2018. It was advised that, for continuity, the 2017/18 themes would be retained in 2018/19. The Committee noted that all 17 of the SPA projects funded in 2017/18 had had a positive impact, and that project funding would also be available in 2018/19. An event to share learning from the 2017/18 projects took place in October 2018, and a small booklet highlighting themes and showcasing some of the projects has been produced.
Student Administration and Support Strand of the Service Excellence Programme LTC received an update from the Service Excellence Programme in September 2018, and the March 2019 meeting would include a presentation to discuss emerging ideas for the Target Operating Model.
Engage with further development of the Teaching Excellence Framework No further developments have been discussed by LTC to date in 2018/19.
Policies and Codes – Ongoing programme of review of policies The Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy is in the process of being reviewed. The review will be complete by the end of the academic year.

Activities specific to Learning and Teaching Committee
Oversee implementation of University Learning and Teaching Strategy The Committee received an update on progress against the University Learning and Teaching Strategy Implementation Plan in September 2018. The paper outlined action being taken at institutional level to drive forward the Learning and Teaching Strategy's priorities. It did not include information about action being taken at College and School levels, and the Committee noted that linkage across levels could be a challenge, particularly given the number of different strategies areas were being asked to consider (eg. the Strategic Plan, Learning and Teaching Strategy, Widening Participation Strategy). Members were broadly happy with the direction of travel outlined in the paper, but were keen to develop a more joined up, University-wide approach.
Implement new institutional policy to support the University's Lecture Recording service LTC received updates at its September and November 2018 meetings, and the Lecture Recording Policy was introduced on 1 January 2019. The Committee was advised at its January 2019 meeting that, since the introduction of the Policy, only around 15% of those courses with lectures that could have been recorded had opted out, resulting in a higher than sector average proportion of lectures being recorded.
Develop an institutional vision for Digital Education (the 'Near Future Teaching' programme) A progress report was considered by LTC at its January 2019 meeting. Members noted that that project was entering its final phase. The co-design approach had been time-consuming but highly effective, and had engaged large numbers of staff and students. A number of short to medium-term actions had arisen from the project. In addition, the Assistant Principal Digital Education was discussing ways in which the project outputs might inform other areas of work and therefore feed into the longer-term trajectory.
Distance Learning at Scale project – contribute to learning, teaching and student experience dimensions This has not yet been discussed by LTC in academic year 2018/19.
Oversee and guide work to support students' careers, employability and graduate attributes A brief update was received at the January 2019 meeting. A further update will be brought to the May 2018 meeting of LTC, with a focus on the outcomes of a recent, light-touch curriculum mapping exercise undertaken in Schools and on experiential learning.
Monitor implementation of the Student Mental Health Strategy LTC received an update at its September 2018 meeting, and noted that there had been substantial progress in this area. The demand for mental health support was increasing year on year, but resources were also being increased in response.

Oversee and guide the implementation of recommendations from the Research-Led Learning and Teaching Task Group

This has not yet been discussed by LTC in academic year 2018/19, but a meeting between the former Assistant Principal Research-Led Learning, Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance and Director of the Institute for Academic Development will take place later in March 2019 to discuss next steps. An 'EngagEd in Research-Led Learning and Teaching' guide is being finalised by the Institute for Academic Development and will be published shortly.

Oversee implementation of recommendations from the University-wide courses task group, taking account of the Spring 2018 consultation process

This has not yet been discussed by LTC in academic year 2018/19. Findings of the Task Group and consultation will be taken into account if an institutional curriculum review project is initiated.

Assessment and Feedback – strands of work regarding the Leading Enhancement in Assessment and Feedback (LEAF) project, and the role of curriculum design in facilitating quality assessment and feedback models

LTC received a report from the Assessment and Feedback Enhancement Group at its September 2018 meeting. The Committee noted that LEAF activity had been undertaken in 3 Schools in 2017/18. It also noted that common themes arising from LEAF activity in 2017/18 were consistent with those arising in previous years.

Strengthen the University's understanding of retention and continuation rates for different student groups

A report of research undertaken by Governance and Strategic Planning (GASP) into the University's undergraduate non-continuation was brought to the November 2018 meeting of LTC. The report provided valuable information about some of the key factors in non-continuation. LTC agreed that there would be benefit in undertaking further research into additional factors that may affect non-continuation. The scope of this further research was agreed at the January 2019 meeting of LTC, subject to GASP securing the resources required to undertake the work.

Additional Activity Undertaken to Date in 2018/19

The following additional areas of work have been considered by LTC since the beginning of academic year 2018/19:

1. Student Experience Action Plan
2. Teaching and Academic Careers Project
3. Student Support Review
4. Proposal to review the University's Common Marking Schemes
5. The Virtual Learning Environment Minimum Standards Project – now known as 'Learn Foundations'
6. 'Teaching BITE' – Curriculum Conversations
7. Task Group on Using the Curriculum to Promote Inclusion, Equality and Diversity
8. Task Group to Review the Operation of Section 6.1 of the Higher Education Achievement Report (HEAR)

Resource implications

None. This paper is for noting.

Risk Management

No risk analysis is included as the paper is for noting.

Equality & Diversity

There are no equality and diversity issues to be considered at this stage as the paper is for noting.

Further information

Author

Philippa Ward
Academic Services
1 March 2019

Presenter

Tom Ward
Academic Services

Freedom of Information

The paper is open

The University of Edinburgh
Learning and Teaching Committee
13 March 2018

Senate Committee Planning 2019-20

Executive Summary

In Semester One 2018-19 the Committee had an opportunity to identify:

- Student experience, learning and teaching issues that Schools / Colleges / support groups should take account of in the planning round; and
- Major institutional projects that the Committee would like to make a case for, which would require significant support from support services which could not be accommodated within existing resources.

In previous sessions, during Spring the Committee would have an opportunity to identify its full set of priorities for the coming session. This session, for reasons set out in the paper, the Senior Vice-Principal asks the Committees to limit their Spring 2019 planning to identifying projects currently underway that will require further work in 2019-20, relatively modest projects to address urgent 'hygiene' issues, and activities necessary in order to respond to external factors. Academic Services would then coordinate more substantive planning work for 2019-20 during summer 2019.

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

Aligns with University Strategic Objective of Leadership in Learning, and with the University's Learning and Teaching Strategy.

Action requested

The Committee is invited to identify its priorities for the coming session, taking account of the parameters that the Senior Vice-Principal has set.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Academic Services will submit the plans to Senate's 29 May 2019 meeting, and will communicate them more widely using the Senate Committees' Newsletter. College representatives on the Committee are encouraged to discuss the plans with their Schools.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

Yes. The paper will assist the University to use its resources strategically. Any priorities identified by the Committee must be possible to implement within existing resources, since it is too late in the planning round for 2019-20 to make a case for new projects.

2. Risk assessment

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.

3. Equality and Diversity

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.

4. Freedom of information

For inclusion in open business

Tom Ward, Director of Academic Services, 26 February 2019

Senate Committee Planning 2019-20

1 Background - 2018-19 plans

At its meeting on 30 May 2018, Senate endorsed the Senate Committees' plans for 2018-9, see Paper C at:

<https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/20180530agendaandpapers.pdf>

2 Input into overall 2019-20 planning cycle

In Semester One 2018-19, the Committee had the opportunity to identify:

- Student experience, learning and teaching issues that Schools / Colleges / support groups should take account of in the planning round; and
- Major institutional projects that the Committee would like to make a case for, which would require significant support from support services which could not be accommodated within existing resources.

3 Identifying Committee priorities for 2019-20

In previous years, during Semester Two the Senate Committees each had an opportunity to identify their full set of priorities for the coming session. Each Committee would then submit its plans to the last Senate meeting of the year for approval.

This session, the context for setting the Committee's plans for the coming session is unusual for the following reasons:

- The University is in the process of appointing a new Vice-Principal (Students) – once in post they will have a key role in determining the Senate Committees' priorities.
- The University is in the process of developing a Student Experience Plan, which will set out a range of key priorities regarding teaching, curriculum and student support (as well as actions in relation to the broader student experience).
- The University is in the process of reviewing Senate's Committee structures, and has also arranged a broader externally-facilitated review of Senate – both of which are due to report to Senate on 29 May 2019.
- The Student Administration and Support strand of the Service Excellence Programme (SEP) will be presenting business cases for strands of work across a wide range of areas that have policy implications for the Senate committees (eg academic lifecycle, examination board operations, programme and course

information management, PGR lifecycle) to its Board in April 2019. In addition, SEP and the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee are initiating a major review of academic and pastoral support. It would not be sensible for the Senate Committees to plan actions that could overlap with the areas that SEP is considering, until the SEP Board decides which business cases to support.

- At present, Student Systems have relatively little capacity to support additional analysis and development activities. It would therefore not be sensible for the Senate Committees to plan additional actions contingent on Systems analysis and development work.
- This year's planning round is more complex than usual.

Taken together, these circumstances make it difficult for the Senate Committees to plan for 2019-20 at this point, and suggest that it would be more appropriate to wait until summer 2019 before planning the main Committee priorities for 2019-20.

The Senior Vice-Principal therefore asks the Senate Committees at this point in the session to limit their planning for 2019-20 to identifying:

- Projects currently underway that will require further work in 2019-20;
- Relatively modest projects to address urgent 'hygiene' issues (eg to address problems with the operation of particular regulations); and
- Activities necessary in order to respond to external factors.

Annex A proposes a set of priorities for the four committees. **The Committee is invited to discuss these priorities.**

Annex – proposed Senate committee activities for 2019-20

Proposed activities cutting across the four Committees

Activity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to work with Students' Association to promote and implement the Student Partnership Agreement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finish implementing the changes in Senate's composition associated with the HE Governance (Scotland) Act 2016, including holding elections to the newly-constituted Senate in March / April 2020
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement any agreed changes to the operation of Senate and to its Committee structures following the externally-facilitated review of Senate, and the review of the structure of the Senate committees
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student Administration and Support strand of Service Excellence Programme – likely to raise various new strands of activity for Senate Committees, for example regarding academic policy and regulations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to take steps towards aligning with the new UK Quality Code, with a view to full alignment prior the University's next ELIR
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep a watching brief on the development of Teaching Excellence Framework
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policies and Codes – Ongoing programme of review of policies

Learning and Teaching Committee

Activity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oversee continued implementation of University Learning and Teaching Strategy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In partnership with the Service Excellence Programme's Student Administration and Support board, oversee and guide the review of student support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oversee the implementation of recommendations from the 2018-19 task group on inclusion, equality and diversity in the curriculum
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor the implementation of the new institutional policy to support the University's Lecture Recording service
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure continued progress to enhance support for Careers, Employability and the development of graduate attributes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to monitor implementation of the Student Mental Health Strategy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to strengthen the University's understanding of retention and continuation rates for different undergraduate student groups, and to focus on enabling students from all groups to succeed

--

Researcher Experience Committee

Activity
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Excellence in Doctoral Training and Career Development programme - evaluate the effectiveness of School / College briefings for supervisors, assess the impact of changes to requirements supervisor training and support planned for 2019-20, and explore the development of online training to supplement School / College briefings for supervisors.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Enhance support for Early Career Researchers (make more visible, enhance and structure provision, strengthen partnerships)

Curriculum and Student Progression Committee

Activity
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Work with the Service Excellence Programme to oversee the implementation of any significant policy changes associated with the current programme of work (e.g. Special Circumstances and Coursework Extensions, Programme and Course Information Management)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Guide the University's response to any policy issues raised by the UK Standing Committee for Quality Assessment's report on degree classification outcomes
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Oversee the implementation of changes in policy regarding resubmission of PGT dissertations and associated dissertation supervision support, and PGT assessment/progression arrangements
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Oversee the implementation of changes to the Code of Student Conduct following the review in 2018-19, and conduct a light-touch review of the impact of the amendments
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Oversee the implementation of any agreed changes to the Support for Study Policy following the review in 2018-19

Quality Assurance Committee

Activity
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Continue to evaluate the impact of the new programme-based approach to the Class Representation System
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Oversee institutional activities in response to the University's 2015 Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) and contribute to preparations for the 2020 ELIR
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Oversee implementation of mid-course feedback to taught postgraduate courses (subject to the outcome of the review during 2018-19)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Continue to monitor the effectiveness of the operation of the Personal Tutor system

LTC: 13.03.19
H/02/25/02

LTC 18/19 4 F

- Continue to support Schools to reflect on their patterns of degree classification outcomes

The University of Edinburgh

Senate Learning and Teaching Committee

13 March 2019

Teaching and Academic Careers Project – Update

Executive Summary

This paper provides Senatus Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) with an update on the work of the Teaching and Academic Careers task group, following on from the paper that came to LTC in January 2019. A final set of principles has been formally approved by the University Executive. The task group has begun phase two of its work. Further details, including timescales for this work are included in the paper.

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

Aligns with strategic objective of leadership in learning.

Action requested

For information and discussion

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Actions will be implemented through the University Executive and the task group will co-ordinate communications, seeking assistance from colleagues in Communications and Marketing.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

Phase two of the project has resource implications for Human Resources, the Institute for Academic Development and Academic Services – for example, project management, benchmarking, policy analysis and drafting, and consultation activities.

2. Risk assessment

This project aims to contribute to the University's broader work to mitigate risks associated with the student experience. During stage two of its work, when translating the principles into practice, the task group is giving careful consideration to identifying and mitigating any risks associated with specific changes to policy or procedure.

3. Equality and Diversity

The task group will oversee Equality Impact Assessments regarding any substantive changes to policy as a result of the implementation of the principles. The adoption

LTC: 13.03.19
H/02/25/02

LTC 18/19 4 G

and implementation of the principles may assist the University to support career opportunities for female staff, who are currently disproportionately represented among teaching-only staff.

4. Freedom of information

This paper is **open**.

Originator of the paper

Mr Tom Ward and Ms Ailsa Taylor (Academic Services)

Teaching and Academic Careers

The University Executive considered the outcomes of a University-wide consultation at its meeting in November 2018 and approved a final set of principles (see Appendix 1). Central to these principles is the introduction of a flexible mainstream academic pathway. This pathway will enable Schools to continue to recruit to teaching-focussed posts in line with the business needs of the School, while providing Heads of Schools with the flexibility to propose variations in the balance of academic responsibilities (e.g. teaching and research) in discussion with individual members of academic staff.

Task group activity in semester 2 of 2018/19

The task group is due to meet in April 2019 to receive an update on progress with the three current main strands of activity:

Strand 1 Review the academic promotions process by HR to ensure it supports promotion from grade UE07 to UE08 for staff regardless of the balance of academic responsibilities (including those specialising in teaching).

Strand 2 Technical review of support/expectations for professional development in teaching to align with the principles (led and supported by the Institute for Academic Development);

Strand 3 Technical review of how we evidence excellence in teaching (led by a sub-group of the task group with support from Academic Services). The agreed principles identified the need to "...ensure we have clear descriptions of what excellence in teaching means at each level, and enable staff to evidence their excellence in relation to these criteria through a range of qualitative and quantitative measures..."

The sub-group's main focus is on:

- expanding the Exemplars of Excellence in Student Education to cover promotion from UE07 to UE08.

The group will also aim to:

- review and refresh the Exemplars more generally, taking account of how other comparator institutions are presenting and organising the information;
- review of the range of specific qualitative and quantitative measures of excellence in teaching including the Exemplars.

Next steps

The task group aims to report to the University Executive in June 2019. The task group aims for the revised HR academic promotions process which supports promotion from grade UE07 to UE08, and revised Exemplars, to be in place by September 2019, in time for the academic promotions process in 2019/20.

To support the launch of these updated processes, the task group will engage with Communications and Marketing to develop a communications plan.

The focus of this launch will emphasise: that we have career pathways for academic staff into the University and up to Professorial level (UE10); that these pathways are clear and

LTC: 13.03.19
H/02/25/02

LTC 18/19 4 G

open to all academic staff from grade UE07; and that recruitment to, and promotion within, these pathways, is possible regardless of the balance of academic responsibilities (including those specialising in teaching).

Appendix 1 – Final Principles

The group aims to enable the University to make a significant step forward in the way excellence in teaching is valued within academic career paths at the University. The following draft Principles will guide the group's recommendations:

What kind of University do we want to be?

- A community that embraces the concept of scholarship, in which we value excellence in teaching and research equally and resource them appropriately;
- A community that uses our staffing policies and processes to value and reward teaching;
- A community that expects and supports our academic leaders to inspire and assist their colleagues to achieve excellence in teaching;

Career pathways open to all academic staff

- We should ensure career pathways into the University and up to Professorial level (UE10) are clear and open to all academic staff from grade UE07, regardless of the balance of academic responsibilities (including those specialising in teaching);
- We should ensure that we have clear descriptions of what excellence in teaching means at each level, and enable staff to evidence their excellence in relation to these criteria through a range of qualitative and quantitative measures;
- We should have codified procedures that enable Heads of School to propose variations in the balance of academic responsibilities in discussion with individual members of academic staff in line with the needs of the School;

Supporting academic development through these pathways

- All annual reviews should provide an opportunity for academic staff to reflect on their achievements, career aspirations and development needs in teaching, as well as on other aspects of their academic role;
- We should provide clear guidance on the experience and qualifications that academic staff require at each stage of their career in order to operate at the level expected in teaching;
- A core aspect of the academic role involves engaging in formal and informal teaching training and development activities, and we should put sufficient capacity in place to support these activities, and ensure that academic staff have space within their workload to engage with them;

LTC: 13.03.19
H/02/25/02

LTC 18/19 4 G

What do we want the University to be like in five years' time?

- All academic staff will understand what we mean by excellence in teaching, and the expectations of this for their own performance, development and career progression;
- We will be able to articulate the different career pathways available to all academic staff, and individual staff will benefit from the diverse range of pathways;
- A significantly higher proportion of academic staff will have demonstrated their commitment to teaching excellence through acquiring teaching qualifications or externally accredited recognition (e.g. HEA Fellowship);
- Students will recognise our commitment to excellence in teaching.

www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/projects/teaching-and-academic-careers/principles

Senate Learning and Teaching Committee

13 March 2019

Potential Curriculum Review Project – Relevant Areas of Work

Description of paper

1. Ensuring that the University offers an 'inspiring' and 'challenging' curriculum is one of the aims of the Student Experience Action Plan. It is anticipated that the new Vice-Principal Students, once appointed, will lead an initial phase of work to scope out what an institutional curriculum review project would involve. This paper aims to summarize the areas of work discussed by Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) since academic year 2016/17 that may be of relevance to any future curriculum review discussions.

Action requested

2. LTC is asked to note the paper and to identify any additional areas of work that should be included in the paper.

Background and context

3. A number of the areas of work discussed by LTC since academic year 2016/17 may be relevant to discussions around institutional curriculum review. This paper aims to identify and provide a brief overview of each of these areas of work.

Discussion

4. Strategic issues regarding the University's undergraduate degree programmes

LTC considered a paper at its September 2017 meeting which aimed to summarize current and proposed developments relating to the University's undergraduate degree programmes, and to open up discussion regarding the merits of taking a more coordinated and strategic approach to these developments.

<https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/agendapapers20170920open.pdf> (Paper H)

The Committee discussed:

- the balance between maintaining flexibility within the curriculum and ensuring that programmes include sufficient subject-specific content;
- the distinctive 'Edinburgh offer', and the importance of ensuring that the University makes best use of its 4 year undergraduate degree structure;
- the definition of an 'outside subject';

- whether the University should be aiming to develop fully integrated, interdisciplinary programmes, or whether students should be expected to take a range of subjects and be the agents of the integration;
- the importance of adopting a cautious approach to offering additional credit, particularly in Semester 1 where the timetable is already very full, and when some students find the transition to University study challenging in Year 1;
- the constraints of the teaching estate;
- the additional student support that would be required if the University were to offer additional flexibility;
- the importance of agreeing the University's overall strategic aims for the curriculum before opening up wide discussion regarding any possible changes.

5. University-Wide Courses

The University's Learning and Teaching Strategy commits to offering students 'University-wide courses in a broader range of skills, for example quantitative methods, digital skills and languages'. In November 2016, LTC agreed to establish a short-life task group to give University-wide courses further consideration. The group reported in November 2017:

<https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/20171115agendapapers.pdf> (Paper E)

It had identified and discussed 3 possible types of University-wide course: existing subject-based courses with broad appeal; themed interdisciplinary courses; and a single 'Edinburgh Experience' course to be taken by all students.

Since the group reported, consultation with staff to assess the demand for University-wide courses has been undertaken:

(<https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/agendapapersa-q20180918.pdf> (Paper N))

In addition, the Assistant Principal (Research-Led Learning) commissioned student interns to develop proposals for a prototype 'Edinburgh Experience' course during summer 2018. Service Excellence has been asked to consider as part of the Programme and Course Information Management Project ways in which the University's existing subject-based courses might be better publicised and therefore made available to a broader range of students.

6. Research-Led Learning and Teaching

A task group to consider research-led learning and teaching was established by LTC in November 2016. The group reported to the May 2018 meeting of LTC:

<https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/agendapapers20180523.pdf> (Paper H).

A meeting of the former Assistant Principal Research-Led Learning, Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance (who will now take this work forward) and the Director of the Institute for Academic Development is planned for March 2019 to discuss progress against the report's recommendations.

7. Social Responsibility and Sustainability Pathways

The further integration of issues relating to social responsibility and sustainability in the curriculum and co-curriculum was discussed at the May 2017 meeting of LTC:

<https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/agendapapers20170524.pdf> (Paper B)

Co-curricular pathways have now been launched:

<https://www.ed.ac.uk/about/sustainability/students/degrees-courses/co-curricular-pathways>

8. Employability / Graduate Attribute Development / Experiential Learning

LTC established a Careers Employability and Graduate Attributes Task Group in January 2018 to report to LTC on actions to strengthen careers, employability and graduate attributes within the Learning and Teaching experience to support positive graduate outcomes.

The Group reported to LTC in May 2018:

<https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/agendapapers20180523.pdf> (Paper D)

Recommendations included encouraging Subject Areas 'to assess the extent to which activity which supports employability (for example problem-based learning, varied assessment methodologies, work-related and work-based learning, with the connection to personal and career development made explicit) is embedded within the curriculum, and to undertake curriculum development where required.' The report also discussed the potential benefit of reviewing graduate attributes to ensure they fully reflect the needs of the future workplace and are aligned to new University values and the Strategic Plan.

The Careers and Employability Team has recently worked with all Schools to undertake a curriculum mapping exercise to gather information on existing employability-related opportunities within the undergraduate curriculum. The findings will be reported to the May 2019 meeting of LTC and will be used to inform staff support and development, provide a baseline for future activity and inform future curriculum development. Experiential learning will also be discussed at the May 2019 meeting of LTC.

9. Inclusion, Equality and Diversity in the Curriculum

A Task Group on Using the Curriculum to Promote Inclusion, Equality and Diversity was established in March 2018:

<https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/agendapapers20180314.pdf> (Paper F)

The Group's final report will be discussed at the March 2019 meeting of LTC, and includes recommendations around:

- encouraging Schools and Colleges to identify staff 'champions';
- supporting academic staff development and practice sharing on the issue;
- embedding consideration of inclusion, equality and diversity issues in curriculum design and approval processes;
- encouraging co-creation approaches involving students and the local community;
- embedding inclusion, equality and diversity considerations in quality assurance processes;
- maximising the use of the University's diverse Library resources and collections;
- evaluating the impact of these activities;
- and developing an internal communications plan to support this work.

10. Near Future Teaching

LTC approved a 2 year project in September 2016 to design the future of digital education at Edinburgh:

<https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/agendapapers20160921.pdf> (Paper J)

The 'Near Future Teaching Project' is now in its final phase and a report on progress was brought to January 2019 meeting of LTC:

<https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/combinedagendapapers20190123.pdf>
(Paper C)

The Project has adopted a co-design approach and as such has been time-consuming but highly effective, and has engaged large numbers of staff and students. A number of short to medium-term actions have arisen from the project. In addition, the project lead is discussing ways in which the outputs of the project will feed into the longer-term trajectory by informing other areas of work, including the Student and Staff Action Plan.

11. Joint Degrees

The College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences has established a Task Group to consider ways to enhance the experience of students on joint degree programmes. The Group aims to report this Semester. It is focussing on developing role descriptions for Programme Directors for joint programmes, along with developing cross-School ways of working to support joint programmes.

12. Teaching BITE - Curriculum Conversations

Following discussion at LTC in January 2019, and subject to securing relevant resources, the Institute for Academic Development is planning a 'Teaching BITE' project to generate a programme of activities, events and publications (printed and online) that will document and explore key themes relevant to curriculum reform:

<https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/combinedagendapapers20190123.pdf>
(Paper D)

This will support ongoing work to enhance teaching and learning locally, and provide a robust institutional evidence base to inform future University-level curriculum reform and renewal.

The project will run for two years, from spring 2019 to 2021, and explore a range of topics and themes informed by the University Learning & Teaching Strategy and identified by a project steering group. The project will draw on existing rich sources of insight (e.g. Teaching Matters, Principal's Teaching Award Scheme (PTAS) projects, Quality Assurance and Enhancement reports and case studies), work with and support colleagues and Schools to capture and curate learning from recent and ongoing curricula reform. It will use insights and methodologies emerging from the Near Future Teaching Project to promote discussion and reflection around key themes linked to future curriculum reform, including employability, impact of technology, pedagogic and educational methods, staff, student and institutional values.

Key elements of the BITE approach are to gather perspectives and practices from as wide and diverse a range of contributors as possible, and then test and validate the insights that emerge with reference to published research findings and scholarship.

Outputs will be designed and produced to support ELIR (and other ongoing or emergent external requirements like TEF), informal and formal staff development activities (including the annual university learning & teaching conference commencing with the 2019 event), and institutional learning & teaching strategy requirements (including curriculum reform).

13. University Learning and Teaching Conference, June 2019

The second University Learning and Teaching Conference will consider a number of themes that are of relevance to curriculum review including inclusive curriculum, research-led teaching and experiential learning. This builds on a keynote talk on curriculum reform delivered by Professor Amy Tsui, University of Hong Kong, at the June 2018 Learning and Teaching Conference:

<https://www.ed.ac.uk/institute-academic-development/learning-teaching/practice/ltconf2018/keynotes>

Resource implications

14. This paper is for noting and there are no resource implications at this stage. An institutional curriculum review project, if undertaken, would have significant resource implications.

Risk Management

15. No risk analysis is included as this stage as the paper is for noting. However, offering an inspiring and challenging curriculum will be essential if the University wishes to improve the student experience and to continue seeing strong student recruitment.

Equality & Diversity

16. There are no equality and diversity issues to be considered at this stage. If an institutional curriculum review project is undertaken, equality and diversity considerations will need to be taken into account.

Further information

Author

Philippa Ward
Academic Services
1 March 2019

Presenter

Tom Ward
Academic Services

Freedom of Information

The paper is open.

REPORT FROM THE KNOWLEDGE STRATEGY COMMITTEE

18 January 2019

1 Information Services Group Plan

The Chief Information Officer presented the emerging key components for the Information Services Group's annual planning round submission. Key challenges and opportunities were highlighted, including:

- Challenges: Brexit, Plan S, ageing IT estate ('technical debt'), compliance and rising IT costs, information security, heritage collections risk;
- Opportunities: Distance Learning at Scale, student experience, digital transformation, core systems, City Region Deal, business intelligence and analysis.

In discussing prioritisation, the Committee noted student support for live mapping availability of study spaces and the subtitling of recorded lectures. Integration of the City Region Deal's data-driven innovation programme into 'core' University activities and the digitisation of library materials were also noted. Further updates on the planning round submission were requested.

2 Distance Learning at Scale Showcase

The Committee received a demonstration of the visual outputs for the first Distance Learning at Scale (DLAS) programme, an MSc in Business Analytics. The following points were raised in discussion:

- The re-usable design template and overall approach of building in re-usability in all aspects was welcomed;
- DLAS courses are not intended to replace existing online courses, whether online Masters degrees or Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) but MOOCs can feed in to DLAS courses and those running existing online Masters degrees may choose to take up the DLAS design template;
- DLAS is in a pilot phase to test the business model and approach taken, with the Committee to be kept updated on progress.

3 Student and Staff Experience Action Plan

An update on the development of a student and staff experience action plan was reviewed. Work to standardise the University's Virtual Learning Environment and improve the proportion of reading lists available electronically is ongoing, with significant progress made in lecture capture, with around 85% of lectures now being recorded. The Committee discussed demand for lecture capture from Masters-level international students who use small teaching spaces not fitted with lecture capture equipment. The new approach taken and use of logic modelling was supported.

4 Plan S

The likely impact of a new initiative from major research funders to accelerate the transition to full and immediate open access to research publications, known as Plan S, was considered. The following points were raised in discussion:

- Copyright procedures will be reviewed to ensure that they are Plan S compliant;
- Clear communication with academic staff is vital given the compressed timetable and concerns that Plan S may restrict freedom to publish in some highly regarded academic journals and with some book publishers that choose not to comply with Plan S and make a full transition to open access;
- A further paper may follow on DORA (San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment);
- Possible effects on the Research Excellence Framework (REF) and international university league tables are under review;
- 70% of research in the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences is not funded by direct grants from external funders and any indirect effects from Plan S will need to be considered, although the immediate focus will be on compliance in research that is directly affected.

5 Library Materials Budget: Long Term Planning

An update on the review of the model used to divide the overall Library material budget between central funds and the three Colleges was presented. The Committee discussed potential Plan S costs and the effect of currency fluctuations on the library materials budget given the large foreign currency-denominated purchases.

6 Information Security Strategy

A draft Information Security Strategy was considered prior to submission to the University Executive. Links with the City Region Deal, the extent to which mandatory information security training is enforced, access to University systems by staff who have recently left the University and best practice in password protection was discussed. It was agreed to invite the Chair of the newly formed Data Ethics group linked to the City Region Deal to present to the Committee at a future meeting.

7 Other items

Updates on the core systems procurement, network replacement procurement and information security were reviewed