

The University of Edinburgh

Senate Education Committee
Thursday 18th January 2024, 2.30 to 4.30pm
Hybrid meeting: Cuillin Room Charles Stewart House and Microsoft Teams

A G E N D A

* Standing item + Committee priority

1.	Welcome and Apologies	
2.	Minutes of the previous meeting To approve <ul style="list-style-type: none">9th November 2024	SEC 23/24 3A
3.	Matters Arising <ul style="list-style-type: none">Convener's communications	
4.	SUBSTANTIVE ITEMS	
4.1	Student Experience Update*: Student Support Model update To note	SEC 23/24 3B
4.2	Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES) 2024 Institutional Questions To approve	SEC 23/24 3C
4.3	Student Online Data Protection Training To approve	SEC 23/24 3D
4.4	Committee Priorities <ul style="list-style-type: none">Mid-year Reflection – to noteRevision to SEC Plan of Activities for 2024 – to discuss	SEC 23/24 3E SEC 23/24 3F
5.	ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/NOTING	
5.1	Doctoral College*: Postgraduate Researcher Experience Survey College Responses. For information and to comment. Closed paper - disclosure would substantially prejudice commercial interests.	SEC 23/24 3G CLOSED PAPER
5.2	Assessment and Feedback Groups+ To note	Verbal update
6.	Any Other Business	
7.	Date of next meeting Thursday 7 March 2024, Hybrid meeting: Liberton Tower Room, Murchison House, King's Buildings and Microsoft Teams	

Senate Education Committee

Thursday 9th November, 2-5pm

Hybrid meeting: College Office Meeting Room, 50 George Square and via
Microsoft Teams

1. Attendance

Present	Position
<i>Colm Harmon</i>	<i>Vice Principal, Students (Convener)</i>
<i>Tina Harrison</i>	<i>Deputy Vice Principal, Students (Enhancement) (Vice-Convener)</i>
<i>Lisa Kendall</i>	<i>Representative of CAHSS (Learning and Teaching)</i>
<i>Laura Bradley</i>	<i>Representative of CAHSS (Postgraduate Research)</i>
<i>Mary Brennan</i>	<i>Representative of CAHSS (Learning and Teaching)</i>
<i>Patrick Walsh</i>	<i>Representative of CSE (Learning and Teaching)</i>
<i>Tim Stratford</i>	<i>Representative of CSE (Learning and Teaching)</i>
<i>Antony Maciocia</i>	<i>Representative of CSE (Postgraduate Research)</i>
<i>Sarah Henderson</i>	<i>Representative of CMVM (Learning and Teaching, PGT)</i>
<i>Paddy Hadoke</i>	<i>Representative of CMVM (Postgraduate Research)</i>
<i>Jo Shaw</i>	<i>Head of School, CAHSS</i>
<i>Jamie Davies</i>	<i>Representative of CMVM (Learning and Teaching, UG)</i>
<i>Shelagh Green</i>	<i>Director for Careers & Employability</i>
<i>Mike Shipston</i>	<i>Head of Deanery, CMVM</i>
<i>Velda McCune</i>	<i>Representing Director of Institute for Academic Development</i>
<i>Melissa Highton</i>	<i>Director of Learning, Teaching and Web Division of Information Services; Assistant Principal (Online and Open Learning)</i>
<i>Nichola Kett</i>	<i>Director of Academic Services</i>
<i>Sian Bayne</i>	<i>Assistant Principal Digital Education</i>
<i>Lucy Evans</i>	<i>Deputy Secretary, Students</i>
<i>Marianne Brown</i>	<i>Head of Student Analytics, Insights and Modelling</i>
<i>Susan Morrow</i>	<i>Senate Representative</i>
<i>Tamara Trodd</i>	<i>Senate Representative</i>
<i>James Hopgood</i>	<i>Senate Representative</i>
<i>Carl Harper</i>	<i>Vice- President Education, Edinburgh University Students' Association</i>
<i>Callum Paterson</i>	<i>EUSA Academic Engagement and Policy Coordinator</i>
<i>Sinéad Docherty</i>	<i>Committee Secretary, Academic Services</i>
<i>In Attendance</i>	
<i>Jon Turner</i>	<i>Director of Institute for Academic Development (Curriculum Transformation Lead)</i>
<i>Paul Norris</i>	<i>Senior Lecturer SPS, Curriculum Transformation Seconded (Course & Programme Approvals Work Package Lead)</i>
<i>Apologies</i>	
<i>Shane Collins</i>	<i>Director of Student Recruitment and Admissions</i>
<i>Jason Love</i>	<i>Head of School, CSE</i>

2. Minutes of Meeting held on 14th September 2023

The Committee approved the minutes of the meeting held on 14th September 2023, with minor amendments to sections 3.5 and 4.1.

3. Convener's Communications and Matters Arising

- **University Firewall Website Controls**

This item was discussed at the previous meeting of the Committee. However, it was later noticed that a recommendation from the Knowledge Strategy Committee (KSC) meeting held in May 2023 had been missed from the paper presented to SEC in September 2023. The recommendation requested a message on any website blocked with an explanation of why the site has been blocked and the dangers of interacting with essay mill companies. The message was also asked to highlight support available to students.

This oversight was raised at the October meeting of the KSC and followed up immediately. Text has been developed by those with the expertise and approved by Professor Colm Harmon and Professor Tina Harrison in their respective roles as VP and DVP.

- **Assessment & Feedback**

Following the update above, there was some discussion of Assessment & Feedback. It was felt that assessment design is an important aspect of inclusivity and combatting plagiarism. Representatives from CAHSS highlighted their College working groups which are working with assessment design to address areas such as student experience, resource and pedagogy.

Action: Deputy Vice Principal, Students (Enhancement) to liaise with IAD colleagues to identify resources which can then be shared across the University to support assessment design.

Action: Convener to meet with student representatives to discuss A&F and key QA requirements. The minutes will be shared with the Committee.

- **Final Grades and Graduations**

A query was raised in relation to any awards still outstanding following the Marking & Assessment Boycott (MAB). It was confirmed that all students are expected to have graduated with full and final awards at the next set of graduations (November 2023). Students have been informed that they can attend the November or later graduation ceremonies if they missed their summer 2023 ceremony.

- **Committee Priorities**

A member of the Committee asked how the Committee should proceed with its priorities which have not yet been approved by Senate. The Convener confirmed that SEC will report to Senate as normal on its priorities which are aligned to the Committee remit and are set annually by the Committee itself. It was confirmed that members can submit a paper to SEC with a proposal to amend the Committee priorities.

4. Substantive Items

4.1 Curriculum Transformation Programme (Paper B)

This paper was presented by Dr Jon Turner, the Curriculum Transformation lead. Comments from members of the Committee raised the following points and queries:

- There needs to be understanding and planning for work streams/competency sets which affect how students approach work within their own discipline.
- Further detail on the difference the project intends to have at Honours and pre-Honours level would be appreciated by some members, particularly in relation to the role of challenge courses within each year of study.
- It was noted that current issues with students not getting on to their chosen courses/modules should be addressed and improved by the implementation of CTP.
- Questions were asked around the resourcing and scale of teaching within the proposed framework, noting that teaching staff on short-term contracts pose a particular resourcing challenge.
- There must be consideration for the impact on student experience, especially in relation to online learning and assessment.
- It was suggested that fundamentals such as systems and timetabling need to be improved across the institution, and there is some concern that large-scale projects distract from these areas.
- The long lead-in time for the project is perceived as a challenge for student engagement as students feeding in will not see the implementation of CTP.
- Further discussion with colleagues across the institution was flagged as necessary for the continued development of CTP activity.

The Committee were informed that an oversight group will have a role in guiding Schools, but Schools will have flexibility to take action in different directions depending on their subject area and requirements. It was emphasised that in its reports to Senate, CTP will be clear on its objectives and expectations.

There was also discussion on work around decolonising the curriculum and how this interacts with the CTP. A member highlighted that work around decolonisation should not be presented as optional, but something that needs to be concrete and actionable. It was emphasised that CTP provides an opportunity to review teaching and provision, and provides a framework to look at decolonising the curriculum alongside other institutional priorities, such as assessment & feedback. The Committee were informed that the CTP is actively recruiting for a role on secondment which will work with the EDI committee on decolonising the curriculum. In relation to a point about student dissatisfaction with reading lists, it was confirmed that SSLCs, conversations with course organisers and mid-course feedback surveys are the best initial avenues for this, rather than the University's Complaints Procedure.

4.2 Tutor & Demonstrator Training (Paper C)

The representative of CSE (Postgraduate Research) presented this paper, which proposed guidance for Schools and Deaneries to help embed the Policy for the Recruitment, Support and Development of Tutors and Demonstrators, on behalf of the IAD working group. The work was a result of both the ELIR recommendation from the 2021 review and challenges with the policy not always being well understood within Schools.

The Committee discussed expectations around training for T&Ds and it was clarified that the time taken to complete training must be paid, as is set out in the T&D policy, and should be paid from Schools' T&D budget. It was highlighted that not all T&Ds are students, and this employed cohort must also be considered. Further feedback from the Committee identified line management and structure as areas which need strengthening within the guidance.

The Committee approved the guidance, whilst noting views on payment and line management.

Action: Lisa Kendall to share notes of this discussion to Heads of College and Registrars for their information.

Action: IAD working group to amend guidance and provide an update to future meeting of SEC.

4.3 Draft Learning and Teaching Strategy (verbal update)

The Deputy Vice Principal, Students (Enhancement) provided a verbal update on this item and shared a draft of the strategy that has been developed so far. It was emphasised that the shared draft is at an early stage, and there will be plenty of opportunities for colleagues across the institution to feed in their comments.

Comments received from the Committee members addressed the importance of EDI and WP throughout the strategy, focus on getting the fundamentals right, the need for space for AI innovation, clear outcomes for staff, students and stakeholders and the suggestion for curriculum development to be considered in the round and not only through the transformation project. It was also highlighted that research, as well as teaching, is an importance pillar of excellence and should be reflected in the strategy for the impact it has on teaching matters.

Discussion also considered the importance of students understanding their journey through their studies, and the role that Academic Advisors had previously played in this. It was agreed that academic advice should be embedded at every stage of the curriculum.

Action: Deputy Vice Principal, Students (Enhancement) to consider how to gather further comments from the Committee on the next iteration of the draft strategy.

4.4 Student Analytics Pilot Study (Paper D)

The paper for this item was considered to be closed business as it contained case study data relating to students. The paper was presented by the Head of Timetabling, Examinations and Student Analytics, Insights and Modelling.

The Committee were informed that the piloted tool analysed student data and correctly identified cases where additional support could be applied. The Committee discussed the impact of such a tool; there was support for analytics to be used to complement and enhance the work of the Student Support model, but some concern around the ethnical scrutiny required to implement use of such a tool, and concerns around which metrics and cohorts would be focussed upon. The presenter emphasised that the analytics would be utilised as a positive way to meet KPIs and requirements and not as a punitive tool. The algorithm is not attuned to certain demographics or protected characteristics. It was raised by a member that the existing Learning Analytic policy needs to be reviewed and updated in light of developments around analytical tools. The Interim Director of Academic Services noted that the ownership of the policy and associated documents should be looked at as part of the next review.

It was acknowledged during the discussion that the current systems utilised by the University which collect data and engagement points do not interact with each other. Therefore, key benefits of a new tool would be to remove the manual work across different systems and to implement consistency across the University.

The Committee agreed to endorse the next phase of work in this project to introduce student analytics as a supporting technology for student support.

4.5 Student Survey Results 2023: PTES and PRES (Paper E)

The paper for this item was considered to be closed business as it contained confidential internal survey data. The paper was presented by the Deputy Secretary, Students. Discussion highlighted the key themes reflected in the survey data, which included evidence that PGR students are looking for more pastoral support throughout their programme and the excellence of teaching at PG level. It was proposed that the views on teaching excellence should be better highlighted by the University, as it is an area which outperforms other themes in student surveys.

It was also acknowledged by the Committee that low response rates are a challenge to engaging with the student voice. The Committee were informed that the PRES response rate is addressed in the Research Cultures Action Plan.

Action: MB & AM to co-ordinate on process to improve PRES response rates.

4.6 National Student Survey (NSS) 2024 Optional Questions (Paper F)

This item was presented by the Head of Timetabling, Examinations and Student Analytics, Insights and Modelling, and is routine business for the Committee. The committee approved the addition of questions B9 and B11 to the 2023/24 NSS Survey, and supported the

proposal that additional questions are included on a two year rotational basis going forward, in order to better understand the rate progress over a period of time.

It was acknowledged by the presenter that work will be ongoing to best interpret and understand the data from surveys.

4.7 Higher Education Achievement Report (HEAR) – Mastercard Foundation Scholars Program Climate Leadership Award

The Committee approved the recommendation that the Mastercard Foundation Scholars Program Climate Leadership Award is added to the HEAR.

5. For information/noting

5.1 Generative Artificial Intelligence

The Deputy Vice Principal, Students (Enhancement) provided a verbal update on this matter. Work is underway to review and develop the guidance around Generative AI, and to develop training that will assist colleagues with AI literacy. The Artificial Intelligence Data Ethics task group (AIDE) is being revised and reshaped by Professor Michael Rovatsos.

6. Any Other Business

There was no other business.

Sinéad Docherty
Academic Services
December 2023

Senate Education Committee

18 January 2024

Student Support Model update

Description of paper

1. This paper provides Senate Education Committee with an update of activity undertaken to embed the Student Support Model during semester 1 2023/24.

Action requested / recommendation

2. The Committee is asked **to note** the update.

Project update

3. The new Student Support model was fully implemented for the 2023/24 academic year. This has demonstrated remarkable commitment and hard work from everyone involved in implementing this change project successfully.
4. Feedback from Colleges and Schools recognise the great work done by Student Advisers and Student Support Teams on connecting with students through implementation of the model, with anecdotal feedback and early evaluation showing the positive impact of the new roles and service. Initial feedback from students has been generally positive about how they are supported in practice, and we are continuing to review feedback from students throughout the year.
5. Evaluation and monitoring of the model has continued across the semester with a series of focus groups with Student Advisers and Wellbeing Advisers. As well as identifying new successes and challenges, this also targeted areas which were identified in Phase 1 evaluation to monitor whether there was any improvement or progression from the experience last year.
6. Positive feedback centred around the ways teams are working together and supporting each other, including relationships between Student Advisers and Wellbeing Advisers. Student Advisers feel they provide a good service to students, are approachable and trusted by their students.
7. Challenges remain around welcome week and start of semester activity (volumes, overlap with progression, course enrolment, timetabling, legacy systems). Space remains an issue for the majority of Schools, specifically looking for dedicated private office space for confidential 1-to-1 meetings with students but also large enough shared office spaces for teams to work together. Estates colleagues are engaged in conversations. Future support for PGR students has also been raised across Colleges.
8. Challenges can be exacerbated by a lack of consistency in the ways things are done, and who is responsible for doing them, across the University. Student

Advisers have raised the rise in complex cases and have asked for support with this which is being reviewed through the Management Group and Board.

9. The processes for referring students to the Wellbeing Service has significantly improved, following extensive collaboration between the service and Schools across the summer period, and in response to previous feedback. Further close collaboration is essential to continue to build trust.
10. Evaluation in Semester 2 will focus on academic support for students, with focus groups planned with Cohort Leads and students.
11. To evaluate whether the model is delivering the intended benefits, a logic model is being developed, led by Professor John Devaney to ensure robust evaluation of the model, and to provide a structure for continuous improvement of the model in how it supports both the student and staff experience.
12. The project team, with oversight of the Project Board, is focussing on embedding the model, and putting in place structures and process to continually review and improve the model. As part of that, in March 2024, Senate Education Committee will be asked to review and approve an updated version of the Student Support Framework (which replaced the previous Academic and Pastoral Support Policy), and related Support Leadership Framework and Student Support Standards. These frameworks aim to ensure governance and quality assurance accountability and processes are in place, and can support planning round conversations ahead of academic year 2024/25.
13. As a key part of the model's ecosystem, Peer Support is the area most in need of development and consistent application across the University. An updated Peer Support Framework and associated operational plan will be presented to the Project Board in February 2024.
14. The project duration was set up to ensure that the project team, board and various support structures remain in place throughout the 2023/24 academic year to help support the embedding of the new model and to ensure there is appropriate time and attention applied to hand over the roles and responsibilities associated with the student support model from a project environment to the business-as-usual environment.
15. In line with this the Project Board is focussed both on the embedding of the model but also the planning for post-implementation roles, responsibilities, and oversight from 2024/25 academic year to help ensure that the principles of the model continue to be adhered to and the benefits realised for our students and colleagues.

Resource implications

16. As this is an update paper, there are no resource implications.

Risk management

17. Failure to address student experience will mean we have not met our strategic ambitions as set out in Strategy 2030. It also carries reputational risk and continues to affect the University's standing in national league tables.

Responding to the Climate Emergency & Sustainable Development Goals

18. This paper would support the SDG "Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all" as part the strategic objective to improve student experience.

Equality & diversity

19. Our work in student experience will support greater equality, diversity and inclusion for students within our community.

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

20. This paper presents an update to note. Regular communication channels are established to share updates about the implementation and embedding of the model.

21. The Student Support Model Project will be one of the projects that is under the remit of the new University Initiatives Strategic Board.

Author

Lisa Dawson
Academic Registrar

Presenter

Lucy Evans
Deputy Secretary Students

21 December 2023

Freedom of Information

Open

Senate Education Committee

18/01/2024

Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES) 2024 Institutional Questions

Description of paper

1. This paper presents the proposed institutional questions for PTES 2024. These questions, if approved, will be asked after the core questions and specifically of students at the University of Edinburgh.
2. The data generated from PTES contributes to improving the quality of teaching and learning, the student experience and student satisfaction.

Action requested / recommendation

3. SEC is asked to **consider and approve** the proposed questions to be included in PTES 2024.

Background and context

4. PTES is an annual survey of postgraduate taught students and takes place between April and June each year at the University of Edinburgh. The survey is administered nationally by AdvanceHE and locally, at institution level, by Student Analytics, Insights and Modelling within Registry Services.
5. The data from the survey provides University results as well as the opportunity for benchmarking against other UK institutions. In 2023, nearly 84,000 students from 101 institutions participated, including 2,350 from the University of Edinburgh which is 18.1% of our postgraduate cohort.
6. PTES includes a set of core questions as well as the option to ask additional, institutional questions.

Discussion

7. In 2023 the University opted to include 3 institutional questions (the same as 2022):
 - My School or Deanery has provided me with people and services to support me (Strongly agree – n/a)
 - My School or Deanery has provided advice and guidance on how to access support where needed (Strongly agree – n/a)
 - If you have any further comments on these issues then please provide them here (open comment)
8. It is recommended that the University asks the same 3 questions in PTES 2024. Retaining these questions in PTES 2024 will provide a third year of data relating

to students experiences of student support which will feed into the evaluation of the new student support model.

9. Similar to NSS (SEC, November 2023), beyond 2024, we are working to identify a rotation of questions to be used across a longer period of time, allowing monitoring across the range of student experience initiatives which are currently on-going or planned. This will be presented to the Committee for approval in 2024.
10. The Deputy Secretary Students and Students' Association President have been consulted on this proposal.

Resource implications

11. No resource implications

Risk management

12. The data from the PTES is used to improve the experience of students at the University. Failure to improve the student experience is a reputational risk for the University.

Equality & diversity

13. Understanding student satisfaction across the theme of student support is key across all students, including EDI groups.

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

14. If agreed, the questions will be included in PTES 2024. The process for including and reporting on these questions will be overseen by Marianne Brown, Head of Timetabling, Examinations and Student Analytics.

Author

*Chantal Reilly – Student Insights
Manager*

Marianne Brown

*Head of Timetabling, Examinations and
Student Analytics.*

14 December 2023

Presenter

Marianne Brown

*Head of Timetabling, Examinations and
Student Analytics.*

Freedom of Information

Open

Senate Education Committee

18 January 2024

Student Online Data Protection Training

Description of paper

1. This paper outlines a recommendation to include the online data protection training for all students via LEARN Ultra in their 'essential training' portfolio.
2. Many students will process personal data in their dissertations and therefore require a sufficient level of knowledge about data protection law to avoid committing a breach, damaging the University's reputation and potentially their own future career. More generally, by providing our students with knowledge about data protection we will better prepare them for working in their chosen fields as well as the digital arena. This will contribute to the following outcome set out in Strategy 2030:
 - The undergraduate curriculum will support breadth and choice, preparing students, graduates and alumni to make a difference in whatever they do, wherever they do it.

Action requested/Recommendation

3. Senate Education Committee is asked to approve adding the Data Protection Essentials training course to the pre-enrolled training portfolio in LEARN Ultra.

Background and context

4. In 2018, the University Executive reached a decision to make Data Protection Essentials training mandatory for all staff members. At a later stage, an informal decision was reached to also mandate the training for PhD students that work with personal data. The training for staff members has now been moved to People & Money and the training for PhD students has been moved to LEARN Ultra. All PhD students have been auto-enrolled, which means that those that use personal data in their research must complete the training and those that don't use personal data can do the training if they so wish. A considerable number of course organisers have now approached the Data Protection Officer to request that the training be also made available for Masters Degree and undergraduate students, as the situation is de facto the same as for PhD students – many will be using personal data for their research. The Business School has even turned the LEARN Ultra training into a course forming part of their learning catalogue. We now have another opportunity to not only reduce the ongoing risk to the University in relation to data protection breaches, but also to increase students' awareness and understanding of the risks of using personal data. Since there is no possibility and no desire to make courses mandatory on LEARN Ultra due to the lack of monitoring facilities, it is requested that the course be added to the 'essential training' portfolio of all Masters and undergraduate students.

In their meeting on 14 November 2023, the University Executive unanimously accepted and supported the proposal.

Discussion

5. To support compliance with the University Data Protection Policy and increase students' awareness of this area where it is relevant to their studies, it is recommended that all students should have the Data Protection Essentials training course as part of their training portfolio, accessed via LEARN Ultra. A number of other courses, such as LibSmart (Library skills), Introduction to Sustainability, Digital Skills Awareness (first years only) and Academic Integrity are already added to their portfolios and recommended as 'essential' training. The proposal is to add the Data Protection Essentials training course to this set of courses.

6. The course was created exporting the updated staff course (hosted on P&M). The course will be self-paced and last approximately 25 – 30 minutes, reinforced via multiple choice knowledge checks at the end.

Although the staff version will use P&M reporting functionality to allow local tracking of completion rates and details of pass/fail, it is not possible to include the same reporting functionality for students and no central follow-up action is anticipated for non-completion. As a result, there is no current proposal to implement any form of centrally managed automated sanction for not completing the course as this is currently neither practical nor pragmatic, though the course will remain on the student to-do list until completed. Therefore, the course would not be mandatory for any Masters or undergraduate students.

Resource implications

7. The course was created and uploaded in LEARN Ultra by the Data Protection Officer so there is no additional resource requirement associated with this proposal, other than the time each student will spend on the training.

Risk Management

8. Provision of Data Protection Essentials training will better equip our students to understand their responsibilities when using personal data in their research and also for their future careers. It will also mitigate the risk of students committing a breach of data protection law when processing personal data of which the University is data controller.

Responding to the Climate Emergency & Sustainable Development Goals

9. There is no specific climate impact as a result of the proposals in this paper.

10. Although the proposals in this paper will better equip our students to process personal data lawfully, it does not directly contribute to the Strategy 2030 outcomes or SDG as it is fulfilling an internal risk reduction initiative.

Equality & Diversity

11. An EIA of the course material was completed when the training was first put on LEARN and no required changes have been identified.

Next steps/implications

12. If the Senate Education Committee approves the recommendation, the Data Protection Officer will finalise the course and liaise with LTW teams to make the training 'essential' to undergraduate and Masters students.

Consultation

13. Making the course 'essential' for all students has been discussed with the EUSA president who fully supported the proposal.

Further information

14. Author

Dr Rena Gertz
Data Protection Officer
November 2023

Presenter

Dr Rena Gertz
Data Protection Officer
November 2023

Freedom of Information

15. This paper is open.

Senate Education Committee

18 January 2024

Committee Priorities – Mid-Year Reflection

Description of paper

1. The paper asks the Committee to reflect mid-year on progress with committee priorities. The outcomes of the discussion will be included in the next update on standing committee business to Senate in February and will inform the Committee's work on the priorities for the remainder of the academic year.

Action requested / recommendation

2. The Committee is asked to **comment** on progress with the committee priorities for 2023/24 in order to inform area(s) of focus and/or actions/outcomes for the remainder of the academic year as appropriate.

Background and context

3. The Committee identified its priorities for the next academic year in March 2023 and these were presented to Senate in May and October 2023 as part of the Annual Report of the Senate Standing Committees.
4. Senate discussed the Annual Report in October 2023, however, the paper was not approved (Senate did not approve the paper by a vote of 51%). The Senate Standing Orders require the standing committees to **report** to Senate on an annual basis on action taken under powers delegated to them by Senate.
5. Senate has indicated a preference for more information on standing committee business, including most recently during the discussion at the October 2023 meeting on the Annual Report. This paper aims to provide Senate with more information as the outcomes of the discussion will be included in the next update on standing committee business which will be presented to the February 2024 meeting. It is also anticipated that this paper and resulting discussion will help the development of the next Annual Report.

Committee priorities 2024/25

6. A paper will be presented for discussion at the March meeting of the Committee. In order to support the discussion and to provide more information for Senate, enhancements to the previous process will include: increased time at the meeting for the discussion; outlining the rationale and how priorities fit with the remit of the committee; providing information on the anticipated area(s) of focus and/or actions/outcomes; and identification of where a priority is related to a regulatory/external requirement.

Discussion

Curriculum Transformation Programme (also a standing item)

7. A verbal update was provided to the Committee in **September 2023** on work undertaken since the last paper was presented (in March 2023), covering key activities and the impact of MAB on engagement with Schools. The Committee fed back on the need for CTP to align with School and College priorities around assessment and on resource implications. More detail on challenge courses was also requested in future updates.
8. In **November 2023** a paper providing an update on CTP since the last paper was presented to the Committee in March 2023 was given. The update was based around three main areas of activity:
 - the development, testing and validation of a new Curriculum Framework for the University (Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate) including engagement with Schools and via Colleges;
 - preparation of an Outline Business Case;
 - and work on an outline project plan to support the adoption of the Curriculum Framework including consideration of what processes could be used to approve changes to programmes and courses.
9. Members fed in comments and discussion included the differences between honours and pre-honours years, resourcing of teaching staff, approaches to teaching at scale, and the need for the framework to include work streams and competency sets which affect how students work within their own subject area. Discussion also addressed other key elements including assessment and feedback, decolonising the curriculum and the importance of fundamental pillars of delivery such as timetabling and systems. It was noted that consideration must be given to how other key strategies of the University interact with CTP, and acknowledged that the continuing consultation with colleagues is vital to the plans and expected implementation.
10. Committee members have been invited to attend the CTP Senate Session on **15 January 2024**. An accompany paper will outline key elements for discussion and feedback at the session. A brief introduction to each of the topics will be had ahead of discussion on each of the following items:
 - The Postgraduate Taught Framework
 - The Undergraduate Framework
 - The planned phasing of the Programme

Assessment and feedback task groups

11. A verbal update in the **September 2023** meeting. The Committee were informed that the Assessment and Feedback Strategy Group and the Assessment and Feedback Guidance, Procedures, Data, Systems and Evaluation Group are both

exploring options for the summer resit diet in 23/24, with a range of options set to be in place to facilitate resits that may not require in-person attendance.

12. Assessment and feedback was also discussed in the context of the NSS Survey Results at the **September 2023** meeting. It was recognised that there is work to do to improve student satisfaction in relation to feedback; this work can be facilitated through the Assessment & Feedback Principles & Priorities which set out the standards and guidance for Schools.
13. Assessment and feedback was discussed under Matters Arising at the **November 2023** meeting, with members expressing the view that assessment design is an important aspect of inclusivity and combatting plagiarism. Following this discussion, the Deputy Vice Principal, Students (Enhancement) agreed to liaise with IAD colleagues to identify resources which can be shared across the University to support assessment design.

Generative Artificial Intelligence

14. The Committee discussed Generative AI in the context of a proposal for firewall website controls that was presented at the **September 2023** meeting. The Committee had been asked for their views, which would be shared with the University Executive. Comments from Committee members addressed firewall limitations, student protection and the need to understand how AI might be legitimately used by both staff and students.
15. In the **November 2023** meeting, the Committee were informed that work is underway to review and develop the guidance around Generative AI, and to develop training that will assist colleagues with AI literacy. The Artificial Intelligence Data Ethics task group (AIDE) is being revised and reshaped and will be involved in this work.

Resource implications

16. This paper does not propose any actions. The resource implications of any actions which arise from the discussion would need to be outlined and considered.

Risk management

17. Progress against priorities is vital to the Committee fulfilling its remit. Failure to fulfil its remit raises potential risks associated with the University's framework of academic policy and regulations and the student experience.

Responding to the Climate Emergency & Sustainable Development Goals

18. This paper does not respond to the climate emergency or contribute to the Sustainable Development Goals.

Equality & diversity

19. This paper does not propose any actions. The equality and diversity implications any actions which arise from the discussion would need to be outlined and considered.

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

20. The outcomes of the discussion will be reported to Senate in February 2024 as part of the update on standing committee business. Additionally, the Senate Committees' Newsletter provides information on standing committee business.

Author

*Academic Services
9 January 2024*

Presenter

Nichola Kett and Colm Harmon

Freedom of Information *Open*

Senate Education Committee

Date 08/01/2024

Title: Revision to SEC Plan of Activities for 2024

Description of paper

(Should also explain how any proposals will contribute to one of more of the Strategy 2030 outcomes)

1. This paper seeks to revise the existing outline of the SEC's plan of activities for 2023-24 in the paper which was presented to Senate on 11 October 2023. The Annual Report of the Standing Committees (S23/24 1C), requested Senate to 'note' a report of business from 22/23 and to 'approve' a plan of business for 23/24. The paper was not approved by Senate. The aim of this paper to revise and improve the part of S23/24 1C which relates to SEC business, in order to try to meet the previous objections from Senate, in particular providing more detail on particular items, and to try to achieve more representation of constituency priorities. In so doing, the aim is to contribute to improving relations between Senate and its committees, to improve the work of the SEC itself, and in doing both, to contribute to improving university governance. As such its aims are internal and do not contribute to Strategy 2030 outcomes except insofar as the original paper contributed to those outcomes.

Action requested / recommendation

2. The SEC is asked to discuss the ideas here and consider revisions to its proposed plan of business.

Background and context

3. Section 6.1 of S 23/24 C1 explains that the business of the three Senate Committees is 'planned in the context of ongoing University strategic project/activities including: the Curriculum Transformation Programme; the Student Support model (including maturing the approach to evaluation and monitoring); Assessment and Feedback, Extensions and Special Circumstances, the ELIR action plan; Student Voice activity and responding to the externally-facilitated review of Senate.'
4. Section 6.2 indicated that for the SEC the following 3 areas are indicated as activities for 23/24: 'Assessment and Feedback Groups', 'Curriculum Transformation', 'Generative AI'. Sections 6.3 and 6.4 explain that other Senate committees (APRC and QA) will look at matters including responding to ELIR and monitoring the new student support model.
5. Objections from Senate members at the 11 October meeting included comments on the level of detail provided in the summary of 22/23 business but also indicated dissatisfaction with the level of detail provided regarding plans for 23/24.
6. Aspects of two recent external reports (the report from the External Review into Senate Effectiveness, and the report into People & Money) both highlighted

failures in communication, understanding and trust between staff 'on the ground' and leadership of the University. The aim of this paper is to contribute to improving governance by helping to improve relations between Senate and its committees, and ensuring Senate Committee business integrates grassroots perspectives on priorities for improving the delivery of education in particular.

Discussion

7. The invitation to consider revisions and in particular additions to the SEC's existing plan of business for 23-24 was posted on the elected academic members' Teams site, and relevant individual role-holders were also contacted in particular areas. Consultation with academic elected members of Senate suggests the following additions to SEC business for 2023-24:

NSS: In light of our very poor recent NSS results, and in a context of ongoing very poor NSS results over a number of years, could the SEC be presented with a strategy document from the Vice-Principal for Students or other relevant role-holder or group, addressed to how we are going to improve our NSS scores, to include benchmarking across university and across sector, on areas where others within/outside UoE outperform us and what they do differently, and ideas to make things better in our key areas. The document should also highlight whether our performance has improved/deteriorated in key areas over time, and any overall trends.

Lost Learning: Owing to both Covid and strikes, students have lost a lot of learning over recent years, although the extent of this is likely to vary significantly in different Schools and subject areas. Existing university mitigations focused on grades. Can the SEC/a working group formed by SEC/others think creatively about how to make up for lost learning? Since the impact is likely to be different in different areas, it is clear that local areas are best suited to assess what's been lost and how it could be made up so the proposal is to invite School directors of teaching, via School Education Committees, to assess the problem and consider possible solutions in each area. One remedial possibility which could be considered locally or more generally might be an extra year's use of a university library card for graduates? Or an extra year's access to online resources like LEARN sites or Resource Lists? Could the University give a budget to Schools for this to spend as they determine fit, e.g. in worse affected subject areas or Schools to pay for 1:1 or small group tutorials for students to help with things like study skills, for students who missed a lot of lectures/tutorials/contact time? Overall, a key thing to stress is that the aim is not to replace teaching, but help to address lost learning in other ways. A problem would be making sure we are in time to catch the affected cohorts, but given strikes were ongoing last academic year, this is an ongoing issue.

Tutor and Demonstrator Minimum Training Policy: In 2021-22 the SEC agreed a policy concerning the establishment and implementation of minimum training standards for Tutors and Demonstrators (TutDems). This was a key aspect of the Collective Agreement with UCU. Although the CA was signed 5 years ago, there has been almost no progress on this front. The SEC paper approved the creation of working group to report to SEC via the Tutor and Demonstrator Steering Group. This working group was supposed to undertake a university-wide mapping exercise of training provision. Much to UCU's dismay, the mapping exercise was not undertaken, and the named lead for this has now left UoE. As such there isn't a named person responsible for TutDems. The T&D Network also seems to be quite inactive and we're still waiting for UCU to be included as mentioned in the SEC paper. We

have been advised that currently, there are no plans to allocate central resources towards TutDem training, and instead the onus will be on individual schools to create, fund and deliver a minimum training programme. The SEC is asked to follow up on implementing the Collective Agreement and associated policies.

Resource implications

8. There would be different resource implications for each of these ideas, but each represents a more or less significant investment of time (e.g. to produce the NSS strategy document), and/or money (e.g. budgets to Schools to make up lost learning from strikes and Covid), which may arguably be considered appropriate given the importance of the issues.

Risk management

9. These ideas are proposed to mitigate significant risks, for example, to University core business and reputational damage, arising from the unresolved issues underlying ongoing poor NSS scores, and to University governance arising from Senate refusal to approve Committee business.

Responding to the Climate Emergency & Sustainable Development Goals

10. To the extent that the ideas suggested here contribute to improving the education offered at the University, they contribute to goal 4, ensuring *inclusive and equitable quality education for all*.

Equality & diversity

11. The suggestions made above are made in part to address potential inequalities in learning. Since no new policies are proposed, an EIA is not yet required. However, due consideration to equality and diversity would be given to any actions arising from the discussion.

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

12. If the SEC agrees to revise its proposed plan of business, this would be presented to Senate for approval at the next appropriate opportunity.

Author

Name Tamara Trodd

Date 8 January 2024

Presenter

Name Tamara Trodd

Freedom of Information (*Is the paper 'open' or 'closed'*) Open