The University of Edinburgh
Senate Quality Assurance Committee

**Meeting to be held on Thursday 18 May 20223
at 2pm via Microsoft Teams**

A G E N D A

1.	**Welcome and Apologies**	
2.	Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 27 April 2023	SQAC 22/23 5A
3.	**Matters Arising**	
	For Discussion	
4.	**Thematic Review:**	SQAC 22/23 5B
	– 2018-19 Review Progress Update	**To Follow**
5.	**Student Support Model:**	
	– Student Support – Evaluation	SQAC 22/23 5C
	– Proposed Policy Changes related to Implementation of Student Support Model	SQAC 22/23 5D
6.	**Student Support Services Annual Review:**	
	– Policy, Guidance, and Reporting Template	SQAC 22/23 5E
7.	**Operation of Senate Standing Committees:**	
	– Annual Review of Effectiveness of Senate Standing Committees	SQAC 22/23 5F
	For Information and Formal Business	
8.	**Annual Monitoring and Internal Periodic Review Themes 2021/22:**	
	– University Level Actions	SQAC 22/23 5G
9.	**Terms of Reference and Membership 2023/24**	SQAC 22/23 5H
10.	**Any Other Business:**	

11.   Provisional meeting dates 2023-2024 (all meetings take place between 2-4pm, venue TBC):
- Tuesday 12th September 2023
- Thursday 7th December 2023
- Thursday 22nd February 2024
- Thursday 25th April 2024
- Thursday 16th May 2024

<u>The University of Edinburgh</u>
Senate Quality Assurance Committee

**Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 27 April 2023
at 2pm via in the Cuillin Room, Charles Stewart House and
via Microsoft Teams**

Present:	
Professor Tina Harrison (Convener)	Deputy Vice-Principal Students (Enhancement)
Professor Laura Bradley	Dean of Postgraduate Research, College of Arts, Humanities & Social Sciences
Dr Anne Desler	Director of Quality Assurance & Curriculum Approval, Edinburgh College of Art
Sinéad Docherty	Committee Secretary, Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services
Olivia Eadie	Assistant Director and Head of Operations and Projects, Institute for Academic Development
Dr Pia Helbing	Programme Director, Business School
Sam McCallum	VP Education, Edinburgh University Students' Association Representative
Callum Paterson	Edinburgh University Students' Association Academic Engagement Coordinator
Present via Teams:	
Professor Matthew Bailey	Dean of Quality, College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine
Brian Connolly	Head of Quality Assurance and Enhancement Team, Academic Services
Dr Gail Duursma	School Representative (Engineering), College of Science and Engineering
Dr Meryl Kenny	Deputy Director of Learning and Teaching, School of Social and Political Science

Dr Linda Kirstein	Dean of Education Quality Assurance and Culture, College of Science and Engineering
Dr Paul Norris	Dean of Quality Assurance and Curriculum Approval, College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences
Professor Leigh Sparks	Deputy Principal, University of Stirling
In attendance:	
Antony Macocia	Dean of Postgraduate Research, College of Science and Engineering/University of Edinburgh Doctoral College
Pauline Manchester	Deputy Director of Planning and Policy, Governance and Strategic Planning
Apologies:	
Marianne Brown	Head of Student Analytics, Insights and Modelling, Co-opted member
Dr Jeni Harden	School Representative (School of Molecular, Genetic and Population Health Sciences), College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine

1. Welcome and Apologies

The Convener welcomed Callum Paterson as the Edinburgh University Students' Association Academic Engagement Coordinator, and Professor Laura Bradley who has joined the Committee to represent PGR experience on behalf of the Doctoral College.

The Convener noted apologies from Dr Jeni Harden and Marianne Brown.

2. Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 6th March 2023

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

3. Matters Arising

The Convener noted that the external review of Senate Committees is ongoing. The emerging themes and recommendations are expected to be presented at the Senate meeting in May, with the report to follow.

The item concerning the Student Support model is not on the agenda for this meeting as Marianne Brown is absent due to the Registry Services away day. An update will be presented at the May meeting.

4. Tutors and Demonstrators Governance SQAC 22/23 4C*

*This item was brought forward in the meeting agenda due to time slot constraints of the presenters for papers B and C.

The Dean of Postgraduate Research, College of Science and Engineering (CSE) was in attendance to present this paper, which will also be presented to Senate Education Committee (SEC).

A working group has been set up, Tutors & Demonstrators Oversight Group, and is co-ordinating with Schools to create a governance structure for managing Tutors & Demonstrators (T&D), and to co-ordinate training of this cohort. A survey has been circulated to Schools and Deaneries and some interviews have taken place.

It was highlighted that this is a governance issue, and was flagged in the last ELIR review. The University needs to assure itself of the training of T&Ds, and plans must be in place ahead of the external Quality Enhancement and Standards Review (QESR) review scheduled for November 2023. The paper asks for an endorsement of approach from the Committee to progress with its aims in the coming months.

It was proposed that the existing policy needs to be augmented; the policy requires more direction and guidance in order to be better implemented and operationalised. Aspects of the policy should also be reviewed to facilitate cross-college/institute training. However, it was recognised that more resource will be required across the institution to achieve this and the responsibility for training must be considered in the Workload Allocation Model (WAM). It was also noted that Schools require different skill sets from their tutoring staff, and this ought to be reflected in the training model.

It was highlighted to the Committee that the School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences (PPLS) demonstrates good practice in its model supporting T&Ds and utilising a paid lead role.

A Committee member noted that there is a distinction between demonstrators, postgraduate tutors and full-time or part-time tutors, and therefore a model is needed that will work for everyone. The model of employment for staff in these roles may also need review as there is pressure, across the sector, to abolish Guaranteed Hours contracts although some concerns remain about the viability of fractional contracts.

The Committee discussed the role of the Doctoral College; it works with postgraduate research (PGR) students as tutors but consideration must be given as to whether it is best placed to work with tutors and demonstrators who are not PGR students. The Committee also discussed the role of IAD and the need to move away from the School-led expectation that IAD provides all training to tutors, and whether there is a Human Resources (HR) link or mechanism that can capture the process of ensuring training has taken place. It was noted that HR involvement, as a central responsibility, needs to be approved at an institutional level.

A Committee member raised the issue of feedback and marking; the WAM tariff does not reflect what is achievable in the time allocated, and this issue affects the cohort of tutors and demonstrators. It appears there is correlation between feedback and assessment issues and low National Student Survey (NSS) scores.

Action: Convenor to take these points in the conversation forward to the Assessment & Feedback Strategy Group.

There was support from the Committee for the principles of change, and for establishing consistency in governance and training for tutors and demonstrators across the institution. The Dean of Postgraduate Research (CSE) will take the paper forward to SEC and look to turn these discussions into improved policy and guidance.

Action: Doctoral College to present an update to SQAC in the September 2023 meeting.

5. Undergraduate Degree Awarded Analysis

This report was presented by Deputy Director of Planning and Policy, Governance and Strategic Planning (GaSP) and the Committee considered the data and findings of the report.

There was some discussion around the best way to use and interpret the data. In some instances, it would be useful to have the exact numbers to allow the Committee to understand exactly how many students are affected by aspects considered in the report.

With regard to Equality, Diversity and Inclusivity (EDI) data, the public data report is back to its annual cycle. This report has a different analysis on the data although still considers the attainment gap.

Action: Committee Secretary to circulate the link to the EDI public data once it is published.

The Committee was informed that GASP is aiming to initiate a project to publish data internally on a dashboard. This should help Schools and Colleges to better understand and respond to the data.

In previous years, after this report was considered by SQAC, Academic Services asked the Schools to reflect on the data as part of the annual monitoring process; this would ensure areas of concern and outliers received a response. This practice was set aside during the pandemic when annual monitoring became a more streamlined activity.

Action: College Deans to share this data with Schools for reflection and response, as part of annual quality processes.

This years' report contained an appendix which presented tariff band benchmarking. This data is available from the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) and had not previously been explored; as this data was considered to be experimental, the appendix was closed. The Committee requested that this HESA data be included in future years for a fuller picture. GASP can continue to provide this, although requested that the data remain closed.

Action: GASP to include this data set in future reports for the benefit of the Committee.

6. Exceptional External Examiner Appointments

The Committee considered the use of multiple External Examiners from the same institution. Where multiple EEs from the same institution sit on the same board, there is an argument for the policy allowing one EE to be appointed.

The Committee had no objection to amending the policy to allow this, whilst noting that flexibility in the EE appointments system must be balanced with maintaining standards.

Action: Dean of Quality Assurance and Curriculum Approval (CAHSS) to update the policy to reflect amendments.

7. External Examiner Reporting System (EERS) Thematic Analysis

The Committee considered the analysis and discussed the importance of External Examiner (EE) reports in the assessment and feedback loop. It was noted that the EEs assess the robustness of marking procedures and assessment; they do not assess how assessment is communicated to students. EEs see the output but not the process of the assessment journey. This may be a gap in the EE process.

The Committee discussed student understanding of the role of EEs and the best ways to communicate the findings of EEs. SSLCs were highlighted as a route to communicating EE reports to students and receiving student comments in response. The Committee discussed how best to take these considerations forward.

Action: Convenor to add External Examiners to the agenda for the next meeting of the Assessment & Feedback Strategy Group.

Action: Academic Services to review the External Examiner forms and identify areas of enhancement for Assessment & Feedback.

8. Scotland's Rural College (SRUC) Accreditation Committee Annual Report 2021-22

The Committee received and noted the annual report of the Accreditation Committee of Scotland's Rural College (SRUC).

Proposal to extend Scotland's Rural College's (SRUC) Accredited Institution status to Postgraduate Research Provision (PGR)

The Convenor presented this paper to the Committee; the proposal to extend SRUC's accrediting powers to postgraduate research (PGR) provision requires decision, and SRUC would like to work with the University of Edinburgh

The Committee was satisfied that due diligence had been undertaken in the process, and that the proposal was a logical extension & development to SRUC's provision. It was noted that the proposal was well put together, and SRUC had an exemplary approach in their paperwork and oversight of the process. It was also noted that guidance booklet produced by SRUC for PGR students was an example of good practice; this can be shared more widely with colleagues for their information.

The proposal to extend accrediting powers was endorsed by the Committee, and can go to Senate for agreement.

Action: Academic Services to inform Senate that it has endorsed the proposal to extend accrediting powers to SRUC.

9. Committee Priorities for 2023-24

The Committee was satisfied with the priorities as laid out in the paper. There was agreement to report these priorities to Senate, although it was recognised that SQAC's work and considerations may not be restricted to only these priorities as defined at this stage.

10. Internal Periodic Reviews: Reports and Responses

The Committee approved the final reports for Moray House School of Education and Sport (UG provision) and the Business School (PGT and PGR provision).

There was a request for further clarification in the 14 weeks response from the School of Informatics.

Action: Academic Services to follow up with the School of Informatics in relation to their 14 week response.

11. Any Other Business

The Committee noted that the Dean of Quality Assurance and Curriculum Approval (CAHSS) will stand in as Convener for the May meeting. The Committee agreed that this meeting to take place online.

The University of Edinburgh
Senate Quality Assurance Committee

18 May 2023

Student Support:
Evaluation

Description of paper
1. This paper provides an update on the two core strands of activity currently underway to evaluate the new student support model; evaluation of the implementation of the model and development of a continuous learning model for on-going quality assurance.

Action requested / recommendation
2. The committee are asked to note and discuss this paper.

Background and context
3. The new model of student support has now been rolled out to c.7000 students across the University. As part of this implementation, Student Advisers, Academic Cohort Leads and Wellbeing Advisers have been appointed to provide an eco-system of support for students throughout their studies.
4. A paper was presented to SQAC in March 2023 confirming activities which have taken place to evaluate the implementation of the model. The paper confirmed four key areas which have been identified for enhancement through the evaluation activity.
5. Evaluation activity has continued throughout semester two, with a focus on feedback from Cohort Leads and students. Further focus groups with teaching office staff and Student Adviser Line Managers will take place over May, and Student Adviser and Wellbeing Adviser feedback will be collected in June. A final report will be presented to the Student Support Project Board in June.
6. Alongside the evaluation of the implementation of the model, work is underway to ensure a model of continuous evaluation is in place as the model transitions to business as usual. Early considerations in relation to this were presented to SQAC in March 2023.

Discussion
Implementation evaluation
7. In January 2023, the Student Support Project Board approved a recommendation to focus on four key areas for enhancement of the student support model ahead of full roll out of the model in September 2023. Actions taken by the Project Team and other associated groups in response to these recommendations can be found in Appendix A. This update was presented to the Project Board in April and progress will continue to be monitored.
8. Evaluation across semester two has focussed on gathering feedback from Cohort Leads and students through a series of focus groups. Cohort Leads were asked to discuss what was working well in their role, what challenges they faced and whether there was additional support required for them to undertake their roles effectively. They were also asked about their understanding of the wider student

support ecosystem. Key themes are summarised in Appendix B. A report confirming students experiences will be available at the end of May.

9. Upcoming evaluation will also include focus groups with teaching office staff and Student Adviser line managers, and further feedback sessions with Student Advisers and Wellbeing Advisers.

10. A full report considering feedback from each group, will be presented to the Project Board in June 2023.

Continuous evaluation

11. An update on the long-term evaluation of the model was presented to the Student Support Project Board in April. Establishing and embedding mechanisms for ensuring the model is continually monitored as it transitions from implementation to business as usual will be key for ensuring the right support is provided to our students on an on-going basis.

12. Student Analytics, Insights and Modelling (SAIM) have been in discussions with academic colleagues in College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (CAHSS) to develop an evaluation approach. This approach will involve the creation of a small stakeholder group who will develop an evaluation model, looking at inputs and desired outputs. The stakeholder group will have representatives from each College, the Wellbeing Service, the Project Team, SAIM, EUSA and Academic Services. The output will be shared with a wider consultation group, including SQAC, for review and input. A request for nominations has now been sent to Colleges and work is expected to progress across the summer.

13. SAIM and Academic Services continue to work closely on approaches to embedding outcomes within existing quality assurance processes.

Resource implications

14. Resource will be managed through Student Analytics, Insights and Modelling team, working in partnership with the student support project, Academic Services, College Implementation Groups and the Student Lifecycle Management Group (SLMG).

Risk management

15. The University is investing in student support which is part of our drive to mitigate concerns in student satisfaction. Effective governance of evaluation and monitoring seeks to mitigate risks to the success of the new model. Failure to deliver this model caries reputational risk, does not deliver student experience as set out in strategy 2030 and continues to affect the University's standing in national league tables.

Responding to the Climate Emergency & Sustainable Development Goals

16. 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. The proposals would not hinder the achievement of any other UN SDGs or exacerbate the Climate Emergency.

Equality & diversity

17. An Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) has been completed. The work undertaken will support greater equality, diversity and inclusion for students within our community.

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

18. This paper presents an update for discussion. Action agreed will be shared with the student support project board and the operational management group which links with the College implementation groups.

Author	**Presenter**
Marianne Brown	*Marianne Brown*
Head of Student Analytics, Insights and Modelling	*Head of Student Analytics, Insights and Modelling*
08/05/2023	*08/05/2023*

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

Appendix A: update on recommended areas for improvement

Recommendation 1 - Enhanced training and induction schedule for incoming staff, of both Central and School processes, systems, policies and institutional knowledge

Actions taken -

· The Project Team has improved communications around the central training it is organising and provided Schools with a list of training recommended to take place at School/College level

· New Student Advisers will complete an initial training programme during their first five to six weeks of employment. This includes both a central and School/Deanery sessions. The Project team has also arranged training for colleagues developing their own training sessions to enhance the quality of training on offer

· Follow-up training sessions are being planned across the summer, covering a mix of repeat sessions for late starts, courses with capped attendance, and courses more appropriate to run close to the start of semester

· Student Analytics, Insights and Modelling (SAIM) have been working with Schools to understand BI training requirements and develop curated suites of reports

Recommendation 2 - Improvements to core processes such as timetabling and course enrolment

Actions taken -

· Task and finish groups have been set up to review and enhance both processes as part of the Student Lifecycle Management Group – workshops are on-going

· The Timetabling group is focussing on key challenge areas such as change management and will be developing recommendations over the next couple of months

· A tool has been developed to support Schools to review pre-honours processes and in doing so generate a list of courses that should not be offered as fully elective options and should therefore be removed from course catalogues/school schedules as potential options.

Recommendation 3 - Clear definition of roles and responsibilities within Schools and other support services, in new roles and existing roles to provide clarity and avoid duplication and/or confusion

Actions taken -

· Focus groups have taken place with Cohort Leads and findings are included below which will be developed into new recommendations

· Focus groups will be taking place with teaching office staff over April/May

· Student Adviser Communities of Practice are beginning to develop

· There has also been work underway to join the dots between services supporting students. The first iteration of a guide for Student Advisers (and Wellbeing Advisers and Cohort Leads) on how to work with central services is currently in review and will be shared shortly and updated in due course. Part of the Phase 2 training sessions will include a "ways of working" session open to existing Student Advisers as well as new starts

Recommendation 4 - Clear articulation of the role of the Student Wellbeing Service in the support model

Actions taken -

· The Student Wellbeing Service have developed guidance to support Student Advisers identify when appropriate to discuss a student's situation with the Student Wellbeing Service. Next steps are being finalised with the Management Group and it is intended the position will be clarified by September 2023 when the remaining taught students transfer to their Student Advisers

Appendix B: Cohort Lead – key themes

Cohort Leads were asked to discuss what was working well in their role, what challenges they faced and whether there was additional support required for them to undertake their roles effectively. They were also asked about their understanding of the wider student support ecosystem.

There was evidence through the discussion that colleagues had input significant time and effort into the role and into planning activities for their cohort. A number of key themes emerged from the discussions relating to their experience this year:

Role and Boundaries

· Cohort Leads recognised the early stages of the role and that much of the first semester was "testing out" the role and its responsibilities. The Board agreed this role would not be prescriptive i.e., there would not be a mandated job description with staff undertaking this role shaping it to meet the needs of their students. This has led to a degree of confusion with many feeding back they were not clear what was expected from them therefore the board should consider how this could be improved. CSE have developed a cohort lead framework which has been shared across the institution.

· Cohort Leads were very positive about the additional support provided by Student Advisers and Wellbeing Advisers in answering student enquiries and dealing with more complex student matters. However, there was some concern about Student

Advisers providing advice about course selections and other academic matters. They also raised concerned about Student Adviser workloads.

· There were mixed responses regarding the impact to their own workload. Most colleagues felt they had benefited from general enquiries being handled by the Student Adviser role. However, some colleagues felt their workload had increased due to the planning and organisation of the cohort activities. Support for organising cohort activities varies across Schools.

· Colleagues reported the benefits of discussing their experiences within the focus group – some colleagues will suggest their School sets up local opportunities to discuss their experiences further with peer Cohort Leads.

Cohort Activities

· Cohort Leads confirmed significant logistical challenges in the planning of events – coordinating clash-free slots for students to attend; identifying and booking suitable venues (with catering allowed)

· Low attendance rates to activities after Welcome Week was a common experience which could be demoralising for both staff and students who did attend. There is a strong desire for an easily accessible central repository of cohort activities to support planning, and to understand what activities work well.

Student connection

· Cohort Leads reported concern they did not know students within their cohort, this was particularly prevalent from those who have been Personal Tutors. They were especially concerned they might not identify students who require additional academic support. In some cases, they have returned to one-to-one meetings to re-establish this.

· Some feedback suggested that it was easier to build the connection with students in instances where a Cohort Lead was teaching on a core course or interacting with students not only through cohort activities

The University of Edinburgh
Senate Quality Assurance Committee

18 May 2023

Proposed Policy Changes related to Implementation of the Student Support Model

Description of paper

1. Submitting draft proposed Student Support Project related changes for SQAC review and approval on the following policies in May 2023 SQAC meeting:
   a. Work-Based and Placement Learning Policy

Action requested / recommendation

2. Review proposed minor changes to the 1 policy document, identified in the "SQAC May 2023 - Appendix for Changes to Student Support Policies", as appropriate for each policy so committee can approve proposed changes.

Background and context

3. Court and the University Executive approved the full implementation of the new student support from 2023-24, following the first phase in 2022-23

4. The Student Support model is being introduced through a phased approach, with some students moved to the new model of support in September 2022 and the remaining coming on board for September 2023

5. In May 2022, APRC/SQAC approved a set of technical changes to a range of policies and regulations in order to incorporate the new model for 2022-23 (primarily by inserting references to Student Advisers alongside Personal Tutors), and we are now inviting it to approve a second phase of consequential amendments to remove references to Personal Tutors (who will no longer exist in 23-24)

6. The majority of changes have been to include reference to the new support roles of Student Adviser or to remove reference to Personal Tutors

Discussion

7. The "SQAC May 2023 - Appendix for Changes to Student Support Policies" document highlights all proposed changes in associated policy documents

Resource implications

8. N/A - While implementation of the model requires resources, the policy, guidance and regulation changes do not in themselves add any further resource requirements

Risk management

9. Provides regulatory framework for Schools/Deaneries to base processes and ways of working, in line with the implementation of the new model of student support and guidance that will be provided by the Project Team. Responsibility for implementation of the regulations will lie within the Colleges and Schools/Deaneries

Responding to the Climate Emergency & Sustainable Development Goals

10. N/A

Equality & diversity

11. The proposed changes do not directly affect EDI considerations. However, these policy and regulation changes are prerequisites for the implementation of the new model of Student Support, which will enhance student experience, including EDI considerations when students are seeking support.

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

12. Academic Services will also include these changes in their annual updates on policies and regulations, and related newsletter

13. Responsibility for implementation of the regulations will lie within the College and Schools/Deaneries. An evaluation plan for the model overall itself is being developed, and evaluation of the impact of the proposed regulation changes will be included in that.

Author	**Presenter**
Rosie Edwards (Senior Design Lead) *25 April 2023*	*Rosie Edwards/Lisa Dawson*

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

Appendix covering:

- SQAC May 2023 - Appendix for Changes to Student Support Policies

The University of Edinburgh
Senate Quality Assurance Committee

18 May 2023

Proposed Policy Changes related to Implementation of the Student Support Model

1. **Work-based and Placement Learning Policy**
- 1 section changed

S4.1.e - Arrangements for the supervision and support of students, e.g. arrangements for <mark>Student Advisers/~~Personal Tutors/~~</mark>Student Support Teams and Research Supervisors, where relevant;

The University of Edinburgh
Senate Quality Assurance Committee

18 May 2023

Student Support Services Annual Review: Policy, Guidance, and Reporting Template

Description of paper
1. The paper seeks approval for minor amendments to the Student Support Services Annual Review Policy and Guidance, and reinstatement of the regular reporting template.

Action requested / recommendation
2. To approve the minor amendments (highlighted in the appendix) and the reinstatement of the regular reporting template.

Background and context
3. All policies, regulations, guidance, and other documents approved by the Senate Standing Committees are required to be reviewed periodically, according to a set schedule, to ensure they remain accurate and aligned with current practice and process.

4. With the transition back to regular business after the Covid-19 pandemic it would be appropriate to reinstatement of the regular reporting template in place of the interim template, introduced as a temporary response to the pandemic.

Discussion
5. The paper proposes minor changes to the Policy and Guidance, to ensure accuracy and alignment with current practice, and the reinstatement of the regular reporting template in place of the interim template.

Resource implications
6. Academic Services has identified no resource implications related to the proposed changes.

Risk management
7. Academic Services has identified no risks associated with the paper as the proposed changes align with current quality processes.

Equality & diversity
8. Academic Services does not anticipate any equality or diversity implications in relation to the proposed amendments. The proposals do not mean any change of practice, only a reallocation of responsibility so an Equality Impact Assessment is not required.

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

9. If agreed, Academic Services will communicate changes to key stakeholders following approval and through its annual communication on policy and regulations updates. Academic Services does not anticipate any impact from the proposals and considers evaluation is unnecessary.

Author
Brian Connolly
Academic Policy Manager
Academic Services

Presenter
Brian Connolly
Academic Policy Manager
Academic Services

Freedom of Information The paper is open.

Student Support Services
Review Policy

THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Purpose of Policy

This policy applies to Student Support Services within the Quality Assurance Framework. It outlines the purpose of the reviews and provides an overview of the monitoring process.

Overview

The policy provides an overview of the Student Support Service quality assurance review process, and covers the different types of review: annual review and thematic review. The policy includes the remit of the Senate Quality Assurance Committee sub-committee and its role in the monitoring process.

Scope: Mandatory Policy

Student Support Services staff, members of Quality Assurance Committee sub-committee.

Contact Officer	~~Susan Hunter~~ Brian Connolly	Academic Policy ~~Officer~~Manager	~~susan.hunter5@ed.ac.uk~~ b.connolly@ed.ac.uk

Document control

Dates	**Approved**: 2011	**Starts:** 2011	**Equality impact assessment:** 17.07.2014	**Amendments:** ~~24.11.2015~~ 18.05.2023	**Next Review:** ~~2019/20~~ 2023-24

Approving authority	Senate Quality Assurance Committee
Consultation undertaken	
Section responsible for policy maintenance & review	Academic Services
Related policies, procedures, guidelines & regulations	Student Support Service Annual Quality Assurance Report Template Thematic Review Guidance
UK Quality Code	Advice and guidance: Monitoring and Evaluation
Policies superseded by this policy	Student Support Services Quality Assurance Framework
Alternative format	If you require this document in an alternative format please email Academic.Services@ed.ac.uk
Keywords	internal review, quality assurance, student support service, QA, annual monitoring

Student Support Services
Review Policy

1. Introduction

This policy applies to the Student Support Services within the Quality Assurance Framework.

The following services have been identified by the Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC) for inclusion in the framework:

- Accommodation, Catering and Events
- Advice Place
- Careers Service
- Chaplaincy
- Disability and Learning Support Service
- ~~Edinburgh Global~~
- Estates
- Finance
- Information Services Group
- Institute for Academic Development
- Sport and Exercise
- Student Counselling Service
- ~~Student Disability Service~~
- Student Recruitment and Admissions
- Student Systems and Administration
- Study and Work Away Service
- University Health Service (attendance at meeting but no report to be produced)

2. Purpose

Student Support Service review assures the quality of the student experience with regard to services, within the existing resources available, by:

- facilitating reflection on the strategic and operational role of services in relation to their impact on the student experience;
- promoting reflection on the ways in which services engage with students and other stakeholders to monitor and improve the quality of services;
- supporting reflection on the ways in which the services promote high quality learning and continuous quality enhancement;
- taking account of the requirements of Professional, Statutory and Regulatory bodies (PSRBs), where appropriate;
- providing a forum for the sharing and dissemination of good practice.

Authority for the oversight of Student Support Service review lies with SQAC. Monitoring of services is delegated to the SQAC sub-committee.

Student Support Services Review Policy

Accreditation by external bodies is considered as part of the service annual review as appropriate. Services involved in thematic reviews will be identified by SQAC.

3. Types of Review
There are two types of review: annual review and thematic review.

3.1 Annual Review

What is annual review?	3.1.1	Annual quality assurance (QA) review is the process for monitoring of and reflecting on services activities in relation to the student experience. Annual review takes the form of an annual QA report.
Which services participate?	3.1.2	All services which have been identified by the SQAC as part of the Quality Assurance Framework are subject to annual review.
What is the reporting period?	3.1.3	The reporting period is the previous academic year (from 1 September to 31 August).
Reporting submission to the sub-committee	3.1.4	All services selected submit a report to the SQAC sub-committee.
	3.1.5	When recommendations have been made to a service, actions taken and progress made towards their completion should be included in the report.
Guidance on annual (QA) report completion	3.1.6	A report template and guidance on the annual review process is available on the Student Support Services Annual Review web page.

3.2 Thematic review

What is thematic review?	3.2.1	Thematic Review is the process for reviewing the quality of the student experience in relation to a particular theme or aspect of student support, rather than an individual service or academic area.
	3.2.2	The aim of Thematic Review is to identify and analyse areas of good practice and areas for enhancement across student support in relation to a select category of student experience or 'theme'. The approach aims to take an overview of strategy, services and user experiences pursuant to a particular theme that cuts across

many areas of the University, in relation to both
support services and academic areas.
Thematic Review Guidance

4. Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC) Sub-Committee

I.   Remit

i.   To monitor and review the quality of the student support services, by
consideration of the outcomes of the services' annual quality assurance reports
(including external accreditation where appropriate).

ii.   To commend and disseminate areas of good practice arising from reports and
reviews.

iii.   To make recommendations aimed at enhancing the student experience.

iv.   To ensure matters of strategic development and institutional priorities are
considered, including alignment with the Service Expectation Review.

II.   Governance

i.   The sub-committee acts with delegated authority from the SQAC to monitor and
review the quality of the student experience in relation to their use of the Student
Support Services.

ii.   The sub-committee reports the outcomes from its monitoring and review activity
on an annual basis to SQAC.

iii.   The sub-committee identifies themes for consideration by SQAC for future
thematic review.

iv.   Sub-committee members are responsible for communicating the outcomes of the
Student Support Services annual review process, as appropriate, for discussion
of recommendations which have implications for their Schools/Support Service.
Sub-committee members will report to SQAC, via the sub-committee, on actions
taken.

III.   Composition

Convener: The Convener of SQAC or his/her delegate
Vice-Convener: The Vice-Convener of SQAC or his/her delegate
The University Secretary or his/her delegate
College Deans of Quality
College Deans of Students
Edinburgh University Students' Association (Students' Association) nominee

External Member*
Heads of Services (or their representatives) submitting reports
Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services (in attendance)

* The External Member will be nominated by the University Secretary and will serve for a period of three years. The external member will be from a comparator institution and have appropriate experience of student support services.

IV.   Operation

i.   The sub-committee holds two meetings each year, to consider the service annual reports and to explore common themes arising from annual reports.

~~31.05.17~~
18 March 2023

Student Support Service Annual Reviews: Guidance on reporting process

THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Purpose of Guidance

This document provides guidance for the role of reader of Student Support Service annual quality assurance reports and sets out the key stages in the review process.

Scope: Guidance is not Mandatory

Members of the Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC) Sub-Committee.
Heads of Student Support Services participating in annual review.

Contact Officer	~~Susan Hunter~~ Brian Connolly	Academic Policy ~~Officer~~Manager	~~susan.hunter5@ed.ac.uk~~ b.connolly@ed.ac.uk

Document control

Dates	Approved: 2014/15	Starts: 2014/15	Equality impact assessment: 17.07.14	Amendments: ~~22.11.16~~ 18.05.2023	Next Review: ~~2019/20~~ 2023-24
Approving authority	Senate Quality Assurance Committee				
Consultation undertaken					
Section responsible for guidance maintenance & review	Academic Services				
Related policies, procedures, guidelines & regulations	Student Support Service Annual Report Template Student Support Service Review Policy				
UK Quality Code	~~UK Quality Code Chapter B4, Enabling Student Development and Achievement~~ Advice and guidance: Monitoring and Evaluation				
Guidance superseded by this guidance	Guidance for Lead Readers and Additional Readers (3 November 2014)				
Alternative format	If you require this document in an alternative format please email Academic.Services@ed.ac.uk				
Keywords	internal review, quality assurance, QA, student support service, annual monitoring, SSSAR, student support service annual report				

Student Support Service Annual Reviews: Guidance on reporting process

1. The role of Reader of Student Support Service annual reports

Every Student Support Service included within the framework will be allocated two readers who each produce a feedback report on the service's annual report. All readers are members of the Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC) Sub-Committee (afterwards referred to as 'the sub-committee').

Readers are asked to provide a concise report, including promising practice for dissemination and areas for the service to consider for further development. As the annual review reports are linked to the University Service Expectation Review, readers are also asked to focus on the quality of service delivery when considering their feedback reports.
The list of readers is available under "Policy and guidance" at:
www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/quality/monitoringandreview/sssqaf

2. Reporting process

Student support services submit their annual reports to Academic Services by the date advised. The support service reports include an update on progress with recommendations from the previous year.

Reports are considered by Readers who are members of the sub-committee.

- **Academic Services** allocates two readers to each student support service report annually and sends the reports to the allocated readers as soon as they are available.

- **Readers** consider key themes arising from the report, including identifying promising practice for wider dissemination, and areas for further development on which the committee may base recommendations to the service. Readers are provided with a report template by Academic Services. Feedback reports are not published as open documents.

- **Readers** submit their reports separately to Academic Services by the deadline notified by Academic Services.

- **Academic Services** produces a composite report including all areas of good practice and areas for development identified by Readers. This is circulated to attendees of the Readers' Meeting prior to the meeting to inform discussion on themes for full sub-committee. Draft recommendations are circulated to Service Directors for comment.

- Service reports are discussed at the **sub-committee Readers Meeting**. The sub-committee then agrees on the recommendations and commendations

arising from the reports and identifies themes for discussion at the full sub-committee meeting.

- **Support service directors** are invited to comment on recommendations prior to the final report to SQAC.

- All sub-committee members (Readers and Heads of Services) are invited to attend the **full sub-committee meeting**, which discusses common themes arising from the annual reports.

- **Academic Services** prepares the final report, including recommendations to the services, for SQAC following the full sub-committee meeting. The final report is approved by the ~~Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance~~ Vice-Principal, Students (Enhancements) before submission to SQAC.

- On approval of the report by SQAC, **Academic Services** confirms the recommendations and promising practice to the relevant services, disseminates promising practice as appropriate, and transmits any actions identified for the wider University to the appropriate quarter.

3. **Meetings**

There are two meetings annually, the **readers' meeting** and the **full sub-committee meeting**. Meeting dates are published online:
www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/quality/monitoringandreview/sssqaf

Readers attend the readers' meeting where themes arising from feedback reports are identified for discussion at the full sub-committee meeting.

The **full sub-committee meeting** discusses the themes arising from reports and identifies any actions for specific areas of the wider University. Actions identified should be targeted and achievable.

4. **Further information**

Further information on Student Support Service annual reviews can be found at:

www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/quality/monitoringandreview/sssqaf

~~31.05.17~~
18 March 2023

The University of Edinburgh
Senate Quality Assurance Committee

18 May 2023

Annual review of effectiveness of Senate Standing Committees

Description of paper
1. This paper notifies Committee members of plans for the annual review of Senate Committees' effectiveness.

Action requested / recommendation
2. Committee members are asked to **note and provide comments on the plans for the review, and to engage with opportunities to provide feedback on the committees' functioning and effectiveness.**

Background and context
3. The 2017 version of the Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance states that institutions are expected to review the effectiveness of their Senate and its committees annually and to hold an externally-facilitated review every five years: "49. The governing body is expected to review its own effectiveness each year and to undertake an externally facilitated evaluation of its own effectiveness and that of its committees, including size and composition of membership, at least every five years. As part of these processes or separately, the effectiveness of the academic board (also known as Senate, Senatus Academicus or academic council) is expected to be reviewed similarly. These reviews should be reported upon appropriately within the Institution and outside. Externally facilitated reviews should be held following any period of exceptional change or upheaval (allowing suitable time to see the effects of changes made), the usual timetable for externally facilitated review being brought forward if necessary in these circumstances."

4. In line with the requirements of the Code, during Spring/Summer 2023, Academic Services is conducting an annual review of the three Senate Standing Committees. The outcomes of this review will be reported to Senate in September / October 2023.

5. Actions identified in the previous annual effectiveness review are noted in Appendix 2.

Discussion

6. The review process is intended to gather information on and evaluate effectiveness in terms of the:
    a. Composition of the committee
    b. Support and facilitation of committee meetings
    c. Engagement of members and knowledge and understanding of their roles and committee remits

d. Impact and strategic relevance of Senate Committees' work

7. The review process will be primarily self-reflective and will gather information as described below:

    a. **Quality and Assurance Committee members are asked to submit written comments to sinead.docherty@ed.ac.uk**

    b. Senate Committee members will also be invited to respond to an online questionnaire during summer 2023 (managed by Academic Services). Draft questions are appended below.

    c. The Committee Convener and Secretary will review committee coverage of Postgraduate Research Student business.

8. Academic Services will collate the information above and produce a report on the findings.

Resource implications

9. The review will be conducted by Academic Services and any resource requirements will be met from existing budgets. The resource implications of any actions identified in response to the outcomes of the review will be considered at that stage.

Risk management

10. The annual effectiveness review process assists the University in ensuring that its academic governance arrangements are effective and enables the University to manage a range of risks associated with its academic provision.

Equality & diversity

11. The review provides an opportunity to identify any equality and diversity issues in the make-up of the Committees and the way they conduct their business.

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

12. The report will be presented to Senate and the Senate Standing Committees in September / October 2023. If the review identifies required actions or enhancement opportunities, these will be taken forward by Academic Service (if directly related to the functioning and support of the Senate Committees) or referred to the appropriate body for consideration.

Author
Academic Services
10 May 2023

Freedom of Information
Open

Appendix 1

Senate Standing Committees: Internal Effectiveness Review 2022-23

Draft questions for Summer 2023 survey

Members of the Senate Committees will be invited to fill in an online questionnaire during Summer 2023 and the draft questions for this exercise are set out below for comment. This is the same question set used in the last three Senate committee reviews.

1. **Committee remit**
   1.1. Is the Committee's remit clear? If not, what improvements would you suggest?
   1.2. Is the scope of the remit appropriate?
   1.3. Has the Committee adapted effectively to the challenges or changes in priority?
   1.4. Are you happy with your Committee's use of task groups?
2. **Governance and impact**
   2.1. Do you have a clear understanding of how the Committee fits into the academic governance framework of the University?
   2.2. Do you feel that the Committee makes the desired impact based on its remit and priorities?
   2.3. Are there clear links between Committee business and University strategic priorities?
3. **Composition**
   3.1. Do you think that the current composition of the Committee enables it to fulfil its remit?
   3.2. Is the size of the Committee appropriate in order for it to operate effectively?
4. **Equality and Diversity**
   4.1. Is the composition of the Committee suitably representative of the diverse University population?
   4.2. Are you satisfied that equality and diversity considerations are adequately addressed when discussing Committee business?
5. **Committee members – Role clarity and participation**
   5.1. Are you clear on your role and responsibilities as a Committee member?
   5.2. If this is not clear, do you have any suggestions on how to improve this?
   5.3. If you were a new member in 2022/23, were you satisfied with the induction you were given to the Committee and its business?
   5.4. Is lack of engagement by members ever an impediment to the Committee?
   5.5. Does anything create a barrier to your engagement with the Committee?
6. **Stakeholder Engagement and Communications**
   6.1. Does the Committee engage and communicate effectively with stakeholders? (For example, is the Senate Committees' Newsletter an effective vehicle?)
   6.2. Do you have a clear understanding of your role on the Committee as a representative of your College or Group?

6.3. Do you have a clear understanding of your role in cascading information from the Committee to your College or Group?

7. **Committee support**

7.1. Do you feel that the Committee is supported effectively by Academic Services?

7.2. Does the information provided to the Committee (in format and volume) support effective decision-making by the Committee?

7.3. Do papers provide you with appropriate levels of detail on the background of issues brought to the Committee, and on how Committee decisions will be implemented?

Appendix 2

Due to the low number of respondents to the Effectiveness Review in 2021/22, a combined analysis of the answers to the review questions provided by all of Senate's Standing Committees suggested the following recommended actions:

Area Under Review	Recommended Action	Responsible	Date
Remit	1. Committees to consider the appropriateness of their remit in addition to overlap with, and links to, other Senate Standing Committees, and to feed their views into the externally-facilitated review.	Committee Conveners Standing Committees Supported by Committee Administrators	Ongoing throughout 2022/23
Composition	2. The expansion of Standing Committee membership to include three elected academic Senate members to each Standing Committee. Senate approved the change of composition and process, with new members expected to join Committees in time for the second cycle of Committees.	Senate Clerk Committee Administrators Committee Conveners.	November 2022
Governance & Impact	3. An external effectiveness review of Senate will take place in 2022/23, and as part of this review the effectiveness of the relationship between Senate, its committees, and the wider University governance structure will be considered. 4. The Convener's Forum will be asked to consider how it can support enhancement of communication between Standing Committee's particularly around items of common business.	Standing Committees members are asked to engage with the external effectiveness review as and when required Convener's Forum Committee Conveners	All: ongoing throughout 2022/23

	5. Each committee to consider more effective use of short-life working groups	Committee Administrators	
EDI	6. Each committee to give proactive consideration of EDI for all papers/discussion and decision making.	Standing Committees Committee Conveners Committee Administrators	Ongoing throughout 2022/23
	7. Committee Convener's will be considering how to respond to a motion approved at Senate on 12 October: *Each committee convener is expected to propose for approval by the Senate Exception Committee and/or next Senate Meeting reasonable additions to their committee to improve BAME, student, and trade union representation.*	Committee Conveners	By the next meeting of Senate
Role	8. Academic Services and the Convener to continue offering effective induction for members and to implement improvements to approaches where possible.	Committee Conveners Committee Administrators	Ongoing throughout 2022/23
Communications	9. A Senate Committees' Newsletter will be reintroduced from 2022 onwards. The newsletter will inform the University community of discussions and decisions taken at Senate and its Standing Committees.	Committee Administrators	The first newsletter is expected to be published in December 2022, with further newsletters to align with the cycle of Committee business.

<u>The University of Edinburgh</u>
Senate Quality Assurance Committee

18 May 2023

Annual Monitoring and Internal Periodic Review Themes 2021-22:
University Level Actions

Description of paper
1. This paper updates the Committee on University level actions agreed in response to issues identified as areas for further development in School Annual Quality Reports 2021-22 and themes that emerged from Internal Periodic Reviews held in 2021-22.

Action requested / recommendation
2. For information.

Background and context
3. Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC) approved actions at University level in response to issues identified as areas for further development in School Annual Quality Reports 2021-22 (at the September 2022 SQAC meeting) and themes that emerged from teaching/postgraduate programme reviews held in 2021-22 (at the September 2021 SQAC meeting).

Discussion
4. See paper below.

Resource implications
5. Resource implications are considered as part of each action.

Risk management
6. Ensuring that students and staff are confident that the University listens to and acts on their comments and feedback is essential to ensuring their engagement with quality processes. This report represents an element of the feedback loop from the central University level to the local School and College levels.

Equality & diversity

7. The actions encompass equality and diversity issues.

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

8. Academic Services will inform relevant areas.

<u>**Author**</u>

Brian Connolly

Academic Services

<u>**Presenter**</u>

Brian Connolly

Academic Services

Freedom of Information

Open

The University of Edinburgh
Senate Quality Assurance Committee

Annual Monitoring and Internal Periodic Review Themes 2020/21: University Level Actions

The following responses were received in relation to issues raised in the reports and reviews 2021-22:

Area for Further Development	Update
Extensions and Special Circumstances (ESC) - the significant increase in students seeking extensions and special circumstances in the recent period is an increasing cause of concern across the Schools and Deaneries, in particular leading to knock-on effects in delays for marking and feedback turnaround times. Concerns were also raised about potential issues with communication between the recently developed central ESC system and local course teams in Schools making it difficult to manage expectations and local communications with students.	In response to significant dissatisfaction with the Extensions and Special Circumstances (ESC) system the Deputy Secretary Students set up the **ESC Review** to seek service improvements and the Senate Academic Regulations and Policy Committee (ARPC) established the **Coursework Extension and Special Circumstances Task Group** to review associated policies. The ESC Review team has consulted with Schools and Deaneries to understand the issues relating to ESC and to understand what is working well/not so well in relation to the ESC Service, specifically in relation to systems, processes, guidance and communications. The Task Group included key stakeholders from across the University to ensure consideration of a wide range of views and experiences. University policies on coursework extensions and special circumstances were last reviewed prior to the launch of the ESC Service. The centralisation of the system has provided an opportunity to reflect on the type and volume of coursework extension and special circumstances applications received, the challenges that the existing policies present, and provides opportunities to target and develop support for students in areas they find difficult. A clear theme of the consultation process to date has been that the existing policies and associated workload across the University community are

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unsustainable. Another theme to emerge from the consultation was the need for compromise from stakeholders in order to arrive at a policy position to address key themes of concern and meet the needs of staff and student communities.

The final recommendations of the ESC Review and Task Group will be presented to ARPC at the meeting due to be held on 25 May 2023.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resourcing - a number of issues were grouped under a broad theme of resourcing including estates/space, IT/systems, and staff workload/welfare. As the University returned to campus and 'business as usual', reports noted difficulties accessing suitable teaching and office space particularly given the move towards new ways of hybrid working and the expansion of various professional service teams (due to the new student support approach). Reports also noted issues arising from the EUCLID system 'going down' at key times (e.g. welcome week and awards publication) and the knock-on effects of certain publication dates (particularly on Fridays). It was noted that these resource issues exacerbated existing concerns in relation to staffing and workload pressures and there is a need to consider these holistically.</td>
<td>The Size and Shape Working Group, convened by the Principal, is exploring the impact of size and shape planning on the student experience and staff workload. The intention is to strike a balance between clarity of intent for planning purposes whilst retaining flexibility. Consideration is being given to the importance of building in accommodation and transport considerations, the changing geopolitical environment and concentration risk, supporting and embedding equality, diversity and inclusion and using market insight to inform our offer. The work of the group has been split into two initial Phases, with full-time on-campus undergraduate and postgraduate students (who form the majority of the student population) the focus of the first phase. A Strategic Performance Framework has been approved, including two key performance indicators (KPIs) focused on student population: (1) Widening participation: Number (and proportion) of undergraduate entrants from an SIMD0-20 area; International student diversity: Ratio of largest overseas market to 5th and 10th largest overseas markets. The University maintains close engagement with the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) and Scottish Government on controlled subject expectations and non-controlled undergraduate places expectations, as well as upskilling.

Student Systems Operations, Student Systems Partnership, and IS Applications Management have taken a number of steps in response to systems issues:

Database tuning to improve the performance of APT for large classes
Google Analytics added to pages in APT and student view to better understand usage patterns and identify areas for further improvement after monitoring over peak periods
</td>
</tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>

- The data source for most BI reports (EUGEX) was moved to the same database schema as EUCLID to reduce delays and improve reliability of BI report data
- BI report performance improved by moving ESC special circumstances data to materialised views which refresh every two hours (actioned June 2021)
- Changed the source of the data feeding student view of their assessments in EUCLID from being the same as the APT pages to pull from a read only database to reduce database load, improve APT performance at publication deadline, and reduce risk of student pages (or even all of EUCLID) crashing at publication deadline

Most of this was in place for last summer's award deadline, but unfortunately we had moved servers without sufficient memory having being added to the new servers, which meant we saw issues again (though not for the same reasons). We have come through the semester one results deadline unscathed, with our highest ever volume of results published on a single day, so are hopeful that we'll see the real benefit in the summer.

We also have a method of locking students out of EUCLID during the morning of the award deadline to reduce the load where absolutely necessary, though hope we won't need to use that again.
</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Campus Transition - Schools and Deaneries reported concerns that student on-campus lecture/class attendance remained relatively low compared to pre-pandemic levels. While the return to on-campus teaching was broadly welcomed, reports noted specific challenges related to teaching on-campus when Covid cases are high. It was also suggested that some students may be unused to on-campus teaching and may have struggled to attend</td>
<td>In accordance with the University general degree regulations students are expected to attend all teaching and assessment events associated with all courses that they are enrolled on. During the COVID-19 pandemic, teaching and learning at the University moved online and then to a hybrid model as restrictions were lifted. For 2022/23 most undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes returned to in-person teaching on campus. However, many programmes and courses will retain a digital element and the University continues to offer online postgraduate degrees. The Edinburgh Futures Institute also offers an approach called 'fusion' teaching on most of its taught postgraduate programmes where students can</td>
</tr>
</table>

for personal reasons and that some have adjusted to online provision and may prefer this mode of delivery for reasons of increased flexibility or accessibility.	choose when to learn on-campus and when to learn online. The University also provides academic support for students via the Institute for Academic Development and the Health and Wellbeing Services provide a range of services to support students' physical and mental wellbeing.
Student Voice Policy - the first year of operation of the new Policy, with a move from centralised to localised management of course feedback (in response to requests from Schools/Deaneries) was welcomed, but it was acknowledged that this increased flexibility had created additional work for Schools. Schools took varying approaches to implementation with a number of Schools taking a School-wide approach. Further monitoring will continue to ensure effective approaches are taken in Schools and effective approaches are shared. Some Schools also queried how locally managed course evaluation data could be used as benchmarked evidence of excellence in teaching.	A new approach to course level feedback was implemented in 2021/22 academic year following the change from centrally managed Course Enhancement Questionnaires (CEQs) to locally managed course evaluation. The rationale for the new model was to give ownership of course level feedback to Schools, enabling local areas to gather feedback according to their own (and their students) requirements and allow for closer staff-student interaction, while in alignment with the revised Student Voice Policy. A toolkit to support development of feedback mechanisms was developed centrally to support staff. Initial studies have been undertaken with both staff and students to understand the success of this approach, and further information has been gathered through quality assurance processes (reported earlier). The student guide on giving feedback has been reviewed as part of our work on the Enhancement Theme. Through this review, we realised that another version for postgraduate research students was needed and this was subsequently developed. The updated guides are available on the University's website. Additional resources both relating to feedback mechanisms, and analysis and closing the feedback loop are being developed as required in response to initial feedback. At institutional level, Pulse Surveys continued to run, although reduced in frequency to October, December, February and April. The Pulse Survey is under review but it is likely it will be continued in some form while we remain in a transition period until there is development of a broader institutional survey. It continues to provide a useful barometer of student satisfaction across the academic year.

A light touch study was undertaken with the Student Panel to understand their views on Student Voice activity (course and institutional) in more depth. Outcomes will shape the future direction of the Pulse Survey for 2022/23, and future student voice activity. A holistic review of Student Voice activity is currently on-going.

The University continues to operate a Programme Representative system, delivered in partnership with the Students' Association, supporting approximately 1400 volunteer student representatives. All Programme Representatives continue to receive a two-part online training and induction package, consisting of an asynchronous self-study module, followed by a live, interactive training workshop delivered by staff within the Students' Association's Student Voice team. In 2021/22, 71.6% of Programme Representative completed both elements of the training, with 74.6% completing the self-study module and 84.4% attending a live training session. The Students' Association continues to provide on-going training and development opportunities for Programme Representatives, through the workshop calendar for volunteer student leaders, as well as access to multiple reward and recognition schemes, from HEAR recognition to the Edinburgh Award for Student Leadership, and for the first time this year, the nationally-recognised Saltire Award.

The Academic Representation Forum on MS Teams, which brought together Programme and elected School Representatives, allowing them to share and escalate feedback, continued to be well-used, although, as-expected, engagement did drop-off as in-person activity returned over the course of the academic year. In 2022/23 the Student Voice team will be introducing a Student Voice Forum, also on MS Teams, which will bring Programme Representatives together with the Students' Association's full cohort of over 90 Elected Representatives, responding to feedback from student representatives that they would like the opportunity to engage with a broader range of non-academic activity, particularly around inclusivity and sustainability.

	In 2021/22, the Student Voice team also reviewed the handover process for Programme Representatives, and the more streamlined approach resulted in 46.7% of student representatives completing their handover documents. These documents, which highlight ongoing issues and key contacts, will be made immediately available to new Programme Representatives in 2022/23 as part of their induction, ensuring that student representatives are able to make an efficient and effective start in their roles.
Staff support and development (11 recommendations across six reviews). Recommendations covered: guidance, training and support for postgraduate tutors and demonstrators; and fora for sharing practice	A working group has been established, led by the Institute for Academic Development (IAD), to map training across the University and examine options for an effective mechanism to record and monitor training. The working group will consult with a newly established Tutors and Demonstrators (T&D) Network and then make recommendations to a new T&D Oversight Group. The T&D Network has been formed with representatives from all Schools and Human Resources (HR). It will be expanded to include other services as well as University and College Union (UCU) representation. So far it has 94 members from all Schools and Deaneries, including School managers and academic leaders as well as the trainers and those involved with administration of T&D. This forum will act as a sounding board for policies, enable exchange of good practice, share problems and liaise better with the services. The T&D Oversight Group has also been convened to act as a governance body for the T&D Network and to report to the ELIR Oversight Group and Senate Quality Assurance Committee. The Group includes representatives from across the three Colleges, the Doctoral College, IAD, HR, and Academic Services. Tutor and Demonstrator representatives will join the group once identified.
Equality, diversity and inclusion (nine recommendations across six reviews). Recommendations related to attainment gaps	We continue to widen access to students from underrepresented and disadvantaged groups across Scotland and the rest of the UK. Year on year, we are consistently achieving our targets in Scotland. As part of our ambition to

(including using data to understand and address these gaps), widening participation, and accessibility requirements.	establish more pathways into the University of Edinburgh for a more diverse student body we have begun new college partnerships and access routes (Articulation from Edinburgh College to MSC Health in Social Science) as well as new SWAP college routes for adult learners to Medicine and Veterinary Medicine (Scotland Widening Access Programme). We recognise the challenges that the last few years have brought for students and have done all we can to mitigate for that within our admissions processes. We had a dedicated helpline for students on results day and rang all those who had received widening access offers with us to congratulate them on their offer and to offer any support and guidance with next steps. For 2023 entry we have also made changes to our contextual admissions criteria in order to address the underrepresentation from state school students, with a particular focus on students from the rest of the UK – recognising that the levels of underrepresentation in our own student body lies within those students coming from the rest of the UK outside of Scotland. The Equality Data Monitoring Research Committee (EDMARC) will also be reinstated, with refreshed membership and terms of reference, to monitor staff and student population data with respect to protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010.

<u>The University of Edinburgh</u>
Senate Quality Assurance Committee

18 May 2023

Terms of Reference and Membership 2023/24

Description of paper:
1. This paper notes the Committee's Terms of Reference and Membership for 2023-24.

Action requested / recommendation:
2. For information.

Background and context:
3. Presented to the Committee annually for information and reference.

Discussion:
4. The Committee is invited to note the Terms of Reference and Membership, with particular attention to the Terms of Office due to end during the summer period.

Resource implications:
5. Resource implications would be considered as part of any proposed actions in relation to the Committee priorities.

Risk management:
6. Risks will be considered as part of any proposed actions in relation to the Committee priorities.

Equality & diversity:
7. Equality and diversity will be integral to the Committee's work.

Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action agreed:
8. Committee Secretary will feedback comments to relevant areas.

Author	**Presenter**
Sinead Docherty,	**Sinead Docherty,**
Academic Services	Academic Services
May 2023	

Freedom of Information: Open

Terms of Reference and Membership 2023/24

1. Purpose and Role

1.1 The Quality Assurance Committee is responsible, on behalf of Senate, for the framework which assures standards and enhances the quality of the student learning experience.

2. Remit

2.1 Oversee the delivery and enhancement of the University's quality assurance framework, ensuring that it meets external requirements.

2.2 In partnership with Edinburgh University Students' Association, ensure effective student engagement and representation of student voices in the University's quality framework.

2.3 Maintain oversight of the outcomes of the quality assurance framework, ensuring that actions are addressed, and support the sharing of good practice.

2.4 Promote the quality assurance framework as an important part of the University's activities and ensure that the outcomes inform relevant University business.

2.5 Support the University's engagement with external quality requirements and activities, including: Enhancement-Led Institutional Review, the UK Quality Code, and responses to consultations and initiatives.

2.6 Identify areas for innovation and enhancement of the student experience and ensure that these inform Senate Education Committee's policy development.

2.7 Consider the implications of the Committee's work and its decisions in the context of external initiatives and compliance and legal frameworks, particularly in relation to equality and diversity.

2.8 In relation to academic collaborations with partner institutions: maintain oversight of development, approval, monitoring and review / renewal processes; receive annual reports on activity and identify any areas where action is required to maintain academic standards and the quality of the student experience.

3. Operation

3.1 The Committee reports to Senate, acting with delegated authority to take decisions in the area of quality assurance and academic standards.

3.2 The Committee may bring matters to the attention of the University Executive as required.

3.3 The Committee has the following sub-committees:

- Student Support Service Sub-Committee - with delegated authority for monitoring the quality assurance of student support services in relation to the student learning experience
- School Annual Quality Report Sub Group - with delegated authority to review reports and prepare recommendations for consideration by the Committee

3.4 The Committee will meet at least four times each academic year and will interact electronically as necessary.

3.5 The Committee will follow a schedule of business set prior to the start of the academic year which is agreed through consultation with Senate, the Conveners of the other Senate Committees, and other relevant members of the community.

3.6 From time to time, the Committee will establish working groups or commission individuals to carry out detailed work under the Committee's oversight.

4. Composition

Role	Term	2023/24 Membership
Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance		Professor Tina Harrison, Academic Standards and Quality Assurance (Convener)
An external member from within the Scottish Higher Education sector with experience in quality assurance	3 years (with no reappointment until 4 years has elapsed)	**TBC** (The term of Professor Leigh Sparks, Deputy Principal, University of Stirling expires July 2023)
College Deans of Quality (or equivalent)		Professor Matthew Bailey, Dean of Quality (CMVM) Dr Paul Norris, Dean of Quality Assurance and Curriculum Approval (CAHSS) Professor Linda Kirstein, Dean of Education Quality Assurance and Culture (CSE)
1 x member of staff from each College with experience of and an interest in quality assurance at a School level		Dr Gail Duursma, Director of Quality, School of Engineering (CSE) **TBC** (CMVM) **TBC** (CAHSS)
3 x elected member of Senate		**TBC** (results of Senate elections not yet announced)
1 x Edinburgh University Students' Association sabbatical officer		**TBC**
1 x member of the Edinburgh University Students' Association permanent staff		Callum Paterson, Edinburgh University Students' Association Academic Engagement Coordinator
1 x member of staff from the Institute for Academic Development		Olivia Eadie, Co-Director, Institute for Academic Development
1 x member of staff from the Doctoral College		Professor Laura Bradley Dean of Postgraduate Research (CAHSS)

1 x member of staff from Academic Services		Brian Connolly, Head of Quality Assurance and Enhancement, Academic Services
Up to 3 co-options chosen by the Convenor	Up to 3 years	Marianne Brown, Head of Student Analytics, Insights and Modelling

4.1 The Convenor can invite individuals for specific meetings or agenda items.

4.2 Substitutions of members (i.e. due to inability to attend) will be at the discretion of the Convenor of the Committee.

5. Responsibilities and Expectations of Committee Members

5.1 Be collegial and constructive in approach.

5.2 Attend regularly and participate fully in the work of the Committee and its task / working groups. This will involve looking ahead and consulting / gathering input in order to provide the broad spectrum of thoughts and opinions which are necessary for proper consideration of the area being discussed.

5.3 Take collective and individual ownership for the issues under the Committee's remit and for the discussion and resolution of these issues. In taking ownership of the work of the Committee, members must take steps to ensure that they are empowered to take decisions on behalf of academic and managerial colleagues.

5.4 Be committed to communicating the work of the Committee to the wider University community.