

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

**Meeting to be held on Wednesday 18 September 2019
at 2pm in the Elder Room, Old College**

A G E N D A

1. **Welcome and Apologies**
2. **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 23 May 2019 and the electronic meeting conducted between Monday 19 and Monday 26 August 2019** SQAC 19/20 1A
SQAC 19/20 1B
3. **Matters Arising**
For Discussion
4. School Annual Quality Reports 2018-19
 - Sub Group Report SQAC 19/20 1C
 - Good Practice SQAC 19/20 1D
5. Internal Periodic Review Themes 2018-19 SQAC 19/20 1E
6. Thematic Review:
 - 2018-19 Final Report SQAC 19/20 1F
 - 2017-18 Progress Update SQAC 19/20 1G
7. Students' Association Priorities 2019-20 SQAC 19/20 1H
8. Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC):
Operational Guidance & Escalation of issues SQAC 19/20 1I
- Workshop**
9. ELIR Activity (30 minute workshop session) Activity
- For Information and Formal Business**
10. Terms of Reference, Senate Committees Members' Guidance and Committee Priorities 2019-20 SQAC 19/20 1J
11. Scottish Funding Council Annual Report 2018-19 SQAC 19/20 1K
12. Enhancement Themes Institutional Plan SQAC 19/20 1L
13. Internal Periodic Review Reports and Responses SQAC 19/20 1M
14. Positive Outcomes from Internal Periodic Review 2017/18 SQAC 19/20 1N
15. [Higher Education in Apprenticeships - Characteristics Statement](#)

H/02/28/02

16. SRUC Enhancement-led Institutional Review report
[Outcome report](#)
[Technical report](#)
17. Personal Tutor (PT) System Oversight Group SQAC 19/20 10
18. Knowledge Strategy Committee SQAC 19/20 1P
19. **Any Other Business**
20. **Date of Next Meeting:** Thursday 5 December 2019, 2pm, Torridon Room, Charles Stewart House

The University of Edinburgh
Senate Quality Assurance Committee

**Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 23 May 2019
at 2pm in the Raeburn Room, Old College**

Present:

Professor Tina Harrison (Convener)	Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance
Dr Shereen Benjamin	Associate Dean (Quality Assurance) College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences
Megan Brown	Academic Engagement Coordinator, Edinburgh University Students' Association
Brian Connolly	Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services
Dr Gail Duursma	School Representative (Engineering), College of Science and Engineering
Dr Katherine Inglis	School Representative (Literatures, Languages and Cultures), College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences
Nichola Kett	Head of Quality Assurance and Enhancement Team, Academic Services
Dr Linda Kirstein	Dean of Education Quality Assurance and Culture, College of Science and Engineering
Sarah McAllister	Head of Operations & Projects & Assistant Director, Institute for Academic Development
Diva Mukherji	Vice President (Education), Students' Association
Dr Claire Phillips	Dean of Quality Assurance, College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine
Present:	
Dr Andrew Horrell	Deputy Director for Undergraduate Studies, The Moray House School of Education
Ros Claase	Design Lead, Student Support and Personal Tutor Review, Service Excellence Programme
Gillian Mackintosh	Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services
Apologies:	
Brian Green	Deputy Associate Principal (Learning & Teaching), University of Strathclyde
Lisa Dawson	Director of Student Systems and Administration

Dr Jeni Harden

School Representative (School of Molecular, Genetic and Population Health Sciences), College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine

1. **Welcome and Apologies**

The Convenor welcomed Dr Andrew Horrell attending to present on Paper D and Ros Claise attending to present on item 12.

2. **Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 25 April 2019**

The Committee approved the minutes of the previous meeting with the following amendments:

- The minute relating to the External Examiner Taught Policy Review: conflicts of interest section should also refer to Colleges reporting on exceptions to qualifications and expertise.
- Megan Brown's title should read Academic Engagement Coordinator

3. **Conveners Communications**

The Convener updated the Committee following a recent meeting Professor Dorothy Miell, Head of the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (CAHSS) on streamlining Internal Periodic Reviews within the College. Academic Services and colleagues in the College Office are reviewing where there are opportunities to move towards a single School Teaching Programme Review for all Undergraduate programmes in every School in CAHSS. This will be discussed at the College Planning and Resources Committee on 28 May.

Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) preparation is progressing well with next steps focussing on drafting the reflective analysis. Academic Services will be contacting colleagues in due course to ask for contribution of content. There will be an opportunity for colleagues to comment on the draft report. The Convener highlighted that we are keen to ensure that the report reflects the diversity and good practice that exists across Schools and that this is incorporated throughout the report where appropriate.

It was discussed that it may be useful for ELIR to be included as a standing item on College and School Committee agendas for information.

Academic Services are working with Communications and Marketing to discuss effective ways of promoting ELIR as part of wider communications around enhancing the student experience. However suggestions of effective ways of engaging staff and students in the preparations would be welcomed.

4. **Matters Arising**

Scotland's Rural College (SRUC) Accreditation Committee:

At the meeting on 25 April it was discussed whether it may be appropriate for the accreditation process to be overseen at University level rather than College level. It was agreed that the Dean of Education Quality Assurance and Culture to discuss at College level and report back to the Committee.

Dr Kirstein reported that the College have recommended that the accreditation process should be overseen at University level, particularly if there is growing engagement with the College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine.

It was noted that the development of a new Memorandum of Agreement requires University level support and it would be helpful to instigate a discussion on this part of the process as soon as possible in preparation for next year's accreditation.

Action: Academic Services to discuss the governance process involved in moving the SRUC accreditation oversight to University level.

Directors of Quality Strategic Development Sessions

The outcomes of the sessions will be sent to School Directors of Quality with a short survey to seek feedback on the sessions and suggestions for future sessions.

Widening Participation (WP) data.

At the meeting on 27 February 2019, the Committee considered the Annual College Quality Reports. The Colleges raised concerns that WP data may not be readily available.

It is anticipated that the data will be available once the new data dashboards are rolled out. Colleagues are asked to review the data at that point and to follow up with the Head of Student Surveys and Data to discuss any concerns.

For Discussion

5. Senate Themes for 2019/20 meetings

The Committee discussed a number of suggestions for themes for the Presentation and Discussion sections for Senate in 2019/20. These included: Diversity, Edinburgh Futures Institute - cross curricula initiatives, Staff and Student wellbeing, Staff and Student experience – working together in partnership.

Action: Committee Secretary to forward suggested themes to Senate Secretariat.

6. External Examiners for Taught Programmes Policy

The Committee received the draft policy for approval, following comments received from the Curriculum and Student Progression Committee.

The comments related to the retention schedule seeking reassurance that consideration of part-time students had been taken into account in approving a five year timeframe.

The Committee **approved** the Policy subject to paragraph numbers to be checked and the wording in section 21 to correspond with the title of the chapter.

7. Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) escalation of issues project

The Committee discussed proposals to explore different approaches to escalating issues that cannot be addressed within SSLCs. The Convener thanked Dr Andrew Horrell for preparing the paper.

It was noted that the main challenges are that the diversity of existing approaches make it difficult to provide clarity in terms of expectations for SSLC roles and the interactions between the SSLC and other University and School committees.

At present there is not a clear or consistent way for issues which are relevant to the student experience but cannot be addressed at programme or School level to be escalated to College or University Committees.

The Committee noted that whilst it is important that a clear process is in place to enable the College and University to be aware of issues, it may not be appropriate to take a mandated approach for each School. It was discussed that it would be useful for Schools to set out their current approach to escalating issues and closing the feedback loop. It was suggested that approach could be set out in a flowchart to provide clarity for both students and staff. The Committee discussed that it would also be helpful to be able to monitor the number of issues being escalated as well as identifying and collating any emerging themes.

The Committee noted that although they agreed with the recommendations in principle they were not supportive of approving that all Schools follow the same approach at this time. It was agreed that the Colleges and Academic Services should work together to explore approaches with Schools.

Action: Academic Services and College Deans to meet in first instance to discuss how to take this forward with Schools.

8. **SSLC Guidance update**

The Committee discussed the proposal to revise the SSLC operational guidance to policy to mandate particular approaches to strengthen the value of SSLCs. The guidance was reviewed as part of the project to explore different approaches to escalating issues that cannot be addressed within SSLCs.

The Committee was not supportive of the proposal to amend the operational guidance to policy. It was agreed to review the wording in the guidance as part of the work with Schools and Colleges on escalating issues. Minor amendments to the guidance will be made to reflect the revised version of the UK Quality Code and consistency of wording in section 7.

Action: Academic Services and College Deans to meet in first instance to discuss how to take this forward with Schools.

9. **Student Voice Policy**

The Committee discussed the Student Voice Policy which has been reviewed to reflect the changes proposed to the SSLC guidance.

In line with outcome from the discussion on items 7 and 8, the Committee agreed that the proposed changes in the SSLC section should not be approved at this time. This will be included as part of the work with Schools and Colleges on escalating issues and reviewing SSLC guidance.

The policy will be updated to reflect the agreement by the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee which recommended that mid-course feedback be encouraged for postgraduate taught courses from September 2019 and that Academic Services consult with Colleges about the proposed introduction. It also recommended that: mid-course feedback should be standard for courses running for 10 weeks or more; guidance on what constitutes mid-course feedback is produced; existing examples of mid-course feedback are shared; and the term mid-course feedback (rather than mid-semester feedback) is used consistently.

The Committee noted that the follow-up evaluation of mid-course feedback and a review of course enhancement questionnaires identified a need to provide clarity for staff and students on the various student voice mechanisms and how they relate to each other.

It was noted that work had begun by Academic Services and the Students' Association to develop a graphically designed visual of the new student representation system. However as

this was still in a transitional phase, this graphic was not shared. All Schools and Deaneries have now confirmed that they will be moving to the new student (programme) representative system from 2019/20. Therefore, the original graphic will be expanded upon and online and hard copy versions shared across the University.

The Committee commented that it would be useful to have more of an understanding of how the Student Panel is advertised and promoted. It was suggested that it may be helpful to promote the Student Panel to School Directors of Quality and Directors of Teaching networks.

Action: Academic Services to amend the Policy to incorporate the changes to mid-course feedback.

Academic Services to request an update on Student Panel from Head of Student Data and Surveys and to circulate to the Committee.

10. Providing Summaries of Student Feedback to School Representatives Pilot update

The Committee received a paper outlining proposals to provide summary reports of student feedback to School Representatives.

Schools will be asked to provide a short contextual overview to accompany the reports which should outline numbers of programmes, students and nature of the cohort.

It is hoped that the availability of the survey reports will help support School Reps in their role and become part of an on-going conversation with the School on activity and initiatives to enhance the student experience.

The Committee **approved** the proposal that survey reports are made available to School Representatives.

11. Thematic Review: 2018-19 initial findings report

The Committee noted the progress update on this year's Thematic Review.

The Committee noted that due to the ELIR there will be no thematic review during 2019/20. At the QAA annual meeting earlier this year, it was suggested that Academic Services would carry out a review to look holistically at learning from thematic reviews in terms of equality and diversity.

For Information and Formal Business

12. Service Excellence Programme: Student Support and Personal Tutoring Project update

Ros Claase, Design Lead, Student Support and Personal Tutor Review, presented an update on the project.

The Committee noted that the project had commenced in April 2019 and included Emma Hunter as Academic Lead. The Vice Principal Students will take on oversight of the project following the departure of the Senior Vice Principal in the autumn.

The project team are gathering information on current practice across the University, involving discussion with students and staff. The project covers all taught provision, at present postgraduate research student support is not in scope.

The Committee noted that it would be useful for the project team to speak with the Senior Tutor Network and the unions. The Committee are encouraged to inform the project team about existing networks that would be useful to speak to.

It was agreed that it would be useful for the Committee to receive a further update in September.

The Committee noted that the School Annual Quality report annual reflections may be useful to the project team.

**Action: Committee Secretary to invite Design Lead to the September meeting.
Committee Secretary to share School Annual Quality Report Sub Group outcomes with Design Lead.
Design Lead to share link to the project SharePoint site.**

13. College Annual Quality Reports : update on actions

The Committee noted the update on actions from the College Quality Reports.

14. ELIR 4 – Outcomes of Reviews

The Committee noted the key themes arising from the recommendations and commendations identified in the first four reviews completed in the ELIR 4 cycle.

15. Internal Review Reports

The Committee **approved** the reports.

16. Any Other Business

The Convener thanked the outgoing Students' Association Vice-President (Education) for her impressive contribution to the work of the Committee.

17. Date of Next Meeting: Thursday 19 September 2019 at 2pm (venue tbc)

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

**Notes of the electronic Senate Quality Assurance Committee meeting conducted from
Monday 19 to Monday 26 August 2019**

NOTES

1. Formal Business

- 1.1 The electronic meeting was conducted to enable the Committee to approve items which did not require substantial discussion in order to provide feedback to schools in a timeous manner.

2. For Approval

2.1 Mid-Course Feedback Guidance

The Committee **approved** the Mid-Course Feedback Guidance requested by Learning and Teaching Committee in May 2019 in response to the follow-up evaluation of mid-course feedback.

2.2 Annual Monitoring, Review and Reporting – Minor Changes

The Committee **approved** the minor changes to Annual Monitoring, Review and Reporting Policy and the College annual quality report template.

2.3 Internal Review Reports and Responses

The Committee **approved** the following Final Reports:

- Postgraduate Programme Review of Edinburgh College of Art (ECA)
- Teaching Programme Review of Engineering
- Teaching Programme Review of Philosophy

The Committee received and noted the following Year on responses 2017/18:

- Teaching Programme Review of Biomedical Sciences
- Teaching Programme Review of Sociology & Sustainable Development
- Student-Led, Individually- Created Courses (SLICCs) Review
- Teaching Programme Review of Medicine (MBChB)

3. For Information

3.1 Enhancement Themes - End of Year 2 Report

The Committee received and noted the University's end of year two report for the Enhancement Theme, Evidence for Enhancement, Improving the Student Experience.

4. Date of Next Meeting:

Wednesday 18 September 2019 at 2pm in the Elder Room, Old College

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

18 September 2019

**School Annual Quality Reports
Sub-Group**

Executive Summary

This report updates the Committee on the sub group tasked with reviewing School annual quality reports.

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

The paper is relevant to the Committee's responsibility for the quality assurance framework.

Action requested

Discuss the positive practice and themes for further development at University level and agree on recommended actions.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

Resource implications will be considered as part of any proposed actions.

2. Risk assessment

The paper does not require a risk assessment.

3. Equality and Diversity

Equality and diversity will be considered as part of any proposed actions.

4. Freedom of information

Open.

Key words

School Quality

Originator of the paper

Nichola Kett, Head of Quality Assurance and Enhancement Team, Academic Services
Brian Connolly, Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

School Annual Quality Reports Sub-Group

Meeting held on **Wednesday 5 September 2019**
in the **Room 299, Old College**

Notes

Present:

Professor Tina Harrison (Convener)	Assistant Principal, Academic Standards and Quality Assurance
Dr Shereen Benjamin	Associate Dean (Quality Assurance) College of Arts, Humanities and Social Science
Brian Connolly	Secretary to Senatus Quality Assurance Committee, Academic Services
Nichola Kett	Head of Quality Assurance and Enhancement Team, Academic Services
Dr Linda Kirstein	Dean of Education Quality Assurance and Culture, CSE
Dr Claire Phillips	Dean of Quality, College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine
Steph Vallancey	Vice President Education, Edinburgh University Students' Association

Late Submission

The Group noted that the School of Informatics would submit its report at a later date.

1. Update on Actions from 2018-19 (for information)

The Group received an updates on actions for Schools, Colleges, and the University from the previous year.

2. Consideration of School Annual Quality Reports

The Group considered each report with particular attention to: the Personal Tutor system; Degree Classification; and Industrial Action.

2.1 College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences

2.1.1 Business

The Group **commends** the School on the numerous activities currently being undertaken across the School to enhance the student experience. However it was also noted that the School's NSS results which fell considerably in 2017-18 have remained constant in 2018-19 despite the ongoing initiatives (including the NSS summit). The Group also noted a lack of reflection on postgraduate research (PGR). Generally the report needs more reflection on evidence, actions and impacts.

- The Group **recommends** that the School resubmit the report to the December SQAC with more evidence based reflective analysis on why the numerous initiatives to improve the student experience have not, so far, had a positive impact on the School's NSS scores. The resubmitted report should also include more reflection on postgraduate research at the School.

2.1.2 Centre for Open Learning

The Group **commends** the Centre on the positive changes being made to the quality culture and processes.

- The Group **recommends** that the Centre include the clarification of roles and responsibilities of student and PT relationship (noted in the report) as a formal action for the coming year (and report on progress in next year's report).
- The Group **recommends** that the Centre encourage a wider range of staff to engage with and contribute to the report next year.

2.1.3 Divinity

The Group **commends** the School on its exemplary report (consistently clear, concise and well written), the streamlining of QA processes, and student representation (as noted in the Quality Model).

2.1.4 Edinburgh College of Art

The Group **commends** the Director of Quality for transforming quality assurance and enhancement processes within the Edinburgh College of Art (ECA).

The Group noted that the report did not address the SQAC request that ECA include a detailed reflection on degree classification outcomes for Architecture in this year's annual quality report, with a full explanation of any trends and actions taken to address any inappropriate patterns.

- The Group **recommends** that Edinburgh College of Art submit an additional update to the December meeting of SQAC reflecting on degree classification outcomes for Architecture and providing a full explanation of any trends and actions taken to address any inappropriate patterns.

The Group noted a disparity, mentioned in the report, between programmes and subject areas which may be a legacy of the merger between ECA and the University in 2011.

- The Group **recommends** that Edinburgh College of Art, as part of the planned work on evidence-based enhancement, reflect on this in next year's report.

2.1.5 Moray House School of Education

The Group **commends** the School on the lunchtime sessions on 'Practice Worth Sharing' which aim to raise standards through building on and expanding the culture of sharing, learning together and learning from each other.

The Group noted that the report did not address the SQAC request that Education include a detailed reflection on degree classification outcomes in this year's annual quality report, with a full explanation of any trends and actions taken to address any inappropriate patterns.

- The Group **recommends** that Moray House School of Education submit an additional update to the December meeting of SQAC reflecting on degree classification outcomes for Education and providing a full explanation of any trends and actions taken to address any inappropriate patterns.

2.1.6 Economics

The Group **commends** the School on its excellent and well-evidenced quality model and report. It was noted that the outdated references in the quality model to 'mid-semester' feedback (amend to mid-course feedback) and the Edinburgh Student Experience Survey (ESES) should be removed.

The Group **commends** the School on the implementation of course-specific written guidance on marking criteria for each type of assessment as evidenced by the sustained increase in NSS scores.

2.1.7 Health in Social Science

The Group **commends** the School on the ongoing work to build academic community.

- The Group **recommends** that the School submit an additional update to the December meeting of SQAC providing greater clarity on progress with each specific action planned in last year's report and any recommendations from last year's Senate Quality Assurance Committee sub group meeting. The update should also include more reflective analysis on Personal Tutor system and Degree Classification.

2.1.8 History, Classics and Archaeology

The Group **commends** the School on the equality and diversity initiatives, in particular the ongoing work on the course proposal process in order to promote consideration of matters of equality, diversity and inclusion in the curriculum.

- The Group **recommends** that the School include ongoing efforts to improve the sense of Learning Community (noted in the report) as a formal action for the coming year (and report on progress in next year's report).

- The Group also **recommends** that the School undertake a comparative analysis of student and staff survey data to consider the findings and actions in relation to academic community in an integrated way.

2.1.9 Law

The Group **commends** the Director of Quality for his excellent contribution to the quality assurance and enhancement processes within the Edinburgh Law School and the exemplary reflection on a range of data in this year's report.

- The Group **recommends** that the School include the need to address student requests to diversify assessment methods (particularly where assessment is typically by 100% exam) as a formal action for the coming year (and report on progress in next year's report).
- The Group **recommends** that the School include more evidence based reflection in next year's report on the how the student sense of academic community is developing since the return to Old College.
- The Group **recommends** that the School encourage a wider range of staff to engage and contribute to the report next year.

2.1.10 Literature, Languages and Cultures

The Group **commends** the School on the Widening Participation Steering Group and Widening Participation Practitioners' Network to map activity, showcase and share good practice, develop strategy, and identify pedagogical and pastoral issues using QAE data.

- The Group **recommends** that the School submit an additional update to the December meeting of SQAC providing greater clarity on the nature of the request for additional funding for students from underrepresented groups.

2.1.11 Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences

The Group **commends** the School on its success at this year's EUSA Student Awards.

- The Group **recommends** that the School submit an updated version of the Quality Model to the December meeting of SQAC reflecting the changes made to QA process.
- The Group **recommends** that the School include more evidence-based reflection in next year's report on the continuing drop in postgraduate research student satisfaction, with particular consideration given to whether teaching training is meeting student needs.

2.1.12 Social and Political Science

The Group **commends** the School on the good use of data in this year's report.

- The Group **recommends** that the School submit an updated version of the Quality Model to the December meeting of SQAC reflecting the changes made to QA process.

2.2 College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine

2.2.1 Edinburgh Medical School: Biomedical Sciences

The Group **commends** the Deanery on the assessed student debate, an innovative approach to assessment.

- The Group **recommends** that the Deanery submit an additional update to the December meeting of SQAC providing clarification on whether moderation is used and if so, if it is effective (particularly in relation to the high proportion of B grades).
- The Group **recommends** that the Deanery submit an additional update to the December meeting of SQAC providing greater reflection on Deanery actions to address student dissatisfaction, particularly in relation to the perceived lack of fairness and clarity of assessment.
- The Group **recommends** that the Deanery include an update in next year's report on the outcome of the research project investigating how the form of marking scheme used affects the mark distribution.

2.2.2 Edinburgh Medical School: Clinical Sciences

The Group **commends** the Deanery on the Student Experience & Executive Group, and the use of annual programme review as a means to share innovation, to evolve and enhance programmes.

- The Group **recommends** that the Deanery to include an update in next year's report reflecting on the migration of programmes to LEARN, notably Edinburgh Surgical Suite online distance learning.

2.2.3 Edinburgh Medical School: MBChB, MSc Clinical Education and Associated PGR students

The Group **commends** the EMS on the enhancements to the undergraduate medicine programme (i.e. the improvements to organisational structures; overhaul of year 6 teaching and delivery; and engagement with the Teaching Office and professional staff) and the improvements in student satisfaction scores.

- The Group **recommends** that the EMS ensure that next year's report has a more balanced focus with more reflection on postgraduate provision.
- The Group **recommends** that the EMS include an update in next year's report on discussions exploring alternatives for doctoral degrees in health professions education.

- The Group **recommends** that the EMS to include an update in next year's report on the trial of supervised assessment reporting.

2.2.4 **Edinburgh Medical School: Molecular, Genetic and Population Health Sciences**

The Group **commends** the Deanery on the engagement with the ELDeR process and the good student satisfaction scores in relation to the quality of programmes.

- The Group had no recommendations.

2.2.5 **Veterinary Studies**

The Group **commends** the School on a very good, reflective and comprehensive report.

- The Group had no recommendations.

2.3 **College of Science and Engineering**

2.3.1 **Biological Sciences**

The Group **commends** the School on the student-led information event for postgraduate research students.

- The Group **recommends** that the School submit an additional update to the December meeting of SQAC reflecting on student data in relation to entrants, progression rates, course pass rates, completion rates withdrawal rates, widening participation and black and minority ethnic (BME) students.
- The Group **recommends** that the School submit an additional update to the December meeting of SQAC with more detailed reflection on how the new programme rep system has functioned.

2.3.2 **Chemistry**

The Group **commends** the School on the restructuring of the MChem curriculum.

- The Group **recommends** that the School monitor the implementation and effect of separating out the tutorial groups for BSc and MChem (and report on progress in next year's report).

2.3.3 **Engineering**

The Group **commends** the School on the introducing lecture recording and LEARN resource lists, both well-received by students.

- The Group **recommends** that the School submit an additional update to the December meeting of SQAC reflecting on degree classification outcomes and providing a full explanation of any trends and actions taken to address any inappropriate patterns.

- The Group **recommends** that the School consider the implications of the Engineering Council's condonement and concessions policy changes to the School's curriculum and University policy (and report on findings in next year's report).
- The Group **recommends** that the School ensure that next year's report is less reliant on appendices as repositories for bulk information and instead ensure that the main points are distilled into a self-contained report, referring to appendices only as supporting evidence.

2.3.4 GeoSciences

The Group **commends** the School on its engagement with the new BI data.

- The Group had no recommendations.

2.3.5 Informatics

The School report was not submitted by the deadline and will now be considered at a later date.

2.3.6 Mathematics

The Group **commends** the School on the introduction of the scholarship programme for students who satisfy one of the University's eight criteria for Widening Participation.

- The Group **recommends** that the School submit an additional update to the December meeting of SQAC providing more clarity on why streamlining of assessment deadlines is considered primarily an issue for the Service Excellence Programme.

2.3.7 Physics and Astronomy

The Group **commends** the School on the high student satisfaction scores for the PT system and postgraduate research student experience.

- The Group **recommends** that the School put a plan in place to support students transitioning onto courses with failure rates greater than 15% (and report on progress in next year's report).
- The Group **recommends** that the School investigate why uptake of industrial placements remains low by engaging with students to understand the issues from their perspective (and report on findings in next year's report).
- The Group **recommends** that the School reflect on the reason why approximately 30% of postgraduate research students failed to submit within the 48 month period (and report on findings in next year's report).

2.3.8 Data Science, Technology and Innovation Programme

The Group **commends** the Programme on the positive feedback from students on the quality of courses, particularly the number of topics and practical approach.

- The Group had no recommends for the Programme.

Action: The University to consider to a formal Memorandum of Understanding approval process in order to ensure the quality of joint programmes.

Action: SQAC to consider a co-opted member drawn form an area of non-traditional provision.

2.4 Specific Reflection

Particular consideration was given to information in School annual quality reports on the Personal Tutor system, Degree Classification, and Industrial Action and the following was noted for each:

2.4.1 Personal Tutor system

The Group noted a general lack of reflection on the PT system and in many cases Schools were explicit in citing the current Personal Tutor and Student Support Review as the reason for holding-off on PT related initiatives and enhancements.

2.4.2 Degree Classification

The Group noted that a number of Schools had failed to reflect on Degree Classification data (in line with the general lack of engagement with the new BI dashboards). These Schools will be asked to submit a further update to the December meeting of SQAC.

2.4.3 Industrial Action

The Group noted that the Industrial Action appeared to have had no discernible residual effect, with no Schools reporting issues.

3. Themes of Good Practice and Areas for Further Development

3.1 Themes of Good Practice

Examples of good practice were identified in every School annual quality report. The following two themes reflect the areas where there was a critical mass of good practice examples.

3.1.1 Student Voice

This was a strong theme across many School annual quality reports. Schools provided a number of examples of how student feedback was gathered and responded to, in many cases beyond the requirements set out in the Student Voice Policy. Additionally, Schools reported that the new programme student representative system was bedding in well. Examples include:

- In the School of Economics Course Organisers are required to provide pre-course updates on new features of their courses and responses to mid-course feedback and course enhancement questionnaires. Combined with cohort level feedback events this has led to a significant rise in responses to the National Student Survey question “It is clear how students’ feedback on the course has been acted on.”
- In the School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences trained student consultants are invited to attend a class and then provide constructive feedback to staff.
- In the Deanery of Molecular, Genetic and Population Health Sciences online distance learning programmes continue to provide several options for communication beyond the formal mechanisms. MSc Clinical Trials students are encouraged to express constructive criticism and make suggestions in the online ‘not just for problems’ forum. This has led to a number of enhancements during the running of the programme.
- In the School of Biological Sciences there has been wide uptake of mid-course feedback with a broad range of collection methods being used, including postcards, TopHat, Learn discussion boards and surveys, drop-ins after lectures, comments post-boxes and online blogs. One particularly effective method was for student representatives to lead a discussion at the end of a lecture which led to a good dialogue with many issues addressed in the meeting.

3.1.2 Academic Community

Schools are continuing to build academic communities through a variety of activities including staff-student collaboration, engaging student representatives, and the use of Student Partnership Agreement project funding. Examples include:

- In the School of History, Classics and Archaeology there are many examples of student-staff collaboration, including a Classics Society debate, an annual staff-student cup, and the School working with the student magazine.
- Student-led innovations in the School of Health in Social Science include Creative Mondays which are run by the School’s postgraduate research student representatives and are an opportunity for staff and students to explore innovative aspects of research and community building. A group of the School’s postgraduate research students have launched a blog to help support other students and build community.
- The Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies is trialling coaching circles, a form of peer-to-peer support and learning, to help students to support each other during their dissertation year.
- The School of Engineering core course, Engineering Design 1, was introduced to foster creativity and independent thinking, problem solving and skills, and working in a multidisciplinary team.

3.2 Areas for Further Development

Academic Services will provide further details on the following items raised by Schools to the area/individual who has been asked to respond:

3.2.1 Space

Schools continue to identify challenges with accessing suitable learning and teaching accommodation. This included social spaces for students and staff to interact outwith timetabled sessions, appropriate space for postgraduate research students, and study space for students. Some Schools also reported challenges with suitability of staff offices, including a lack of private space to meet with students requiring support, and issues with staff and/or teaching being split across multiple sites. These issues were felt to impact on the ability to build academic communities. The importance on minimising the impact on students of estates developments at King's Building was also noted.

Refer to: University Executive and Space Strategy Group

3.2.2 Timetabling

The majority of Schools reported increasing issues with timetabling. Individual examples included: significant changes to course timetables; allocation of rooms; consecutive classes timetabled in rooms some distance apart; and communication with the Timetabling Unit. Further investigation will be required to understand the specific issues. It was noted that the complexity of our provision is challenging to timetable. Challenges with the exam timetable, specifically its release date and tight timescales for marking when examinations with large cohorts happen late in the examination period, were also raised.

Refer to: University Executive and the Director of Student Systems and Administration

3.2.3 Pressure on staff time

Schools reported that rising student numbers, especially in postgraduate taught programmes, and challenges with staff recruitment (appointing to and replacing posts) are increasing staff workloads and impacting on the student experience.

Refer to: University Executive

3.2.4 Assessment and Feedback

Some Schools requested that the 15 day feedback turnaround deadline be reconsidered in light of student feedback and challenges staff have in meeting this blanket deadline for different cohort sizes and types of assessments.

Refer to: University Executive. The Sub Group recommend that the 15 day feedback turnaround deadline is reviewed to determine if it is appropriate in all circumstances and to explore if a different approach could be taken which still allows for timely and quality feedback to be provided to students in a clearly communicated timeframe alongside robust marking and moderation processes.

3.2.5 Student Voice

Several Schools questioned the purpose and usefulness of course enhancement questionnaires. This was felt to be contributing to the low, and declining, response rates. It was also felt that course enhancement questionnaires add to feelings of survey/feedback fatigue by students.

Refer to: University Executive. The Sub Group recommend a fundamental review of the purpose of course enhancement questionnaires and their role in relation to other student voice mechanisms.

3.2.6 IT and Systems

A collection of individual, and sometimes recurring, items were raised by Schools under this broad heading:

- Student record-related issues raised included annual monitoring for postgraduate research students, work and study away, special circumstances, and Boards of Examiners. **Refer to: Student Systems and Administration and Service Excellence Programme**
- Student record-related workarounds and the challenges of accessing meaningful data for non-standard provision (interdisciplinary, online, and open learning) were also raised. **Refer to: Head of Student Data and Surveys**
- Several Schools, primarily within the College of Science and Engineering, also made requests for more support for online examinations. **Refer to: Director of Learning, Teaching and Web Services**

4. Reflection on the Process

The Group noted that in preparation for this year's reporting process each Director of Quality had been sent an aide memoire summarising actions proposed by their school in last year's report and recommendations from Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC) in response to the report. The aide memoire also included a progress report on actions agreed by SQAC for the Colleges and the University in response to issues for further development across the institution identified in last year's reports. The aide memoire appeared to have been effective as each report, to a greater or lesser degree, address the actions from last year's reporting cycle.

The Group noted a lack of reflection and engagement with the data on the new BI dashboards. More development and training will be planned over the coming year to encourage Directors of Quality to engage with this new resource.

The Group agreed that Schools will be encouraged to include more reflection on local initiatives and good practice in next year's reports.

The Group **recommended** that Academic Services collate examples of curriculum review underway and send to the new Vice-Principal Students.

Nichola Kett, Head of Quality Assurance and Enhancement Team, Academic Services
Brian Connolly, Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services
September 2019

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

18 September 2019

Good Practice identified from School Annual Quality Reports

Executive Summary

The paper outlines a selection of good practice identified by members of the Sub Group that reviews School annual quality reports.

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

Aligns with the Committee's responsibility of "Disseminating good practice in quality assurance, as identified through the work of the Committee."

Action requested

For information.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Academic Services, College Offices and the Institute for Academic Development work together to share good practice across the University using a variety of methods. Examples of Teaching Matters blog posts that have been identified through quality assurance and enhancement processes are tagged¹. Additionally, an area of the University's quality website is being developed to share good practice and resources.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

The paper is for information, no actions are proposed, and therefore there are no resource implications.

2. Risk assessment

The paper is for information and a risk assessment is not required.

3. Equality and Diversity

The paper is for information and equality impact assessment is not required.

4. Freedom of information

Yes.

Key words

Quality reports, good practice

Originator of the paper

Nichola Kett, Academic Policy Manager, Academic Services
10 September 2019

¹ <https://www.teaching-matters-blog.ed.ac.uk/tag/quality-enhancement-report-examples/>

Academic Community

- Student-led innovation postgraduate research reps running 'Creative Mondays' to build community and other student-led events (HSS)
- Student-staff cooperation through: Classics Society debate; staff-student cup; student magazine; student-run Literacy through Latin taught in several state primary schools in Edinburgh (HCA)
- Student Partnership Agreement project funding for a Philosophy podcast (PPLS)
- Buddying system putting potential applicants in touch with students on programme has had a positive impact on conversion rate (Medical Education)
- Trialling coaching circles to help students to support each other during their dissertation year (Vets)
- Engineering Design 1 was introduced to foster creativity and independent thinking; problem solving and skills; and working in a multidisciplinary team (Engineering)
- Undergraduate Physics Outreach Team provides extra-curricular opportunities and enhanced student experience (Physics)

Assessment and Feedback

- Workshop on use of assessed group work (Business)
- Mapping of assessments (Business)
- Innovation in assessment and feedback practices including Pecha Kucha presentations, self-evaluation, and video feedback (ECA)
- MSc Transformative Learning and Teaching has an innovative assessment philosophy, elements of which have been adopted by another programme (Education)
- Course-specific guidance on marking criteria (Economics)
- Provision of undergraduate exam feedback through assessment and progression tools and improved advertising of access to scripts (Economics)
- Diversity in assessment methods (Law)
- Language assessment working party to look at plagiarism proof assessment and enthuse students about translation skills (LLC)
- Practique online assessment software, an example of good software deployment driven by defined user direction and needs (Medical Education)
- Medical Microbiology 3 includes an assessed student debate which features two teams of students each arguing one side of a controversial issue in the field which provides a greater motivation for students to engage in the topic (Biomedical Sciences)
- E-marking for dissertations (GeoSciences)
- Changed the continuous assessment in junior honours, reducing the amount of hand-ins, a greater use of online tests for more immediate feedback as well as the introduction of some class tests to encourage early consolidation (Physics)

Community Engagement

- Community engagement with Psychological Therapies Clinic and Centre for Homeless and Inclusion Health (HiSS)

Employability

- Personal Tutor meetings on the Sport and Recreation Management programme are employability focussed (Education)

- Use of interviews of well-known professionals in the field to include in course material, fostering the sense of relevance, potential role models and awareness of employability (Vets)
- Graduate School “mock” interviews aim to provide our graduates with relevant feedback and experience, thus increasing their employment prospects post-graduation (Maths)

Equality and Diversity

- LGBT+ support through an allies network (Divinity)
- Sharing good practice through the Teaching Forum and People and Equalities lunchtime sessions (LLC)

Learning and Teaching

- Innovative teaching practices including community engagement, mock interviews, and co-design of studio manifestos (ECA)
- Establishment of a research training centre to bring together and develop teaching in research methods (SPS)
- Plans to record more introductions/practical round-up sessions for practical classes (Vets)
- The use of play in formal teaching with the zombie scenario, exploring through play negotiation, delegation, other key professional skills, opportunity to explore dealing with failure/resilience (Vets)
- MSc Stem Cells is offering a course on industrial delivery which blends theory with practice, allowing students to work with real-world examples of big data, highlighting analytical flows and the potential to apply machine learning processes to data analytics (Clinical Sciences)
- Co-creation of a resource for dissertation supervision with current and former students and co-creation workshops with supervisors focusing on formative and summative feedback in collaboration with the Institute for Academic Development (MGP)
- The Course Organiser for Biomedical Sciences 2 sends an e-mail at the end of each week summarizing the content of the following week. This course is highly varied with a large number of teaching staff and a lot of skills training together with biomedical content so these summaries are greatly appreciated by students (Biomedical Sciences)
- Video component engaging the students in advanced material while also enhancing their transferrable skills (Chemistry).
- Foundational course “Fundamentals of Algebra and Calculus” has been a success, as is evidenced by the Diagnostic Test (Maths)
- Teaching themes will promote the design, development, and evaluation of innovative instructional strategies, course formats, and delivery methods, with a focus on blended learning, online assessment, and pedagogical research (Maths)

Space

- The refurbished Rainy Hall (Divinity)
- Move back to Old College (Law)

Student Support

- Undergraduate support provided through Piazza discussion forums (Economics)
- Student support officers in a more accessible location and private space for consultations (SPS)
- Introduced student information hubs on Learn to give students standard information and reduce the amount of email traffic (GeoSciences)

- Newly created postgraduate taught (PGT) Student Learning Advisor (SLA) role has resulted in much-improved learning support to PGT students (Maths)

Student transitions

- Supporting student transitions through stepping up to honours workshop (HCA)
- Use of University Welcome Week app which really helped students know what was taking place (Biological Sciences).
- The Master of Family Medicine programme team designed and delivered a very successful summer school activity for our first year students (MGP)
- Postgraduate research (PGR) handbook; guidance document outlining the annual review procedures; PGR induction now incorporates health and safety training and ethics in research online course provided by Institute for Academic Development (Chemistry).
- Welcome video for incoming students and Edinburgh Tour video for online students (DSTI)
- Exit questionnaires for students who either graduate or withdraw from the programme (DSTI)

Student Voice

- Involvement of students in School annual quality reporting (Business)
- Closing the student feedback loop through pre-course updates (Economics)
- Enhancing the postgraduate student voice through engaged representatives and an annual conference (HiSS)
- Winner of Teaching Award for best implementer of student feedback two years in a row (LLC)
- Trained student consultants in Philosophy attend a class and provide constructive feedback to staff (PPLS)
- Use of Twitter to engage with students, this was particularly prominent for one course and may have led to the very high CEQ response rate observed (Vets)
- Providing time in every live session for students to give feedback and raise issues: highlights the importance of the student voice in directing course development and reduces sense of isolation, a valuable process for online programmes (Vets)
- Online distance learning programmes continue to provide several options for communication beyond formal feedback/evaluation, for example, the MSc Clinical Trials Students are encouraged to express constructive criticism and make suggestions in the online 'Not just for problems' forum and this has led to a number of improvements during the running of the programme (MGP).
- A broad range of collection methods is used to gather mid-course feedback (Biological Sciences)

Supporting and developing staff

- Excellence in Teaching Awards to create parity between teaching and research (Business)
- Appointing Undergraduate Subject Teaching Champions responsible for dynamic review (Business)
- Staff community building (COL)
- Practice Worth Sharing lunchtime sessions (Education)
- Building staff community through the Programme Directors and Administrators Network and Teaching Strategy Committee (HSS)
- New structure for learning and teaching: a new directorate addressing the delivery of teaching and/or student support services (SPS)
- All new dissertation supervisors are supported by a mentor (MGP)

Wellbeing

- Use of therapets (HCA)

Widening participation

- Outreach and widening participation activity (COL)
- Various activities including establishing a Steering Group and Practitioners Network to share good practice, identifying pedagogical and pastoral issues using quality assurance and enhancement data, events, Student Led Individually Created Course, awards, etc. (LLC)
- ChM Clinical Ophthalmology has secured funding for bursaries to increase depth of expertise in Low and Middle Income Countries and to upskill and enhance work for College of Ophthalmologists for Eastern, Central and Southern Africa countries (Clinical Sciences)
- Scholarship programme improves conversion rates among widening participation applicants (Maths)

COL – Centre for Open Learning

DSTI – Data Science, Technology and Innovation Programme:

ECA – Edinburgh College of Art

HCA – History, Classics and Archaeology

HSS – Health in Social Sciences

LLC – Literatures, Languages and Cultures

MGP – Molecular, Genetic and Population Health Sciences

PPLS – Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences

SPS – Social and Political Science

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

18 September 2019

Internal Periodic Review Themes 2018/19

Executive Summary

The paper identifies areas of good practice and further development arising from teaching/postgraduate programme reviews held in 2018/19, and proposes responsibility for action in response.

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

The paper is relevant to the Committee's responsibility for the quality assurance framework.

Action requested

For discussion and approval of proposals for responsibility for action in response.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

- Responsibility for action in response will be communicated to those allocated the role.
- College Deans of Quality will be asked to communicate the areas and the outcome of the discussion to relevant College committees.
- Academic Services will communicate the areas and responsibility for action in response to Schools/subject areas which had provision reviewed in 2018/19.
- Areas of good practice will be shared across the University through various mechanisms including: events; network meetings; Teaching Matters; and websites.
- Areas for further development will be reported to University Executive.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

There are no additional resource implications associated with this paper at this point.

2. Risk assessment

Failure to respond to areas for further development would constitute an institutional risk.

3. Equality and Diversity

The paper itself does not require an Equality Impact Assessment. The Equality Impact Assessment for internal periodic review processes is published at:

<https://edin.ac/2p3B7WZ>

4. Freedom of information

The paper is open.

Key words

Internal review, TPR, PPR, good practice.

Originator of the paper

Nichola Kett, Academic Policy Manager, Academic Services
Gillian Mackintosh, Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services
5 September 2019

Institution-led review (Teaching/Postgraduate Programme Reviews) – 2018/19

- Classics (undergraduate provision)
- Engineering (combined) (undergraduate & postgraduate taught provision)
- History of Art (undergraduate provision)
- Earth Sciences (undergraduate provision)
- Philosophy (undergraduate provision)
- College of Medicine & Veterinary Medicine (postgraduate research provision)
- Edinburgh College of Art (postgraduate taught & postgraduate research provision)
- GeoSciences (postgraduate research provision)

Individual review reports are available at: <http://edin.ac/2pRLdck>

Areas of Good Practice

- **Student support – the support, dedication and commitment provided to students by both academic and professional services staff.** Examples include:
 - The dedication of staff teaching languages who provide extra support to students (TPR of Classics)
 - The clear commitment of Postgraduate Tutors (TPR of History of Art).
 - The dedication of the Personal Tutors, the Senior Tutor who is very active and is providing high quality training and guidance, and staff working within the Student Support and Teaching Offices who provide an outstanding service, especially with mental health support (TPR of Philosophy).
 - The strong administrative and pastoral support provided to students by the administration and student support team (PPR of Edinburgh College of Art).
- **Learning, teaching and the curriculum – including the quality of teaching, breadth of curriculum, skills development, and fieldwork opportunities.** Examples include:
 - The quality of academic staff in the subject area, the inspirational quality of academic teaching, and the emphasis on the relevance and application of teaching (TPR of Earth Sciences).
 - The cross-disciplinary Engineering 1 core course provides flexibility for students by keeping options open and a positive sense of community (Engineering TPR).
 - The diversity and breadth of programmes and courses (PPR of Edinburgh College of Art).
- **Employability and graduate attributes – engagement with alumni and employers, involvement of the Careers Service and use of placements.** Examples include:
 - The School Careers Consultant works with each subject area to develop its careers and employability profile through various activities including developing ways of further embedding employability initiatives in the curriculum. The School Marketing Officer is involved in linking recent graduates to the current cohort to promote careers options and employment opportunities (TPR of Classics).
 - The Work Placement Co-ordinator liaises with host institutions, supports students on placement, and ensures and maintains the quality of the work placements offered (TPR History of Art).
 - The use of residencies (typically run as micro-residencies held over the summer with student workshops) in Architecture, in order to make live projects coherent and visible (PPR of Edinburgh College of Art).
 - Careers Service support is integrated into the curriculum in a number of ways, including tailored sessions (TPR of Engineering).
- **Supporting and developing staff, including support for tutors and demonstrators – rewarding and recognising teaching, roles to support and mentor tutors and demonstrators, and support provided to staff by other staff.** Examples include:

- The support provided to tutors and demonstrators in Biomedical Sciences, particularly their mentoring training programme for the joint provision with Zhejiang University (PPR of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine).
- A major review of tutoring and demonstrating, which involved postgraduate research students, resulted in an overhaul of the tutor and demonstrator system, including making the application process more transparent (PPR of GeoSciences).
- The support provided by the Teaching Office and course organisers to postgraduate tutors and teaching staff, including during induction, the oversight of marking and feedback, and the coordination of implementation of adjustments for students in class (TPR of Classics).
- The School has ensured that contributions to good teaching are rewarded by promoting staff via the recognition of teaching pathway (TPR of Earth Sciences).
- **Academic community – use of societies, social activities and student-led activities.** Examples include:
 - Encouragement of student-led peer support through postgraduate societies and the SolidariTEA initiative which aims to provide an informal support and advice network for students (PPR of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine).
 - The work being undertaken to develop community, which includes degree programme lunches, changes made to the honours curriculum to develop cohort identity, and involvement of academic staff in year 2 tutorials (TPR of Philosophy).
 - Various social activities in place to encourage as sense of community between staff and students across all disciplines (TPR of Engineering).

Areas for Further Development

Tutors and demonstrators. Recommendations related to training, promoting continuing professional development opportunities, improving two-way (feedback to and from) communication, allocating reasonable time for tasks, appointing a role to provide support, and appointment processes.

Proposal for responsibility for action in response:

Refer this to the review of the Policy for the recruitment, support and development of tutors and demonstrators, which was delayed from 2018/19.

Widening participation. Recommendations related to increasing numbers of students from widening participation backgrounds, considering widening participation students through reviews of curriculum and induction arrangements, provision of additional management information, and the appointment of a subject area dedicated Widening Participation Director.

Proposal for responsibility for action in response:

Refer to University Executive.

Assessment and feedback. Recommendations focussed on quality of feedback and implementing assessment and feedback policy on formative assessment, feedback turnaround times, and scaling of marks.

Proposal for responsibility for action in response:

Refer to University Executive alongside the assessment and feedback further development outcomes from the annual monitoring, review and reporting process.

Supporting and developing staff. Recommendations covered the importance of staff engagement in continuing professional development and aspects of promotion.

Proposal for responsibility for action in response:

Refer to the Teaching and Academic Careers task group for consideration and response.

Student voice. Two out of three PPRs had recommendations relating to clarity and enhancement of the student representation system at postgraduate research level.

Proposal for responsibility for action in response:

Committee to discuss postgraduate research representation.

Employability and graduate attributes. Recommendations related to embedding transferable skills and graduate attributes within the curriculum, extending writing skills support, engagement with alumni and employers, and extending the use of inter-disciplinary projects.

Proposal for responsibility for action in response:

Refer to University Executive.

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

18 September 2018

Thematic Review 2018-19: Black and Minority Ethnic Students

Executive Summary

The paper contains the final report of the Thematic Review of Support for Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) Students.

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

The paper is relevant to the University's Strategic Goal of 'provide the highest-quality research-led teaching and learning".

Action requested

For Approval.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

- 1. Resource implications (including staffing)**
Resource implications were considered as part of the review.
- 2. Risk assessment**
Risks were considered as part of the review.
- 3. Equality and Diversity**
Equality and diversity was an integral part of the review.
- 4. Freedom of information**
Open.

Key words

Thematic, Black, Minority, Ethnic

Originator of the paper

Brian Connolly, Academic Policy Officer



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Thematic Review 2018-19: Black and Minority Ethnic Students

Final Report

Foreword from the Review Convenor

This thematic review has allowed us to talk to our black and minority ethnic students as well as staff about how ethnicity, colour, religious, cultural and linguistic issues matter within a university environment. While our black and minority ethnic students are proud to be at the University of Edinburgh, their stories and experiences are indicative of a significant lack of racial literacy among staff as well as from fellow students. Racial literacy means having the understanding and practice to recognise, respond and counter forms of every day racism or racial micro-aggressions at all levels, personal, cultural and institutional.

While some might dismiss these students' narratives and experiences as anecdotal and may regard reviews such as these as pandering to political correctness, the Review Panel wishes to commend the University for listening to the experiences of black and minority ethnic students, to acknowledge that there are barriers and to understand that there are huge benefits in taking diversity and equality seriously.

Our recommendations are bold and will take University leaders and service provision heads into potentially unfamiliar and uncomfortable territory.

We believe bold steps are necessary if we wish to be sector leading in the area of racial equality.

Professor Rowena Arshad OBE, FEIS

Chair in Multicultural and Anti-Racist Education
Head of Moray House School of Education and Sport
University of Edinburgh

Director of the Centre for Education for Racial Equality in Scotland (CERES)

Executive Summary

The following represents the key findings and recommendations of the review:

Racial Literacy and Awareness Gap

- **Key Finding:** A gap exists between the awareness and racial literacy of University staff and the lived experiences of both UK-domiciled and international black and minority ethnic (BME) students.
- **Key Recommendations:**
 - The Review Panel **recommends** that the Principal leads a conversation on 'race' in higher education and the implications for the University of Edinburgh.
 - The Review Panel **recommends** that University Leadership recognise the need to improve knowledge and upskill in the area of developing racial literacy.
 - The Review Panel **recommends** that the University provide each Head of College, School, and Professional Service area with a copy of '*Why I'm No Longer Talking to White People About Race*'.

Sense of Belonging

- **Key Finding:** The impact of attending an institution where BME people are in the minority can contribute to a sense of academic and social isolation.
- **Key Recommendations:**
 - The Review Panel **recommends** that the University commit to increase the percentage of BME staff, both academic and professional services, with immediate priority in the professional services areas.
 - The Review Panel **recommends** that the University recruit a new BME Outreach Officer to work with BME communities.
 - In relation to the two representation recommendations in this section, the Review Panel **encourages** the University to use positive action to diversify staffing.

Accessing Support Services

- **Key Finding:** BME students experience barriers accessing support services at the University.
- **Key Recommendations:**
 - The Review Panel **recommends** that the Service Excellence Programme ensure that a systematic staff training programme is an integral part of the final recommendations of the current Personal Tutor and Student Support Team Review.
 - The Review Panel **recommends** that the Student Counselling Service use positive action to diversify its staffing.

Curricula and Learning

- **Key Findings:** There is an attainment or awarding gap between white and BME students at the University. BME students experience barriers related to both representation and cultural diversity within the curriculum and learning environments they encounter. Staff with a remit to improve BME inclusion and attainment also experience institutional barriers to achieving better outcomes.

- **Key Recommendations:**
 - The Review Panel **recommends** that the University address the attainment/awarding gap that exists between BME and white students.

 - The Review Panel **recommends** that the proposed Curriculum Review enables BME students to be involved in diversifying content, including the co-design of curricula and assessments.

 - The Review Panel **recommends** that Senate Quality Assurance Committee implement systematic monitoring of retention, progression and degree outcome data for BME students and, if appropriate, recommend interventions where there are clear and consistent patterns of divergence between BME students and white students.

Report

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The University is committed to creating an equal, diverse and inclusive environment for all students and staff, and regularly carries out reviews into the needs and experiences of different groups.

As part of this ongoing commitment, Senate Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) agreed that the 2018-19 Thematic Review of Student Support would focus on black and minority ethnic students' experiences of support at the University.

The Review Panel acknowledges the limitations of the term black and minority ethnic (BME), particularly in its homogenising of domestic and international BME students. The Review Panel wishes to stress the need to understand that while BME students are often referred to as a group, this masks the varied and specific experiences of ethnic, nationality, colour, linguistic, cultural and religious/belief diversity.

- 1.2 The Equality Act (2010) states that it is illegal to discriminate against someone on the grounds of their race. The Act defines race as a protected characteristic that refers to an individual's race, colour, nationality and ethnic or national origins.

The University, as a public sector body, has a legal duty to:

- eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act;
- advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

- 1.3 The remit of the review was to identify areas of current good practice and ways in which the University could better support BME students.

The curriculum was not specifically within the remit of the review because a Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) task group had reported earlier in the year and made recommendations on institutional actions to assist in promoting inclusion, equality and diversity in the curriculum. However it was agreed that the curriculum would be referenced by the review as part of the over-all experience of BME students at the University.

- 1.4 The review was overseen by a panel convened by **Professor Rowena Arshad OBE**, Head of Moray House School of Education / Co-Director of the Centre for Education for Racial Equality in Scotland (CERES), with membership as follows: **Laura Cattell**, Head of Widening Participation/Deputy Director of Student Recruitment and Admissions (Professional Services representative); **Professor Vicky Gunn**, Head of Learning and Teaching, Glasgow School of Art (External); **Isabella Neergaard-Petersen**, Black and Minority Ethnic Officer, Edinburgh University Students' Association (Student Representative 2018-19); **Kai O'Doherty**, Vice President Welfare, Edinburgh University Students' Association (Student Representative 2018-19); **Oona Miller**, Vice President Welfare, Edinburgh University Students' Association (Student Representative 2019-20); **Dr Emily Sena**, Research Fellow, Centre for Clinical Brain Sciences (CCBS)/Co-convenor of the University of Edinburgh's Staff

BME Network (Academic Representative); **Brian Connolly**, Academic Services (Review Co-ordinator).

2. Methodology

- 2.1 Due to the heterogeneous nature of the student groups involved the methodological approach agreed by the Review Panel placed more emphasis on qualitative methods than would usually be the case with student consultations at the University. The Panel opted for a more agile and in-depth approach utilizing interviews and small focus groups to drill down under the general sector-wide issues to get a better understanding of the specific experiences of BME students at Edinburgh.
- 2.2 The Review Panel met for the first time on 23 January 2019 to agree on the terms of reference, data and evidence for the Review Panel wiki, and review timelines. The Panel also agreed on a general email communication which was circulated to student and staff stakeholders across the University announcing the review and consultation plans.
- 2.3 The student consultation was conducted between Wednesday 26 February and Thursday 14 March 2019.

Four student focus groups were held on the following dates:

- Tuesday 26 February 2019 at the Vet School in Easter Bush.
- Friday 1 March 2019 in the Main Library, George Square.
- Friday 8 March 2019 at Murchison House, King's Buildings.
- Thursday 14 March 2019 in the Main Library, George Square.

The second group in the Main Library replaced a scheduled date at Little France which was cancelled due to a lack of responses.

In total, 40 BME students participated in the consultation sessions which is in line with the number of students that University internal review panels would expect to meet during traditional formal review days (drawn from larger cohorts than those subject to this review).

The sessions were conducted by the following Students' Association team: **Isabella Neergaard-Petersen** (Black and Minority Ethnic Officer, Students' Association), **Kai O'Doherty** (Vice President Welfare, Students' Association), **Sarah Moffat** (Welfare and Equality Coordinator, Students' Association) and **Diva Mukherji** (Vice President Education, Students' Association).

Invitations were circulated to the BME Liberation Campaign, Students' Association reps and relevant societies, and the University Student Panel. The sessions were held over lunchtime with lunch provided by way of an additional incentive to attend. The invitation included the following guidance on BME terminology (devised by the Students' Association team):

This includes students of African, Asian, Arab and Afro-Caribbean descent, as well as those from other minority ethnic groups including Jewish and Romani students, and those who would describe themselves as being of mixed or multiple ethnicities. We are keen to hear from both UK-domiciled and international students, including those from countries such as China and India. We acknowledge that ethnic identities can be complex and so if you are unsure whether you would be included in this review, please contact liberation@eusa.ed.ac.uk.

A question set was devised by the Students' Association team and used at each session (however the questions set was only used as a prompt for discussion and students were invited to comment freely on issues that were of particular interest to them at each session).

- 2.4 The Review Panel met on Friday 29 March 2019 to consider the findings of the student consultation and agree on further lines of enquiry to be taken forward with key stakeholders across the University as part of the next phase of the consultation process.
- 2.5 The initial findings of the consultation sessions were presented to the May 2019 meeting of QAC. It was agreed that the Review Panel would submit its final report, identifying areas of good practice and areas for enhancement, to QAC for approval and subsequent publication in September 2019.
- 2.6 Staff stakeholder meetings were held by the Review Panel on Friday 28 June 2019 to examine issues raised by students. These meetings were essentially formative, helping the Review Panel to understand the issues from a service delivery perspective and to seek staff suggestions on existing good practice and possible areas for enhancement.
- 2.7 The Convenor and Review Coordinator held a number of additional meetings with key stakeholders to follow-up on comments and issues identified during the staff consultation day. The outcomes of these meetings were reported to the final meeting of the review panel.
- 2.8 The Review Panel met for the final time on 4 September 2018 to agree on the key findings and recommendations of the review.
- 2.9 The final report and recommendations were discussed and approved at QAC at the meeting held on 18 September 2018.

3. Background and Context

3.1 Statistical Data

The Review Panel noted that the [Equality Diversity Monitoring and Research Committee \(EDMARC\)](#) produces an annual report analysing student and staff data by the key equality dimensions of gender, age, disability and ethnicity. The report supports the monitoring of equality and diversity within the University of Edinburgh.

The Review Panel noted the following from the 2018 Report:

3.2 Students

The overall proportion of UK domiciled BME undergraduate (UG) entrants is the highest level recorded by EDMARC. The most recent five years has seen a year-on-year increase from 7.8% to 10.2%. The proportion of UK domiciled postgraduate taught (PGT) entrants from an ethnic minority background has varied between 10.7% and 13.3% over the last five years. The proportion of UK domiciled postgraduate research (PGR) entrants from an ethnic minority background has risen year-on-year over the last five years from 9.7% to 11.5%.

The University of Edinburgh has a slightly higher proportion of UK domiciled BME entrants at all levels of study in comparison to other institutions in Scotland. However, for all levels of study the proportion of UK BME entrants is lower than the

Russel Group average. Compared to the Russell Group peers the University has approximately half as many BME entrants at both undergraduate and taught postgraduate level and approximately 75% at postgraduate research level.

The Review Panel acknowledges that this pattern is influenced by a complex mix of factors including the different ethnic mix of local populations and the different geographic range that individual institutions recruit from across the UK at UG, PGT and PGR levels of study.

For context, the 2011 UK Census reported that 12.9% of the UK population identified as black or minority ethnic and 4.1% in Scotland. When looking solely at under 25s (who make up 95% of UG entrants to the University) these figures rise to 20% in the UK and 6.2% in Scotland.

The Review Panel noted that for non-UK domiciled or international BME entrants, the proportion of UG and PGT students has increased during the last five years (rising from 44.4% to 49.9% and 56% to 60.4% respectively) whereas for non-UK PGR entrants it has remained steady (ranging from 42% to 45%).

3.3 Staff

The Review Panel noted that the proportion of UK nationality academic BME staff is 6.3% and for those staff from outside the UK it is 31.1%.

The proportion of non-UK BME staff shows a stronger upward trend over the last six years (increasing year-on-year from 23% to 31.1%) than UK BME staff (increased from 5.5% in 2012/13 to 6.3% in 2017/18).

The proportion of UK BME professional services staff is 2.9% and for non-UK staff is 22.4% with the trend showing no appreciable increase for the last few years for either category of staff.

The University of Edinburgh has a higher proportion of both UK nationality BME academic staff and BME professional services staff than the average for other institutions in Scotland but a lower proportion than that for Russell Group institutions.

There is a tendency for UK staff overall to be on higher grades than non-UK staff, and that within each of the non-UK and UK nationality groups, there tends to be a greater proportion of white ethnicity staff than BME staff on higher grades for both academic and professional services staff.

For academic staff, non-UK nationality BME staff are most likely to be employed on a fixed-term contract and white UK staff the least likely, this pattern has not changed significantly over the last six years. However, the proportion of UK BME academic staff on fixed-term contracts has fallen from 50% in 2012/13 to 34% in 2017/18, and is now a lower proportion than white non-UK academic staff (44% in 2017/18).

For professional services staff, non-UK BME staff overall are more likely to be on a fixed-term contract than their UK counterparts over the last six years, with BME staff being more likely to be on fixed-term contracts than their white counterparts for both UK and non-UK staff.

The Review Panel noted that the staff data was a snapshot of the staff database, as of 31 July 2018.

3.4 Degree Outcomes

The Review Panel noted a gap between the proportion of BME students and the proportion of white students achieving a First or Upper Second Class Honours degree at the University.

While there is little difference between the proportion of white and BME UG students that leave with an exit qualification, there is a divergence of achievement for UK-domiciled BME students. The proportion of UK domiciled BME students achieving a 1st or 2.1 honours degree has been lower than white students for each of the last five years (ranging from 2.9%-points lower to 9.3%-points lower). For non-UK BME UG students the diversion of achievement is more pronounced, with the proportion achieving a 1st or 2.1 honours degree being lower than white students in every one of the last five years (ranging from 6.7%-points lower to 13.6%-points lower). A lower proportion of BME students achieved a 1st or 2.1 honours degree in 18 out of 20 Schools across the University (ranging from -1.8%-points lower to -20.3%-points lower).

The difference in proportions of white and BME students achieving a 1st or 2.1 Honours degree is reported across the sector. In the Russell Group the difference ranges from 10 to 14 percentage points lower over the last five years. Sector-wide the overall difference stands at 15% points lower after modelling other factors and seen by a variable degree across all entry qualifications (from between 5% and 18%-points lower) and in each country in the UK.

For PGT students, a higher proportion of white UK domiciled entrants exit with a qualification than do BME entrants (ranging from 2.1%-points to 12.2%-points). However, for non UK domiciled entrants the proportion of BME students exiting with a qualification was similar to that of white students (range 2.1%-points to -0.8%-points).

In every year over the five years, UK domiciled PGR BME students were less likely to successfully complete their programme than white students (range 2.5%-points to 8.5%-points) whereas there is little difference in completion rates between non-UK domiciled BME and white students.

4. Key Themes

4.1 Racial Literacy and Awareness Gap

A gap exists between the awareness and racial literacy of University staff and the lived experiences of both UK domiciled and international BME students.

4.1.1 Student Experience

Micro-aggression is a term used for brief and commonplace daily verbal comments or behavioural actions, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative prejudicial slights and insults toward any group, particularly culturally marginalized groups.

The students who responded to the review consultation shared their experiences of racial micro-aggressions and racism at the University:

- **‘staff asking where students are from and then making jokes about countries or nationalities’**

- **‘sometimes hard to tell if comments are intended to be humorous or come from ignorance – challenging behaviour is often framed as being rude or not being able to take a joke’**
- **‘being surprised that students of colour, students from Africa, are knowledgeable and academically gifted – Black PhD students being questioned, or an assumption they’re UG’**
- **‘no recognition that some topics e.g. readings which refer to Black people as “animals” and “savages”, or images of police brutality are traumatic for Black students’**
- **‘assumption that BME students are only interested in race and will want to write their essays/thesis on it’**

The students felt that the University leaves the burden of challenging or reporting instances of racism or racial micro-aggressions to them and therefore instances often go unreported:

- **‘worried about raising issues – don’t want to be seen to be making a fuss’**
- **‘challenging and reporting harassment experienced was additional emotional and practical labour that BME students are expected to take on’**
- **‘raised issue with Student Support Officers but was just told not to go to lectures if it was a problem – all responsibility put back on student to resolve’**
- **‘challenging relationship with academic staff: often they won’t challenge anti-Semitic or racist comments from other students, or they’ll make those comments themselves, leaving BME students to call it out’**

The students suggested that at an elite university, such as Edinburgh, the fear of not being seen to be coping may make it less likely that students will come forward to report harassment and therefore make it harder to detect issues.

The Review Panel **recommends** that the University work with the student BME Liberation Campaign, BME Staff Network, and the Race Equality Working Group (see section 4.1.5) to identify mechanisms for reporting racial micro-aggressions and racism.

The Review Panel noted that the Residence Life team within Accommodation, Catering and Events (ACE) has enhanced reporting protocols to include the reporting of all significant interactions with students including instances of racial micro-aggressions and racism. The team has developed existing software to capture more data and centralise the reporting process. This will help the Residence Life team to better assess the wellbeing of students and provide earlier interventions as appropriate.

The Review Panel also noted that the ACE team has started the reconfiguration of the former security team, now called ‘Community Support’, to better reflect the role and softer skillset they currently provide students. The training and skill set of the Community Support team will be developed to better reflect and address the challenges of providing 24 hour support to students living in University accommodation.

The Review Panel **commends** Residence Life and Accommodation, Catering and Events (ACE) on the enhancements to reporting processes.

4.1.2 Staff Awareness

A key theme that became apparent during the review was the lack of staff awareness of the lived experiences of BME students.

For most of the staff that the Review Panel spoke to the absence of overt racism (or clear complaints of racism) is taken that all is well:

- **“no one has complained to me so we don’t have a problem in our school”**

Connected to this, there was a consistent lack of reflection by staff on why under-reporting may be occurring given the well-publicised sector-wide student concerns about equality and diversity issues and the evidence of a BME attainment gap. The Review Panel was also concerned that some staff seemed to be of the opinion that, having undergone unconscious bias training, racism was no longer an issue for them.

The consequence of this is a sense in which racism is not and has not been an issue to deal with either locally or institutionally. How race might matter within the University is simply not on the radar for most staff. This ran through a range of conversations with both academic and professional staff alike.

On the staff consultation day, the Review Panel spoke to academic and professional services staff from Schools with a relatively high BME student cohort and a relatively high BME attainment gap. In preparation for these meetings, staff received details of the current EDMARC report (including their School’s attainment gap) and they were informed that the review panel was interested in exploring their School’s approach. Most were unaware that there was an attainment gap in their School and some were surprised by how large the gap was.

The Review Panel was concerned that this general lack of awareness of equality and diversity issues extended to staff involved in major institutional reviews. On the staff consultation day, when enquiring if BME issues were being considered, the Review Panel was told that ‘it just hadn’t come up’ in the current Personal Tutor and Student Support Review.

The Review Panel noted a general underlying assumption that BME issues were being considered elsewhere in the University and that plans were in place. The Review Panel was also cognisant of the feeling of some staff that such discussions may not be taking place at an institutional level as formal recognition of a problem would entail significant costs – either financial or in terms of staff time.

The Review Panel **recommends** that the University work with the student BME Liberation Campaign, BME Staff Network and the Race Equality Working Group (see section 4.1.5) to identify mechanisms that address BME staff-student experiences.

4.1.3 Racial Literacy

Racial literacy means having the understanding and practice to recognise, respond and counter forms of everyday racism or racial micro-aggressions at all levels, personal, cultural and institutional.

During the consultation, the Review Panel became aware of a basic lack of racial literacy amongst both academic and professional service staff. Some staff did not

seem to have the confidence or lexicon to articulate what they wanted to say and struggled to discuss the issues raised by BME students. Staff spoke of 'other staff' being unwilling to discuss BME issues either for reasons of 'political correctness' or for fear of 'saying the wrong thing', which essentially resulted in BME issues being overlooked or avoided altogether. BME staff raised concerns that the online unconscious bias training is largely ineffective and that there is a need for more face-to-face training and discussion.

The Review Panel was in agreement that staff at all levels require assistance to develop racial literacy.

The Review Panel **recommends** that University Leadership recognise the need to improve knowledge and upskill in the area of developing racial literacy.

4.1.4 Institutional Conversation

The Review Panel was in agreement that the University must cultivate a more open culture of discussion and engagement with BME issues. The University's current approach to BME issues is risk averse, with an emphasis on seeking private resolution of problems wherever they arise to maintain reputation.

A more open and honest culture must be cultivated both inside and outwith the classroom. This new approach should be more about developing spaces for discussion and raising awareness rather than legislation or training. The aim should be to engage staff and students with issues such as: What are racial micro-aggressions and how do they impact on staff-student and student-student conversations? What does a racially relevant pedagogy mean and why does decolonising the curriculum matter? This approach will help develop greater racial literacy and raise awareness of the needs of all students and staff. Simply put, it will help staff and students to be more considerate and respectful of each other.

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Principal leads a conversation on 'race' in higher education and the implications for the University of Edinburgh.

The Review Panel was impressed by the work of Dr Krithika Srinivasan (Equality & Diversity Coordinator in the School of Geosciences) to mainstream equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) initiatives. A key activity in 2018-19 was the organisation of a workshop with the aim of collectively developing a fresh EDI strategy for the School. In this event, 6 external speakers offered brief provocations on EDI concerns in academia. Each speaker was matched with a School discussant who briefly responded to the speaker's talk and facilitated a wider discussion with the audience. The event saw active participation (more than 60 people) from across the School community (academic & professional services staff, PG and UG students, senior and junior members). Feedback from several School members in the days following the event indicated it had had immediate and direct impact in inspiring and generating reflection and action at the individual level as well as enthusiasm and ideas for building structural change at the School level. A new EDI action plan, along with a dedicated EDI budget, has been developed, approved, and is currently under implementation.

The Review Panel **commends** Dr Krithika Srinivasan and the School of Geosciences on initiatives to mainstream equality, diversity and inclusion.

During the review students and staff drew the Panel's attention to the Reni Eddo-Lodge book '*Why I'm No Longer Talking to White People About Race*' and how it had helped them understand the range of issues considered by the review. The Review Panel was in agreement that by disseminating this book to leaders across the institution the University could help initiate the institutional conversation. The book is

provocative and challenging and whilst staff may not agree with every aspect it does provoke debate and therefore growth. It would also send a signal to students and staff, both current and prospective, that the University is engaging in a new approach to BME issues.

The Review Panel **recommends** that the University provide each Head of College, School, and Professional Service with a copy of 'Why I'm No Longer Talking to White People About Race'.

4.1.5 Race Equality Charter

The Review Panel noted that the University is a signatory of the Race Equality Charter, established by Advance HE (formerly the Equality Challenge Unit) with the aims of improving the representation, progression and success of BME staff and students within higher education.

Advance HE awards the Race Equality Charter Mark (RECM) to institutions making cultural and systemic changes that will make a real difference to minority ethnic staff and students (in similar ways to which gender inequalities have been addressed under the Athena SWAN Charter). The Review Panel noted that the University was unsuccessful with a RECM application in 2016 because the judging panel felt that the action plan needed to be more ambitious.

The Review Panel was in agreement that a new application would help focus institutional actions to address BME issues (just as Athena SWAN has for gender issues). The University should re-establish the Race Equality Working Group (the Self-Assessment Team for the RECM) and work closely with Advance HE to reapply for the Race Equality Charter Mark (RECM). The new application should not just include staffing but also seek to address issues of student experience, attainment, learning and teaching, research and ethics.

The Review Panel **recommends** that the University reapplies for the Race Equality Charter Mark (RECM).

4.1.6 Benchmarking

The Review Panel was in agreement that the University needs to learn from peers across the sector to determine what other universities (in the UK and across the globe) are doing to support BME students. The University of Edinburgh should aim above the benchmarked average or basic provision of support.

The Review Panel **recommends** that the University conduct a benchmarking of approaches to supporting BME students across the UK. The findings of this exercise must be implemented at a level above the benchmarked basic provision of support for BME students.

4.1.7 Data

The Review Panel **commends** the University on the quality of the EDMARC data. The annual report provides the University with comprehensive statistical data on protected characteristics to support the monitoring of equality and diversity within the University.

However, the Review Panel noted that none of the staff who attended the consultation day were aware of the existence of the annual EDMARC Report. The Review Panel also noted that staff are not required to systematically engage with the EDMARC data once it has been published on the University's Equality and Diversity

website. Instead, the data is simply made available to Colleges and Schools for use if they wish to take it forward.

The Review Panel **recommends** that the EDMARC Report receives a high profile communication upon publication and that each College, School, and Professional Service is systematically required to provide a formal response to the report each year.

The Review Panel noted that once staff had been made aware of the EDMARC data there was an appetite to gain more detailed data to identify discipline and school-specific BME issues. Staff suggested that data needs to be more granular to identify scores on entry, progression year-on-year, and final outcomes. The data must also be collected in such a way that the differences in experiences between UK domicile and international BME students can be analysed. This will enable judgements to be made regarding how well each area of the University is supporting BME students and where more support is needed.

The Review Panel noted that the new PowerBI Data dashboards currently being rolled out by Student Systems will allow BME data to be easily assessed by all relevant staff, including Heads of School and Directors of Professional Services.

The Review Panel **recommends** that the University review the collection of data for BME students to provide more granular data, accessible via the PowerBI Data dashboards.

The Review Panel was in agreement that staff must recognise the responsibilities integral to their role and be proactive in fulfilling these, including seeking and engaging with all relevant data. There must be clarity on who has access to data (as Schools with very few BME students will not be able to anonymise students) and each area must be required to systematically engage with the BME data as part of academic and professional service annual review processes.

The Review Panel **recommends** that the University requires Colleges/Schools/Deaneries and Professional Services to respond to BME data as part of annual review processes.

4.2 **Sense of Belonging**

The impact of attending an institution where BME people are in the minority can contribute to a sense of academic and social isolation.

4.2.1 **Feelings of Isolation**

The students who responded to the review consultation shared their experiences of arriving and settling into the University:

- **‘Checked city demographics so knew it would be predominantly white but hard to conceptualise what that would feel like before coming – felt aware of difference’**

Some students mentioned that they had expected the University to be more diverse, particularly given marketing statements regarding the percentage of 'international' students and staff. However, many students were disappointed by the lack of BME people and felt that the term 'international' can sometimes be used to imply racial diversity when in fact it refers to wealthy, white, middle-class students and staff from other European or North American countries:

- **'Even home students from Edinburgh were surprised by the lack of diversity at the University, in comparison to their schools'**

Students shared their experiences of being 'the only person of colour in the room', feelings of isolation and the impact that this can have on their sense of identity and wellbeing:

- **'spaces being primarily white isn't necessarily a barrier to participation, but it's something you clock – can make you self-conscious or hyper-aware of your behaviour'**
- **'feel a pressure to integrate quickly, to avoid feeling like the odd one out – often compounded by off-hand comments from students'**

Some students explained that this sense of isolation set-in during their time in University accommodation. It was noted that living away from home with other young people, some from diverse areas and backgrounds and some not, all together for the first time can be an uncomfortable experience if you are in the minority:

- **'in halls – people are getting to know each other, but sometimes results in "jokes" at BME students' expense'**

Another student felt the weight of expectation due to the lack of BME representation in the student body:

- **'being the only person of colour on your course often means being asked repeatedly to be the "face" of your department or School (prospectus, ambassador, open days, Welcome Week, E&D Committees) – "model minority", even where opportunities are rewarding it's a lot of pressure and expectation'**

The students explained that these experiences can make it difficult for BME students to feel that they belong at the University.

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Sense of Belonging strand of the Student Experience Action Plan consider ways of specifically improving the experience of community and belonging for BME students.

The Review Panel noted a suggestion from students and staff that the University could do more to recognise and celebrate the contributions of BME staff and students to inspire other students and staff and make them feel they belong.

The Review Panel **recommends** that the University recognise and celebrate the contributions of BME staff and students.

4.2.2 Representation

The Review Panel was in agreement that representation at all levels is critical for a positive student (and staff) experience.

The Review Panel noted that Widening Participation (WP) to higher education is a strategic priority for the University. The Review Panel also noted that at present the University's approach to student recruitment within the UK can be polarised between the Scottish Government's WP priorities and the intake from the rest of the UK, which is typically from independent schools. The Review Panel was in agreement that a broader approach to WP, beyond socio-economic factors, would enable the University to target student recruitment from specific groups. This could enable the University to develop holistic outreach programmes in local schools and communities which could be led by BME staff and targeted at BME learners.

The Review Panel noted that this would be the first of its kind in Scotland.

The Review Panel **recommends** that the University recruit a new BME Outreach Officer to work with BME communities.

The Review Panel was impressed by the work of Gurpreet Grewal-Kang (Student Recruitment Manager, Veterinary Teaching Organisation) and the Veterinary admissions team to encourage WP applications and support candidates via a suite of outreach activities, regular review of entry requirements and individual guidance.

The Review Panel **commends** Gurpreet Grewal-Kang and the Veterinary admissions team on their efforts to diversify student recruitment.

The Review Panel noted the student suggestion that more staff with backgrounds and experiences similar to them would provide role models and inspirational leaders to challenge feelings of isolation, marginalisation, alienation and exclusion sometimes experienced by students from under-represented backgrounds. In particular, UK-domiciled BME people need to be better represented in the staff and student numbers. International staff and students provide a greater sense of diversity but might mask the low numbers of UK-domiciled BME staff and students. The Review Panel was in agreement that the University must be proactive with strategies to reach out to local communities to signal that Edinburgh should be the institution of choice for BME people, both for study and employment.

The Review Panel **recommends** that the University commit to increase the percentage of BME staff, both academic and professional services, with immediate priority in the professional services areas.

The Review Panel notes that the Equality Act 2010 allows an employer, when faced with two or more candidates of equal merit, to select a candidate from a particular group (e.g. a particular racial group, age group or gender) that faces a disadvantage or is under-represented in its workforce over a candidate who is not from that group, to achieve diversity in its workforce.

In relation to the two representation recommendations in this section, the Review Panel **encourages** the University to use positive action to diversify staffing.

4.2.3 Pre-arrival Information

The Review Panel noted that some students felt that the University could have done more to help them prepare for their arrival at Edinburgh. More practical pre-arrival information relevant to the needs of BME students could have helped them manage

their expectations and reduce the experience of 'culture shock' for international students or those from more diverse areas of the UK.

For example, more pre-arrival information such as advice on Vitamin D supplements for international BME students from parts of the world that may struggle with the drop in Vitamin D during their initial settling-in period in the UK. Also, more awareness that the needs of UK-domiciled BME students may be different, particularly those from more diverse cities. For example, where to locate a specialist Chinese supermarket or Afro-Caribbean hair and beauty products in Edinburgh.

Recognising student diversity by including this type of information within core pre-arrival materials would serve our BME students and subtly convey to all our students a more realistic picture of what they can expect at the University and Edinburgh.

The Review Panel **recommends** that Student Recruitment and Admissions consult with the Students' Association and the student BME Liberation Campaign to explore how pre-arrival information can be enhanced to better meet the needs of BME students.

4.2.4 Induction

The Review Panel noted a number Student Recruitment and Admissions (SRA) initiatives to help students settle in to the University.

An SRA Events App developed enables new students to browse Welcome Week events to create their own personal Welcome Week programme, explore maps of the city, and read current students' recommendations about living and studying in Edinburgh. The Welcome Week programme includes a number of events organised for new students by intercultural and multicultural student societies.

The Review Panel noted that SRA also manages a Facebook group for new students (with over 7,000 members signed up for the 2019-20 group). The group provides an opportunity for students to get to know one another, share information about everything from where to buy good cheap food, form networks around common interests and backgrounds, and support one another. It also provides an avenue for the University and Students' Association to share information and promote events. It is a very successful, active group, with a diverse membership.

The SRA also manages a Student Stories microsite that gives prospective students insights into student life at Edinburgh directly from current students. Student bloggers are from diverse backgrounds, studying across a wide range of disciplines.

The Review Panel **commends** Student Recruitment and Admissions on its initiatives to help students settle in to the University.

4.2.5 Safe Spaces

Students also shared their experiences of groups, societies and networks at the University and how they provide a safe space and lifeline of support:

- **'felt isolated before finding the BME Liberation Campaign and making other POC (*Person of Colour*) friends at a party'**

- **‘BME Liberation Campaign provides an opportunity to meet and build friendships with students outside your cohort’**

Students discussed the need for safe spaces such as these to share experiences, talk to others about being BME at University and to develop a sense of community and feeling of belonging.

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Sense of Belonging strand of the Student Experience Action Plan consult with the Students’ Association and the student BME Liberation Campaign to agree how best to target funding for BME groups, societies and networks.

4.3 Accessing Support Services

The students responding to the consultation shared their experiences of accessing support services at the University and the barriers they faced.

4.3.1 Barriers to Support

Concerns were expressed regarding a lack of staff awareness around issues of race, culture, faith leading to a perception that some staff are unable to understand or empathise with the needs of BME students:

- **‘lack of cultural awareness from staff in services – making assumptions about childhood experiences which aren’t universal and relying on cultural stereotypes e.g. assuming that stress is due to pressure from Asian family’**

Students shared their experiences of the inconsistent support they had received:

- **‘PTs are constantly changing – hard to build a relationship, can make students reluctant to reach out for support’**

Students discussed the importance of well-trained and competent staff with the willingness and skills to support all of their students and allowing staff the time and space to build a rapport with their students.

The Review Panel was in agreement that all staff with a role directly supporting students (e.g. Personal Tutors or Student Support Officers) must feel able, and empowered, to develop effective relationships with all their students.

The Review Team **recommends** that the Service Excellence Programme ensure that a systematic staff training programme is an integral part of the final recommendations of the current Personal Tutor and Student Support Team Review.

4.3.2 Mental Health

The students discussed feeling weak or embarrassed asking for mental health support and suggested that there was a need for more conversations to normalise mental health/illness:

- ‘perception before coming to university that mental health was “white people problem” as wasn’t discussed in my home country’
- ‘feel weak or embarrassed asking for support – more need for conversations which normalise mental health/illness’

Some students explained that they struggled to speak up about their mental health because of a lack of BME specific support:

- ‘concepts and understanding of mental health are really culture-specific – University’s language doesn’t always resonate with students of colour, or address cultural barriers to accessing support’

The Review Panel noted that the University’s Student Counselling Service (SCS) has a small number of BME counsellors and students can see one of these counsellors on request. It was noted that the most common request made to the SCS by student users in regard to particular counsellors is to see a counsellor of a specific gender. In anticipation of this the SCS systematically asks students if they have a preference for a female or male counsellor. However, BME students queried why the option of seeing a BME counsellor is not also be offered systematically to students seeking help.

The Review Panel noted that all SCS counsellors are Registered with or Accredited by the British Association for Counselling and Psychotherapy (BACP), the only university counselling service in Scotland to be accredited by the BACP. Furthermore, all University counsellors work to the Competency Framework required to deliver effective counselling in higher education, which includes the ability to work with difference (working in a “culturally competent” manner). The Review Panel also acknowledges the challenges that the SCS has faced when seeking to diversify its staffing in a profession which has traditionally attracted a white middle-class female workforce and a city which has a relatively small BME population. However, the Review Panel was in agreement that the service must continue to strive to meet the needs of the University’s increasingly diverse student population.

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Student Counselling Service use positive action to diversify its staffing.

The Review Panel noted that the SCS signposts students to local counselling organisations on occasions when a BME counsellor is unavailable, or more usually, when longer term counselling is needed than the service is able to provide to students.

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Student Counselling Service should ensure that it has a Service Level Agreement in place with any organisation that it uses to support University of Edinburgh students.

The Review Panel was in agreement that there is a need to strategically look at the provision of mental health support for BME students and, in particular, the presence of BME counsellors within the Student Counselling Service.

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Student Counselling Service conduct a benchmarking of approaches to supporting BME students across the UK. The findings of this exercise must be implemented at a level above the benchmarked basic level of provision.

4.3.3 The Review Panel also noted a particular example of services at the University working together to support BME students.

A multi-disciplinary team worked together last year to support Chinese students who had fallen victim to a financial scam - ensuring the students were safe and well, and that they understood what was happening from a legal perspective. Information was drawn together in order to enable students to understand the risks associated with finance, and a leaflet with information on the University's support services has been developed, translated into Mandarin and Traditional Chinese. The Review Panel noted that the University has worked in close partnership with the Chinese Student Society on this project.

The Review Panel **commends** the multi-disciplinary team of support services on the partnership project with the Chinese Student Society.

4.4 Curricula and Learning

BME students experience barriers related to both representation and cultural diversity within the curriculum and learning environments they encounter. Staff with a remit to improve BME inclusion and attainment also experience institutional barriers to achieving better outcomes.

4.4.1 The Curriculum

The students discussed their expectations that the curriculum, at a University with a global reputation, would reflect the diverse international intake of students. They had expected an inclusive curriculum that would stimulate them while they are here and prepare them for the rapidly changing and demographically diverse world into which they will move as graduates. However, the students spoke of their disappointment with the way the institution approached issues of equality, diversity and inclusion in the curriculum and how this had exacerbated their feelings of isolation and exclusion:

- **'academic spaces are welcoming but many conversations – especially about race and the global south – could be improved by a greater diversity of voices'**
- **'when international examples are brought up in lectures it's usually negative – Africa is always framed as less developed, inferior, backwards etc. – staff should try and counter this with positive examples'**
- **'language e.g. "established science" serves to dismiss the contributions of non-Western research'**

Some students explained that they felt uncomfortable contributing their perspective during lectures and tutorials, particularly when they were the only person of colour in the room:

- **'academic discussions about race often lack nuance and are dominated by white students and staff – people don't seem to value first-hand experiences'**
- **'you don't want to self-censor but aware that certain comments could make white students feel uncomfortable'**

Other students held off contributing for fear of becoming a default representative for all BME students:

- **‘sense that when discussions are around race or Islam, everyone looks to the BME and Muslim students in the room to say something – difficult for students with anxiety who don’t feel comfortable speaking’**

Students discussed how they felt unsupported when attempting to address issues of equality, diversity and inclusion in the curriculum. They shared their experiences of being challenged by academics to justify requests for the inclusion of more diverse topics or reading lists in the face of the historic weight and objectivity of the disciplinary ‘canon’:

- **‘staff reluctant to engage in critical discussions around colonialism etc. – students who raise these issues are seen as disruptive’**

In this context, some students felt that they were expected to ‘consume’ the disciplinary status quo instead of being included as partners with staff in a collaborative approach to the curriculum. Students contrasted this with the responses of some staff to poor results in student surveys – often decrying the onset of student consumerism and insisting that a collaborative partnership between students and academics is fundamental to higher education.

Students cited the lack of inclusion and diversity in the course creation process as an element of the growth of student consumerism and fear of intellectually straying too far from the established path to a ‘good degree’. The students discussed how their initial desire to seek reform can dissipate due to the barriers they face, only to be replaced by a tacit acceptance that to get a qualification the individual simply has to learn to ‘play the game’ within the confines of the existing curriculum.

The students discussed how courses and programmes could be rooted in their disciplinary history while also focused on what is happening now and where a discipline should aspire to be in the future. However, the students felt that if issues of diversity and inclusion are to be addressed then they have to make all the effort to challenge the academic status quo:

- **‘some academics seem to feel it’s enough just to point out that reading lists aren’t diverse rather than taking steps to address this’**

The students felt that going against the prevailing approach can be a daunting undertaking particularly if the academic community is not a willing collaborator. The students felt that if an individual student chooses to pursue a subject of inquiry not on the prescribed curriculum or reading list then they risk spending time and effort on a task that may not directly contribute towards their course marks. The students agreed that this places the burden of risk wholly on the individual student:

- **‘lack of support for students who want to pursue work that explores race e.g. student told that there was no-one in the School who could supervise their thesis and no real alternatives offered – a friend whose topic was also niche but didn’t involve race was offered much more support’**

The students regarded the lack of diversity across the University as a barrier to innovation and new radical approaches to research and teaching. Some students felt

that a more *diverse* academic staff population, with *diverse* research interests, driving the design of a *diverse* range of courses and programmes was the only way to ensure diversity in the curriculum.

Students suggested multiple forms of assessment so that students could select the form of assessment that best allowed them to demonstrate their skills and capabilities:

- **‘sense that sometimes marking schemes are biased against students who haven’t been educated in the UK or US, but there’s no real guidance on this’**

The students noted that when employability is addressed in the curriculum the approach taken is very local to Edinburgh or the UK. Students wanted a more international approach which reflected more global perspectives:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the proposed Curriculum Review enables BME students to be involved in diversifying content, including the co-design of curricula and assessments. Academic staff must collaborate with BME students to understand their experiences in the design, implementation and evaluation of their access, progression, and employability activities.

4.4.2 Progression and Attainment

As noted in section 3.4, the recently published EDMARC Report draws attention to the attainment or awarding gap which exists between white and BME students at the University.

The Review Panel acknowledges the limitations of attainment, in contrast to progression, as a measure of success. Furthermore, reasons for the awarding gap are complex, and will encompass a wide range of factors such as qualifications on entry and intersecting factors such as gender and class. However, students feeling socially or academically isolated or excluded may be less likely to feel they have sufficient support to fall back on when studies become challenging. This, in turn, may have a detrimental impact on progression and attainment.

Staff attending the review consultation day were invited to comment upon their School’s BME attainment data. The Review Panel noted a low level of awareness across the institution, at all levels, of the BME attainment data. Staff were not aware of the annual EDMARC Report and explained that the University does not require them to regularly monitor or discuss progression or attainment data specifically for BME students.

The Review Panel **recommends** that the University address the attainment/awarding gap. The action plan should include targets to reduce the attainment gap.

The Review Panel was in agreement that the University needs to systematically monitor retention, progression and attainment data for BME students. It was noted that it would be important to understand this data in terms of the ‘distance travelled’ by different BME groups (for example, UK-domiciled and international BME students). This type of analysis would also provide a greater understanding of the ‘value-added’ by the University and the extent to which student needs have been supported by the University. The data should be monitored at an institutional level and by subject areas, weighted by qualifications on entry, to determine if the differential is actually evidence of systematic disadvantage or whether pre-existing disadvantage is exacerbated or mitigated whilst at Edinburgh. It would also be important to monitor

the reasons why BME students decide to withdraw. This will enable the University to better understand and evaluate the individual context and challenges of each subject area and School.

The Review Panel **recommends** that Senate Quality Assurance Committee implement systematic monitoring of retention, progression and degree outcome data for BME students and, if appropriate, recommend interventions where there are clear and consistent patterns of divergence between BME students and white students.

5. Conclusion

With increasing diversities will come increasing complexities. There are variations between different groups and terms like black and minority ethnic do not fully capture the diversities on our campus. However, what cannot be denied is that our statistics show that there are issues we need to address such as closing the attainment gap between black and minority ethnic students and white students, improving the diversity of staff particularly within professional services, and continuously working to ensure the ethos and culture of the University genuinely engages with diversity.

This means being pro-active to ensure that we grapple with ideas of belonging, of identity and do not shy away from the need to educate and act against all forms of racism. We also need to debunk any misconceptions we might have that we are in a post-racial era where we have addressed issues like racism through undertaking unconscious bias training.

We should take forward action based on evidence. Statistics provide one source of evidence. However tackling racism and acting for racial equality is not just about numbers. If that was the case, then minoritized groups will never have sufficient critical mass to effect change. The stories and lived experiences of black and minority ethnic students and staff provides further evidence that works alongside statistics to provide texture and nuance when addressing complex and potentially sensitive issues.

The recommendations place primary responsibility on the institution and its leaders to lead the change. It is not about how well black and minority ethnic students integrate, it is about steps the University can take to put in place opportunities and mechanisms to assist service heads to have the data they need and require to identify what should be addressed. It is about providing strong leadership to open up safe and brave spaces to have meaningful conversations about race as well as changing institutional cultures. It is about recording and monitoring progress but most importantly it is about developing ways in which a staffing and leadership group that is largely from the majority group listens and acts on the experiences of a minority group, in this instance, black and minority ethnic students (home and international).

Thematic Review Panel
September 2019

Lists of Commendations and Recommendations

Paragraph Reference	Commendations
Foreword	The Review Panel commends the University for listening to the experiences of black and minority ethnic students, to acknowledge that there are barriers and to understand that there are huge benefits in taking diversity and equality seriously.
4.1.1	The Review Panel commends Residence Life and Accommodation, Catering and Events (ACE) on the enhancements to reporting process.
4.1.4	The Review Panel commends Dr Krithika Srinivasan and the School of Geosciences on initiatives to mainstream equality, diversity and inclusion.
4.1.7	The Review Panel commends the University on the quality of the EDMARC data.
4.2.2	The Review Panel commends Gurpreet Grewal-Kang and the Veterinary admissions team on their efforts to diversify student recruitment.
4.2.4	The Review Panel commends Student Recruitment and Admissions on its initiatives to help students settle in to the University.
4.3.3	The Review Panel commends the multi-disciplinary team of support services on the partnership project with the Chinese Student Society.

Paragraph Reference	Recommendation	Responsibility
4.1.1	The Review Panel recommends that the University work with the student BME Liberation Campaign, BME Staff Network, and the Race Equality Working Group (see section 4.1.5) to identify mechanisms for reporting racial micro-aggressions and racism.	University
4.1.2	The Review Panel recommends that the University work with the student BME Liberation Campaign, BME Staff Network and the Race Equality Working Group (see section 4.1.5) to identify mechanisms that address BME staff-student experiences.	University
4.1.3	The Review Panel recommends that University Leadership recognise the need to improve knowledge and upskill in the area of developing racial literacy.	University Leadership
4.1.4	The Review Panel recommends that the Principal leads a conversation on 'race' in higher education and the implications for the University of Edinburgh.	The Principal
4.1.4	The Review Panel recommends that the University provide each Head of College, School, and Professional Service area with a copy of 'Why I'm No Longer Talking to White People About Race'.	University

4.1.5	The Review Panel recommends that the University reapplies for the Race Equality Charter Mark (RECM).	University
4.1.6	The Review Panel recommends that the University conduct a benchmarking of approaches to supporting BME students across the UK. The findings of this exercise must be implemented at a level above the benchmarked basic level of provision.	University
4.1.7	The Review Panel recommends that the EDMARC Report receives a high profile communication upon publication and that each College, School, and Professional Service is systematically required to provide a formal response each year.	EDMARC
4.1.7	The Review Panel recommends that the University review the collection of data for BME students to provide more granular data, accessible via the PowerBI Data dashboards.	University
4.1.7	The Review Panel recommends that the University requires Colleges, Schools, Deaneries, and Professional Services to respond to BME data as part of annual review processes.	University
4.2.1	The Review Panel recommends that the Sense of Belonging strand of the Student Experience Action Plan consider ways of specifically improving the experience of community and belonging for BME students.	Sense of Belonging strand of the Student Experience Action Plan
4.2.1	The Review Panel recommends that the University recognise and celebrate the contributions of BME staff and students.	University
4.2.2	The Review Panel recommends that the University recruit a new BME Outreach Officer to work with BME communities. The Review Panel encourages the University to use positive action to diversify staffing.	University
4.2.2	The Review Panel recommends that the University commit to increase the percentage of BME staff, both academic and professional services, with immediate priority in the professional services areas. The Review Panel encourages the University to use positive action to diversify staffing.	University
4.2.3	The Review Panel recommends that Student Recruitment and Admissions consult with the Students' Association and the student BME Liberation Campaign to explore how the pre-arrival information can be enhanced to better meet the needs of BME students.	Student Recruitment and Admissions

4.2.4	The Review Panel recommends that the Sense of Belonging strand of the Student Experience Action Plan consult with the Students' Association and the student BME Liberation Campaign to agree how best to target funding for BME groups, societies and networks.	Sense of Belonging strand of the Student Experience Action Plan
4.3.1	The Review Team recommends that the Service Excellence Programme ensure that a systematic staff training programme is an integral part of the final recommendations of the current Personal Tutor and Student Support Team Review.	Service Excellence Programme
4.3.2	The Review Panel recommends that the Student Counselling Service use positive action to diversify its staffing.	Student Counselling Service
4.3.2	The Review Panel recommends that the Student Counselling Service should ensure that it has a Service Level Agreement in place with any organisation that it uses to support University of Edinburgh students.	Student Counselling Service
4.3.2	The Review Panel recommends that the Student Counselling Service conduct a benchmarking of approaches to supporting BME students across the UK. The findings of this exercise must be implemented at a level above the benchmarked basic level of provision.	Student Counselling Service
4.4.1	The Review Panel recommends that the proposed Curriculum Review enables BME students to be involved in diversifying content, including the co-design of curricula and assessments. Academic staff must collaborate with BME students to understand their experiences in the design, implementation and evaluation of their access, progression, and employability activities.	Vice Principal Students
4.4.2	The Review Panel recommends that the University address the attainment/awarding gap. The action plan should include targets to reduce the attainment gap.	University
4.4.2	The Review Panel recommends that Senate Quality Assurance Committee implement systematic monitoring of retention, progression and degree outcome data for BME students and, if appropriate, recommend interventions where there are clear and consistent patterns of divergence between BME students and white students.	Senate Quality Assurance Committee

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

18 September 2019

Thematic Review of Mental Health Services: Report on Remitted Recommendations

Executive Summary

Update on progress to implement the recommendations from the 2017-18 Thematic Review of Support for Mature Students and Student Parents and Carers.

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

The paper is relevant to the University's Strategic Objective of 'leadership in learning'.

Action requested

For approval.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

- 1. Resource implications (including staffing)**
Resource implications were considered as part of the review.
- 2. Risk assessment**
Risks were considered as part of the review.
- 3. Equality and Diversity**
Equality and diversity were an integral part of the review.
- 4. Freedom of information**
Open.

Key words

Thematic, Mature, Parents, Carers

Originator of the paper

Brian Connolly, Academic Policy Officer

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

18 September 2019

**Thematic Review of Student Support 2017-18:
Mature Students and Student Parents and Carers**

Report on Recommendations/Remitted Actions

Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC), at the meeting held on Thursday 20 September 2018, approved the final report of the [Thematic Review of Support for Mature Students and Student Parents and Carers](#). The recommendations of the review were then remitted to the individuals and areas identified in the report, which in most instances involved further consultative and developmental work during the 2018-19 academic session.

The individuals and areas remitted actions were asked to provide a year-on response to each, noting expected timescales for completion and highlighting potential barriers to progress. The following responses were received:

Report Paragraph Reference	Recommendation	Initial Update	Year-on Update	Completion date/ <i>Expected completion date</i>
3.1.3	The review panel recommends that the Student Systems develop and implement a systematic collection of data on student parents and student carers.	This will be addressed through the Edinburgh Cares project (the implementation of the Corporate Parenting Strategy, and focusing on students who are carers an estranged students).	n/a	Completed
3.2	The review panel recommends that the Director of Student Wellbeing and Senate Curriculum and Student Progression	Within work-plan for “Edinburgh Cares” project	Initial draft has been completed through ‘Edinburgh Cares’ group,	Mar 2020

	Committee develop and implement a Student Parent and Student Carer Policy setting clear expectations for when the institution and the individual need to take action.	(University's working group on implementing the Corporate Parenting Strategy, also focusing on students who are carers and estranged students.	this now needs to be completed. Collaboration with colleagues from Academic Services is taking place.	
3.3.1	The review panel recommends that the Director of Student Wellbeing develop and implement a systematic and sensitive disclosure process for student parents and carers with follow-up assessment of needs and appropriate support, advice and guidance. This system must be underpinned by a programme of training for academic and professional service staff supporting it, with particular in-depth training for those assessing the needs and recommending support mechanisms.	Within work-plan for "Edinburgh Cares" project (University's working group on implementing the Corporate Parenting Strategy, also focusing on students who are carers and estranged students.	Edinburgh Cares group taking this forward with colleagues from Student Systems and Administration. Training programme has been organised for academic and professional services staff.	Apr 2020
3.3.2	The review panel recommends that Senate Curriculum and Student Progression Committee and the Director of Student Wellbeing consider developing a system of adjustments (covering issues such as extensions and examination arrangements) that are consistent with, but not the same as, those for disabled students.	Within work-plan for "Edinburgh Cares" project (University's working group on implementing the Corporate Parenting Strategy, also focusing on students who are carers and estranged students.	This will be integrated into the work within the first recommendation above.	Nov 2019
3.3.3	The review panel recommends that Student Recruitment and Admissions conduct a consultation with mature students and student parents and carers and tailor induction provision according to the findings.	As part of Welcome Week 2019, SRA's Pre Arrival & Induction team (PAI) are organising an event for commuter students, mature students, student parents and student carers. This event will be designed for new students who are not	Ongoing	Jan 2020

		<p>living in University accommodation, and will be an opportunity to meet and socialise with other students in similar circumstances.</p> <p>As part of this event, we will ask students for their initial thoughts on their induction and welcome experience, and what they think they need to know at this point in their journey, and will aim to address these issues, and to incorporate them into planning for future events.</p> <p>In addition, we will interview mature students, self-identified student carers, and student parents to ask them about their induction experience.</p> <p>As a follow up, at the start of semester two, we will carry out focus groups with some of the original participants and capture their reflections on their induction experience and</p>		
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

		<p>improvements for future cohorts.</p> <p>The major barrier to this consultation will be identifying student carers and parents in sufficient numbers to gain meaningful insights that can inform future activity. To mitigate this, in part, we will work with the Centre for Open Learning and include participants in the Moving On programme in the evaluation.</p>		
<p>3.3.4</p>	<p>The review panel recommends that the Director of Student Wellbeing and Student Systems develop central, user-friendly webpage portals for mature students, student parents, and student carers. These pages must provide clear and supportive information on support, representation and facilities including application details and profiles, quotes, videos or case studies, wider local community information (e.g. childcare, finance etc.).</p>	<p>Within work-plan for “Edinburgh Cares” project (University’s working group on implementing the Corporate Parenting Strategy, also focusing on students who are carers and estranged students.</p> <p>The Head of Student Data and Surveys (Paula Webster) is liaising with the Director of Student Well-being to plan and implement this action.</p>	<p>Web-content for students within these groups has been refreshed within the work of Edinburgh Cares project. Will require ongoing monitoring and updating within Edinburgh Cares work.</p>	<p>Nov 2019</p>

<p>3.4.1</p>	<p>The review panel recommends that Senate Learning and Teaching Committee explore the options for growing undergraduate part-time provision to provide more flexible study options for mature students and student parents and carers. This would benefit many other groups of students, including those from Widening Participation backgrounds.</p>	<p>Discussions around curriculum review are being taken forward as part of the Student Experience Action Plan. It is anticipated that the new Vice-Principal Students, once appointed, will lead an initial phase of work to scope out what an institutional curriculum review project would involve. Exploring the potential to provide more flexible study options would be part of this work.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
<p>3.4.2</p>	<p>The review panel recommends that Senate Learning and Teaching Committee embed lecture recording fully across all academic areas, with an opt-out policy to maximise the availability of lectures to mature students and student parents and carers. This would benefit many other groups of students, including those from Widening Participation backgrounds and international students.</p>	<p>Lecture recording is now fully embedded in venues where the service is available. The Lecture Recording Policy came into operation on 1 January 2019 and makes provision for those lecturers that have reasons (in line with the policy) to opt out of lecture recording.</p>		<p>Completed</p>
<p>3.4.5</p>	<p>The review panel recommends that Senate Quality Assurance Committee implement systematic monitoring of retention and degree outcome data by age and caring</p>	<p>To be considered by SQAC at the February 2020 meeting.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Feb 2020</p>

	responsibility and, if appropriate, develop interventions where there are clear and consistent patterns of divergence between ‘traditional’ students and mature students, student parents, student carers.			
3.5.5	The review panel recommends that the Vice-Principal People and Culture and Director of Student Wellbeing conduct a strategic review of childcare provision, from the provision of child friendly spaces and crèche facilities to nurseries and childcare bursaries. The review must include benchmarking with peer institutions and consultation with students and staff in order to understand fully the needs of students and staff and to provide an evidence base for strategic decision making regarding the allocation of resources.	Within work-plan for “Edinburgh Cares” project (University’s working group on implementing the Corporate Parenting Strategy, also focusing on students who are carers and estranged students.	Significant piece of work. VP People and Culture has now left the organisation. Director of Student Wellbeing will pick up this piece of work with VP Students.	Aug 2020
3.6	The review panel recommends that the Director of Student Wellbeing explore the need to support the development of online or in-person social networks for mature students and student parents and carers, recognising the lack of time they have to establish these on their own.	Within work-plan for “Edinburgh Cares” project (University’s working group on implementing the Corporate Parenting Strategy, also focusing on students who are carers and estranged students.	Collaboration with incoming student reps required (through Edinburgh Cares) to ensure that existing networks are working, and to identify any gaps.	Nov 2019
3.7	The review panel recommends that oversight of support for student carers should be integrated into the remit of the Implementation Group overseeing support for care-experienced and estranged students, chaired by the Director of Student Wellbeing .	Oversight of support for student carers has been integrated into the remit of “Edinburgh Cares”- the Implementation Group overseeing support for care-experienced and estranged students.	n/a	Completed

<p>3.7</p>	<p>The review panel recommends that the University Disability Access and Equality Manager consider the appropriate provision of Changing Places facilities across the estate.</p>	<p>The Disability Access and Equality Manager considers the provision of changing places facilities to be reviewed across the estate on an ongoing basis. Upgrading of existing ones and developing and providing new ones occurs, where possible and appropriate. The feasibility of providing a new changing place facility at the Wellbeing Centre (7 Bristo Square) is under review. Further inclusion of suitable locations in forthcoming developments will be reviewed by the Disability Access and Equality Manager.</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>Completed. The initial action was completed in October 2018 but the requirement to consider the need for changing places facilities is an ongoing action.</p>
-------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Edinburgh
University
Students'
Association



Sabbatical Officer
Priorities & Objectives
2019-20

President 2019-20

ANDREW WILSON

Objective 1: Getting In and Getting On

The Edinburgh experience should be accessible and affordable for all students, regardless of background. The University has a responsibility to address the rising cost of city living, and financial security is key to academic success.

Objective 2: A Relevant Students' Association

The Students' Association must continue to ensure its offer is relevant to student life, working to respond to developing trends in students' lifestyles.

Objective 3: Students as change-makers

We must play a role in empowering students to achieve change at the University and beyond, harnessing the power of students' collective voice, and recognising students as conscious consumers.



Vice President Activities & Services 2019-20

BETH FELLOWS

Objective 1: Increasing participation and improving communication

When students are supported to participate in student life and extracurricular activities it improves their student experience, and gives them a greater sense of belonging to a University community.

Objective 2: Improving our services

Our services must remain relevant and in-line with students' developing needs and desires. Quality services are key to improving students' everyday experience.

Objective 3: Celebrating students

Recognising the individuals and groups which make up our diverse University community, and their achievements, builds belonging and contributes to students feeling valued.



Vice President Community 2019-20

ROSHEEN WALLACE

Objective 1: Ensuring city life suits our students' needs

Living in the city should be an affordable and enriching experience for our students. I wish to empower students as tenants and ensure that they are not priced out of living in Edinburgh.

Objective 2: Promoting and facilitating green living

In the context of the on-going climate crisis, we all have a responsibility to both make individual lifestyle changes and push for national and global responses. We should be supporting and empowering students to make sustainable choices, mobilise for change, and celebrate our successes.

Objective 3: Supporting students to engage beyond the student bubble

Students can and should play a role in the wider Edinburgh community, whether through volunteering, being involved in local decision-making, or getting involved in residents' groups.



Vice President Education 2019-20

STEPH VALLANCEY

Objective 1: Promoting quality and constructive feedback

Students deserve to receive quality feedback on their academic work, and for the feedback they provide to the University to be taken seriously.

Objective 2: Ensuring students have access to the support they need

Accessible and tailored academic and pastoral support is key to improving student experience at Edinburgh.

Objective 3: Improving the accessibility and inclusivity of academia

From a diverse curriculum to tackling hidden course costs and promoting innovative assessments, academia should be a place for all.



Vice President Welfare 2019-20

OONA MILLER

Objective 1: A commitment to campus accessibility

In order to make Edinburgh an accessible place to study and live, we must work with and lobby the University to take a proactive and forward-thinking approach to addressing the barriers of our ancient estate and city.

Objective 2: Fostering a compassionate University community

The University has a responsibility to provide quality support services, and cultivate a caring community. We all have a role to play in ensuring that students – no matter the challenges they face – are supported to thrive here.

Objective 3: Building inclusivity and tackling elitism

We must ensure that students from marginalised communities are supported in making their voices heard, have a seat at the decision-making table, and are able to see themselves reflected in the fabric of the University.



Sabbatical Officer Priorities

President

Getting In and Getting On

A Relevant Students' Association

Students as Changemakers

Vice President Activities & Services

Increasing participation and improving communication

Improving our services

Celebrating students

Vice President Community

Ensuring city life suits our students' needs

Promoting and facilitating green living

Supporting students to engage beyond the student bubble

Vice President Education

Promoting quality and constructive feedback

Ensuring all students have access to the support they need

Improving the accessibility and inclusivity of academia

Vice President Welfare

A commitment to campus accessibility

Fostering a compassionate University community

Building inclusivity and tackling elitism

Relevance: We must continue to ensure our offer is relevant to student life, working to respond to developing trends in students' lifestyles.

Participation: Strong participation and engagement is key to a healthy Students' Association and University.

Support: From academic and pastoral support, to practical help with student life, we should be here to support our members.

The University of Edinburgh

Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

18 September 2019

**Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC)
Operational Guidance & Escalation of issues**

Executive Summary

This paper asks the Committee to discuss the revised Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance and proposed action plan.

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

The paper is relevant to the Committee's responsibility for the quality assurance framework.

Action requested

The Committee is asked to discuss the guidance and proposal.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

The guidance will be made available on the Academic Services and Student Voice webpages. An email will also be sent to key stakeholders to notify them of the guidance updates.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

Full student engagement is essential to the enhancement of the student experience.

2. Risk assessment

There are risks associated with ineffectively responding to student feedback.

3. Equality and Diversity

An Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) was carried out on the Principles and Operational notes for SSLCs in September 2015 and identified no major equality and diversity implications. There have been no changes to the operational guidance since the EqIA was carried out. A review of the EqIA will be carried out if the proposal is approved.

4. Freedom of information

Open.

Key words

Student Staff Liaison Committee, SSLC, Student feedback, student voice, Student Representation

Originators of the paper

Gillian Mackintosh, Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services
Megan Brown, Academic Engagement Coordinator, Edinburgh University Students' Association

Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance & Escalation of issues

At the Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC) meeting on 23 May 2019, proposals to amend SSLC guidance to policy and mandate approaches to escalating issues and closing the feedback loop were not approved.

It was agreed that Academic Services and College Deans should meet in first instance to discuss how to take this forward and to explore approaches with Schools.

As a result of that meeting, the following was suggested for discussion at SQAC .

Action	Who	When
Update SSLC Operational Guidance/ Principles for further discussion at SQAC Suggest that SSLC principles be included in Student Voice Policy to mandate particular approaches and operational guidance to focus on the practical arrangements for running SSLCs and good practice examples	Academic Services (GM)	18 September 2019
Draft Principles to be discussed with College Deans Directors of Teaching and other relevant colleagues	College Deans and College Office administrative lead (QA), College Quality Officer or equivalent	During semester 1 2019/20
Initial conversations with School Directors of Teaching/Directors of Quality and other relevant colleagues on current approaches to escalating issues and closing the feedback loop with a view to drafting a formal remit for SSLCs or equivalent	College Deans and College Office administrative lead (QA), College Quality Officer or equivalent	During semester 1 2019/20
Communication to Schools to update on next steps	Academic Services (GM)	During semester 1 2019/20
SSLC Principles/Guidance to be submitted to SQAC for approval	Academic Services (GM)	5 December 2019
Schools can adopt practices in revised principles	Schools	Semester 2 2019/20
Colleges to confirm that Schools have submitted SSLC remits	College Deans and College Quality Administrative Officer	Prior to Feb QAC meeting (27 Feb 2020)
Revised SSLC principles to commence	Academic Services to communicate	Semester 1 2020/21

Further points for information:

- The College of Science & Engineering to introduce a College level SSLC: Once per semester, items will be escalated from College Learning committee and College Quality committee.

A summary report will be submitted to SQAC annually.

- It is suggested that SSLC good practice could be included in University sharing practice event in Feb rather than running another event.

- Examples of School remits could be shared as examples of good practice.

Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance



Purpose of Guidance

This ~~guidance policy~~ sets out the operational notes for Student Staff Liaison Committees (SSLCs). The guidance was developed in partnership with Edinburgh University Students' Association as one of the ways to support and promote the engagement of our students in their learning and to strengthen the value of SSLCs.

The guidance supports the Student Voice Policy.

Scope: Guidance is not Mandatory

The guidance applies to all students and staff involved in SSLCs.

Contact Officer Gillian Mackintosh Academic Policy Officer Gillian.Mackintosh@ed.ac.uk

Document control

Dates	Approved: 03.09.15	Starts: 01.07.13	Equality impact assessment: 11.09.15	Amendments: 18.09.19.	Next Review: 2018/2019 2021/2022
Approving authority	Senate Quality Assurance Committee (QAC)				
Consultation undertaken	The Students' Association, current School Directors of Quality, a group of Academic and Administrative staff supporting SSLCs.				
Section responsible for guidance maintenance & review	Academic Services				
Related policies, procedures, guidelines & regulations	http://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/externalexaminerstaught.pdf http://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/quality/monitoringandreview/annual-monitoring-review-and-reporting https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/tprrprsubjectareasschoolsstudentinvolvement.pdf http://www.ed.ac.uk/records-management/data-protection/guidance-policies/student-information http://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/guidanceschoolcommsrep.pdf https://www.eusa.ed.ac.uk/activities/postgraduate/about/odl/ https://www.eusa.ed.ac.uk/representation/yourrepresentatives/classreps/				
UK Quality Code	UK Quality Code Code for Higher Education Chapter B5: Student Engagement Advice and Guidance : Student Engagement (November 2018)				
Guidance superseded by this guidance	Principles and operational notes for Student Staff Liaison Committees				
Alternative format	If you require this document in an alternative format please email Academic.Services@ed.ac.uk or telephone 0131 651 4490.				
Keywords	SSLC, Student Staff Liaison Committee, Student Representation, Edinburgh University Students' Association, External Examiners.				

Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

Student Staff Liaison Committees (SSLCs; or, Teaching or Programme Committees in some Schools or Postgraduate Research Forums in some Schools) are held in every School and are the main forum for staff and Student Representatives to discuss matters relating to degree programmes and the student experience. Staff and Student Representatives are responsible for ensuring that students are made aware of how their feedback is acted upon after the SSLC meeting.

The following principles outline how SSLCs operate:

Commented [MG1]: To be added to Student Voice Policy in this format

1.	Role	<p>SSLCs provide a formal mechanism for communication and discussion between academic and administrative staff and representatives of the student body, relating to all matters connected with improving the degree programmes (at all levels of study including UG, PGT and PGR) and the student experience. In line with the new Programme Rep model, it is suggested that SSLCs would benefit from taking a programme level approach. This would draw on the Student Representatives' feedback to identify areas of improvement within the student learning experience which contribute to the degree programme. In addition it provides a mechanism to escalate issues that are outwith the remit of the programme and School to resolve, to College, University or Support Service for further action.</p>
2.	Remit	<p>SSLCs <u>should</u> have a formal written remit <u>remit which sets out the operation and governance of the SSLC, including where the SSLC sits in relation to other Committees in the School. The remit should also detail the mechanism for escalating issues out with the remit of the programme or School and how actions are reported back to the SSLC.</u></p> <p><u>Staff and Student Representatives are responsible for ensuring that students are made aware of how their feedback is acted upon after the SSLC meeting. The remit should set out the mechanism to notify students on the actions taken, and how the School will do this during the same semester as the SSLC.</u></p> <p><u>The remit should be is published on the School/Subject area/Research Centre/Institute website or equivalent.</u></p>
3	Membership	<p>Meetings should <u>can</u> be attended by Programme Representatives for the programmes being discussed, Elected School Representatives, Course/Year Organisers, Programme Conveners, School PG-Programme Directors, Research Centre or Institute staff, Personal tutors, School Directors of Quality, Administrative staff, School IT representatives & other relevant staff to discuss programme issues and staff responsible for the leadership and organisation of the programme, including professional services staff and appropriate staff as identified by the School governance structure</p>
4	Frequency of meetings	<p>At least one formal meeting should be held in each semester, which should be agreed upon in consultation with School staff and Student Representatives. This should ideally be scheduled to avoid clashing with courses students may typically be taking within the School.</p> <p>All SSLC members should be informed of the date, time, location of the meeting, inviting any additional items to be added to the agenda.</p> <p>Schools <u>must should</u> publish the date, time, and location of the meeting, inviting any additional items to be added to the agenda, s of the meetings ahead of the meeting. It and it is suggested that this happens at least two weeks in advance of the meeting.</p>

Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

5	Agenda items	The Agenda agenda must should be made available in advance of the meeting. Suggested agenda items are listed in section 5.3.
6	Meeting format	<p>Students should be Schools are encouraged to have student chairing of meetings or co-chairing with staff.</p> <p>Schools are further encouraged to select a member of staff to support the student chair.</p> <p>Online Learner Student Representatives and Students should have the opportunity to participate virtually during the meeting or otherwise, input via other electronic means beforehand.</p> <p>Exact format will vary between Schools however, an example of a basic format is described in section 6.</p>
7	Minutes	Schools are strongly encouraged must to publish minutes on the School/subject area webpages and inform students and staff where these are located

1. Role

Student Staff Liaison Committees (SSLCs; or, ~~Teaching or Programme Committees~~ in some Schools or Postgraduate Research Forums in some Schools) are meetings at which Student Representatives, ~~Programme/Course/Year Organisers, Academic and Administrative staff and staff~~ supporting teaching and learning discuss the student experience which may include issues and activities in courses, programmes, and Schools.

Commented [BM2]: Is 'Teaching or Programme Committees' still terminology which is used?

~~To increase the effectiveness of student representation and support from Schools and the Students' Association, it is suggested that SSLCs would benefit from taking a programme-level approach. This would draw on Student Representatives' feedback and mid-course feedback to identify areas of improvement within the student learning experience which contribute to the degree programme. Schools are expected to implement a programme-level representation system for taught provision rather than following a tutorial- and course-level representative model. The number of programme representatives ('student reps') for taught provision in each School should be broadly proportionate to the number of students on programmes in the School. While Schools have flexibility, in liaison with the Students' Association, to determine how they organize their programme reps, a ratio of 1:40 is a useful guide.~~

~~Edinburgh University Students' Association coordinates Student Representation across the University and provides training and support for all Student Representatives (including Programme Representatives and elected School Representatives). Student Representatives should be jointly supported in their role by the Students' Association and Schools. Schools take ownership over their own student representation structures, the recruitment of Programme Representatives, and facilitating communication between Student Representatives and the students in their cohort so that feedback can be representative. Student Representatives work with the students they represent to identify areas for improvement, suggest solutions, and ensure that the views of the students they represent inform strategic decisions within the University. Student Representatives work in partnership with staff to build a stronger academic community and improve the student learning experience.~~

Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

As structures and systems vary between Schools, Institutes or Research Centres, the format of SSLCs may also be different to reflect this. Nonetheless, the principles should remain the same in that the committee provides a formal mechanism for communication and discussion between ~~academic staff, administrative~~ staff and representatives of the student body relating to all matters connected with the degree programme, and the student experience.

2. Remit

2.1 Formal Written Remit

~~SSLCs are encouraged to have a formal written remit, of which Student Representatives and staff review annually to ensure that it reflects current learning, teaching and research matters in their School/Subject area.~~

SSLCs should have a formal written remit which sets out the operation and governance of the SSLC, including where the SSLC sits in relation to other Committees.

The remit should be reviewed annually by staff and student representatives to ensure that it reflects current learning, teaching and research matters in the School/Subject area.

Staff and Student Representatives are responsible for ensuring that students are made aware of how their feedback is acted upon after the SSLC meeting. The remit should set out the mechanism by which students will be notified on actions taken and expected response timelines. Schools are strongly encouraged to respond to issues in a timely manner, ideally during the same semester as the SSLC. This could happen at another meeting or via another route.

The remit should state who is responsible for checking that actions have been remitted and responded to.

~~It is suggested that the remit should be published on the School/Subject area/Research Centre/Institute website or and that equivalent. Staff and students in that area should be made aware of its location. this.~~

2.2 Expectations Student engagement

~~SSLCs are one way in which students and staff should engage in discussions to improve the student experience at the University of Edinburgh, including the online learning environment for students not studying on campus.~~

~~Following the launch of the publication of the UK Quality Code Advice and Guidance: Chapter B5: Student Engagement (November 2018), the code states that the provider actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience. Higher education providers create and maintain an environment within which students and staff engage in discussions that aim to bring about demonstrable enhancement of the educational experience'. SSLCs are one way in which students and staff should engage in discussions to improve the student experience at the University of Edinburgh, including the online learning environment for students not studying on campus.~~

~~Furthermore, the code states: 'Higher education providers, in partnership with their student body, define, promote, monitor and evaluate the range of opportunities to enable all students to engage in share information so that students and staff involved in quality assurance and enhancement processes systems have an equally informed voice'.~~

Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

Student Representatives ~~are will be~~ expected to gather representative student views to identify good best practices and practice and areas for development to enhance the degree programme and student experience of improvement of the delivery, content, materials, assessment and feedback, and

~~Students should share with staff any~~ suggestions with staff so they can work in partnership ~~to to improve these areas and~~ create a strong academic community within their area.

~~Schools should share with Student Representatives the University student email address of the students they represent or facilitate alternative ways for Student Representatives to contact classmates e.g. m-list. Guidance is available for Schools which outlines the mechanisms by which Schools should share University student email address to facilitate alternative ways for Student Representatives to contact students in compliance with data protection guidelines.~~

~~Please refer to Guidance for Schools regarding communication between Student Representatives and students and the Policy on Disclosure of Student Information~~

3. Membership

3.1 Suggested membership

~~SSLC meetings are attended by Programme Representatives, Course/Year Organisers, Degree Programme Conveners, School Postgraduate Programme Directors, staff representing Research Centres or Institutes, Personal tutors, School Directors of Quality, Administrative staff supporting teaching and learning, School IT representatives and other relevant and staff staff to discuss programme issues, responsible for the leadership and organisation of the programme, including professional services staff and, appropriate staff as identified by the School governance structure~~. It is suggested that the relevant elected Undergraduate/Postgraduate School Representative is also invited to SSLCs to be given the option to attend, and that they would receive SSLC communications.

~~The relevant elected Undergraduate/Postgraduate School Representative should be invited to attend SSLC meetings in their School, or at minimum be informed of the business conducted. Their contact details can be obtained at <https://edin.ac/2NtW2gH> or by emailing reps@eusa.ed.ac.uk. Where appropriate, presidents of relevant academic societies within the School or subject area could also be invited to SSLC meetings; their details are available via eusa.ed.ac.uk/societies~~

~~Some Schools may choose to ask the School Representative to chair the SSLC meeting(s).~~

3.2 Student Representatives

~~During the first two weeks of the semester, Year Organisers or Degree Programme Conveners should invite students to become Programme Representatives and, where appropriate, hold elections to select the Representatives with consideration to the ratio of the student cohort. Students should be made aware of the purpose of the Programme Representative role, expectations of Programme Representatives, and that their details will be passed to the Students' Association in order to provide them with training and support.~~

~~Recruitment of Programme Representatives should happen as early as possible and no later than the end of Week 2 of each semester. Each School Office will collate details of Programme Representatives and send them to the Students' Association during Week 3. Details of Programme Representatives will not be accepted after Week 4.~~

Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

The Students' Association holds elections in March (followed by By-Elections in October for postgraduate positions and any unfilled positions) each year to elect Undergraduate and Postgraduate School Representatives. These elected School Representatives should be invited as members of SSLC meetings in their School, or at minimum be informed of the business conducted. Their contact details can be obtained at <https://edin.ac/2NtW2gH> or by emailing reps@eusa.ed.ac.uk. Where appropriate, presidents of relevant academic societies within the School or subject area could also be invited to SSLC meetings; their details are available via eusa.ed.ac.uk/societies

~~Schools should share with Student Representatives the University student email address of the students they represent or facilitate alternative ways for Student Representatives to contact classmates e.g. m-list. Guidance is available for Schools which outlines the mechanisms by which Schools should share University student email address to facilitate alternative ways for Student Representatives to contact students in compliance with data protection guidelines.~~

~~Please refer to [Guidance for Schools regarding communication between Student Representatives and students](#) and the [Policy on Disclosure of Student Information](#)~~

4. Frequency of meetings

The frequency of SSLC meetings should be agreed in consultation with School staff and Student Representatives. However, at least one formal meeting should be held in each semester. This may vary between Schools depending on their size and structure as well as in terms of undergraduate and postgraduate provision.

For example some SSLCs may operate at School, subject or programme level depending on their structure.

At undergraduate level it may be more appropriate to meet once per semester whereas for postgraduate taught students it may be more appropriate to have additional meetings spread over the year.

Some Subject areas and Schools may meet formally once a semester but may operate a more informal system throughout the year in terms of students having access to other meetings such as Director of Teaching meetings, School Undergraduate Learning and Teaching Committee meetings and meetings taking place at different levels (e.g. programme; subject area; school).

Therefore, Schools should operate whichever system is most appropriate to their structure. Schools should publish the dates of meetings on the School/Subject area webpage or equivalent ahead of the meeting ~~and email all members with this information.~~

Good Practice

Some Schools list the dates of the meeting on the Rep student timetable. Students receive a note in their student timetable encouraging them to communicate with their Rep.

Some Schools schedule two meetings per semester: during week 3 /4 to discuss immediate issues at the start of semester, and towards the end of semester to feedback on actions.

Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

5. Agenda items

The agenda must be made available in advance of the meeting.

5.1 Sharing information

Staff are expected to share information with students. This could include information such as themes arising from student surveys, themes from External Examiners reports, Part 3 External Examiner reports (Postgraduate Research), course evaluation and review documentation, School Annual Quality Reports, and Internal Periodic Review TPR/PPR reports. Student Representatives and staff should collaborate to identify trends, areas for improvement and suggestions to enhance the student experience. Students' views should be sought on new programmes and courses as well as on changes to existing ones and the SSLC could provide a forum for this type of discussion.

5.2 Suggested agenda items

Although the exact format of meetings will vary between schools, this is an example of the basic format which many follow, in the order that they occur.

Agenda items can be suggested by students and staff and should be used as a focal point through which students can be informed about and be involved in decision making processes relating to:

- Minutes of last meeting including update on actions
- Matters arising
- Agenda items suggested by students
- standing items: School, College or University wide issues and any updates from School rep
- School Annual Quality report
- themes arising from Student Surveys, course evaluation questionnaires
- themes from for mid-course feedback
- Internal Periodic Review preparation, where appropriate
- Internal Periodic Review reports, where appropriate
- themes from External Examiner summary reports
- Professional, Statutory & Regulatory Body (PSRB) accreditation reports, where appropriate
- Enhancement Led Institutional Review (ELIR), where appropriate
- staff communications
- Student Partnership Agreement - priorities and any local activities which advance these priorities
- Any other business (AOB)
- Date of Next Meeting: The date and time of the next meeting should be agreed and recorded by the minute-taker.

5.3 External Examiner summary reports at SSLCs

Schools must provide an opportunity for Student Representatives to view themes extracted from External Examiner reports and the School's summarised response to these themes (section 68 External Examiners for Taught Programmes Policy).

In partnership with the Students' Association, Senate Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) has agreed that the SSLC is the best forum for consideration of themes arising from External Examiners' reports and summarised responses of Schools/Subject areas.

Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

In order to streamline material being presented to SSLCs, Schools are encouraged to summarise points from External Examiner reports and group them into themes, together with the response from the School/Subject area/Programme and highlight areas of good practice.

In some Schools, the School-level SSLC may not be the most appropriate forum for discussion of themes and responses as this will take place at department or programme level rather than as part of the School as a whole.

Consideration should also be given to instances where one External Examiner's report might be relevant to more than one SSLC particularly for joint degrees. Therefore, each School should decide which SSLC is most appropriate to their structure for the consideration of the summary reports.

Undergraduate External Examiner reports are received after the summer exam diet. For undergraduate students, the summary reports should be submitted to the first SSLC meeting of the academic year.

Postgraduate Taught External Examiner reports are received at the end of November and the summary reports will be submitted for consideration at SSLCs in the second semester.

The summary reports and responses should be emailed to SSLC members ahead of the meeting and in good time to allow members to prepare responses for discussion.

The consideration of summary reports is an opportunity to be involved in discussion of potential improvements to courses and programmes recommended by the External Examiners. During the SSLC meeting, Students should consider the themes and responses in the summary report and be encouraged to provide comments and suggestions.

However, it should be noted that there may be occasions when an External Examiner makes a suggestion or recommendation that is not possible/practicable for the University to implement. The response from the School to the External Examiner should demonstrate that the University has given full and serious consideration to the comments made and indicates the reason that action cannot be taken forward.

Following consideration of the themes at the SSLC, comments and suggestions should be recorded in the SSLC meeting minutes.

Depending on recommendations, ongoing actions would be reported to SSLC meetings later in the academic year and ultimately through subsequent External Examiner reports.
(Section 68.1- 68.4 [External Examiners for Taught Programmes Policy](#))

It should be noted that individual students and members of staff will not be named in the reports.

5.3 Suggested Agenda items

~~Agenda items can be suggested by students and by staff and should be used as a focal point through which students can be informed about and be involved in decision-making processes relating to:~~

~~— student-generated items~~

Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

- ~~— School Annual Quality report – The shorter school annual quality report will lend itself to discussion of themes and actions being taken by the school in student staff liaison committees at the start of the following academic year~~
- ~~— themes arising from Student Surveys, course evaluation questionnaires~~
- ~~— processes for mid-course feedback~~
- ~~— Internal Periodic Review preparation, where appropriate~~
- ~~— Internal Periodic Review reports, where appropriate~~
- ~~— themes from External Examiner summary reports~~
- ~~— Professional, Statutory & Regulatory Body (PSRB) accreditation reports, where appropriate~~
- ~~— Enhancement Led Institutional Review (ELIR), where appropriate~~
- ~~— standing items~~
- ~~— staff ideas and communications~~
- ~~— Student Partnership Agreement – priorities and any local activities which advance these priorities~~

Good Practice

Some Schools ask the Reps to suggest items under the headings of Start, Stop and Continue or by theme.

6. Meeting format

6.1 Chairing of meetings

~~Students should be~~ Schools are encouraged to ~~have a student chairing the~~ meetings. This could be an elected School Representative or another trained Programme Representative. ~~Where Schools decide not to have a student chair they~~ may wish for the chair person to be neutral (e.g. not a student on-programme, Programme Director or Course Organiser teaching on the programme which is being discussed). ~~Some Schools are encouraged to may wish to assign~~ select a member of staff to support the student chair, ~~and facilitate the student's leadership role within the SSLC.~~

Further information for students on preparing for and chairing meetings, is available on the Students' Association Programme Representative Forum on Learn (a closed area for Programme Representatives), and on the Students' Association website at: www.eusa.ed.ac.uk/programmereps

Good Practice

~~Some Schools have a student chair and a student taking the minutes. It is helpful to assign a member of staff to support the student members and facilitate the student's leadership role within the SSLC.~~

Some Schools may choose to ask the School Representative to chair the SSLC meeting(s).

Some Schools organise a Welcome event at the start of semester so Reps have a clear understanding of the role and expectations and to make them aware of the staff who can offer support.

6.2 Example of meeting outline

~~Although the exact format of meetings will vary between schools, this is an example of the basic format which many follow, in the order that they occur. The minutes of the meetings should follow the same structure.~~

Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

Agenda

Minutes of the last meeting

Matters arising

Agenda items suggested by students and by staff

Any other business (AOB)

Date of Next Meeting: The date and time of the next meeting should be agreed and recorded by the minute-taker.

6.3 Online Learner (OL) Student participation

At School level, Online Learner (OL) Student Representatives and students should have the opportunity to participate virtually or otherwise input into SSLCs electronically.

Consideration should be given for meetings with remote participants for example, Student Representatives should be able to input into the agenda; receive meeting papers before meetings and minutes afterwards.

Meeting organisers should consider the following when arranging the timing of meetings:

- the availability of students who have work commitments,
- time zone considerations,
- allow students plenty of notice of the meeting,
- ensure in advance that students can access whichever system is being used.

A number of options exist for Schools to set up meetings to enable OL students to participate such as Collaborate, Skype or video conference.

Collaborate, for instance, is an IS-supported system designed to support online classes and meetings. Any member of staff or student can set up Collaborate sessions via MyEd, and a wide range of guidance materials is available and accessible online.

- <http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/information-services/learning-technology/communication/collaborate/collaborate-students>

Skype is not centrally supported but is widely used by staff and students, and like Collaborate requires just a computer/tablet and a webcam. Other similarly 'technology light' tools and environments exist and are valued because they are free, and can be used with a lot of flexibility.

- <https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/display/mscdetech/11.+Skype>

Video conference three video conference (VC) suites exist in centrally bookable rooms, and other VC suites are situated in Schools around the university. The VC system is hosted by JANET, and requires registration. Online tutorials are available via the JANET VC webpages, and local support is offered via LTSTS.

- <http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/information-services/computing/comms-and-collab/videoconferencing>

Further information for students on preparing for and chairing meetings, is available on the Students' Association Programme Representative Forum on Learn (a closed area for Programme Representatives), and on the Students' Association website at: www.eusa.ed.ac.uk/classreps

6.3 Communication following the SSLC

Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

Students and staff should not be expected to give an immediate response at meetings to all issues or where they would want to consult further. ~~Students; they~~ may feel it necessary to consult with students in the cohort or with students in other parts of the School. Most important of all, if any action is called for and agreed upon it should be promptly reported back to students via Student Representatives.

Staff and Student Representatives are responsible for reporting back information to those e-people they represent and taking ownership of any action points agreed at the meeting.

Schools should appoint named academic and Professional Services support staff contacts in each School for Student Representatives to discuss any additional issues as they arise or request additional meetings if required. Student Representatives and the Students' Association (reps@eusa.ed.ac.uk) should be kept informed of the contact details of these staff contacts.

7. Minutes

The minutes should follow the same structure as the agenda outline. ~~Schools are encouraged to publish the minutes from meetings on the School/Subject area webpages; Learn; showing clear action points resulting from SSLCs.~~

The person nominated to write the minute should identify agreed action points and assign them to specific individuals, with a target completion date.

It is normally the responsibility of a member of staff to write the minute, and students would not be expected to write the minute. However, where a student member volunteers or is nominated to write minutes, they should be supported by a member of staff to ensure that actions are directed appropriately.

Schools must publish the minutes from meetings on the School/Subject area webpages, Learn or equivalent and inform students and staff of the location. Minutes should be made available as soon as possible after the meeting.

Minutes can be made available to internal review teams if there is a particular theme from the reflective report to be followed up.

Minutes may be reviewed by Senate Quality Assurance Committee and/or College Quality Committees in relation to themes emerging from the escalation of issues

Good Practice

The Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies provides a Rep starter pack detailing an example of clear and helpful style of minutes and flowchart detailing the pathway of the minutes.

~~Some Schools record in the minutes the action point, who will action and the target completion date.~~

Some Schools prepare a 'You Said, We Did' response and post it on Learn and inform students via announcements and email.

~~Please note that SSLC minutes can be made available to internal review teams if there is a particular theme from the reflective report to be followed up.~~

Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

8. Equality

Schools should determine appropriate mechanisms for ensuring that all Student Representatives have an opportunity to participate. It is suggested that Schools consider the use of online forums or virtual meetings where appropriate.

17 August 2018
September 2019

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

18 September 2019

**Terms of Reference,
Senate Committees Members' Guidance,
and Committee Priorities 2019/20**

Executive Summary

This paper notes the Committee's Terms of Reference, Senate Committees Members' Guidance and outlines the planned priorities for 2019-20.

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

The paper is relevant to the University's Strategic Goal of 'excellence in education' and the Strategic Theme of 'Outstanding student experience'.

Action requested

For information.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

- 1. Resource implications (including staffing)**
Resource implications would be considered as part of any proposed actions.
- 2. Risk assessment**
The paper does not require a risk assessment.
- 3. Equality and Diversity**
Equality and diversity would be considered as part of any proposed actions.
- 4. Freedom of information**
The paper is open.

Key words

Terms of Reference, Committee Priorities

Originator of the paper

Brian Connolly, Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services

Terms of Reference and Committee Priorities 2019/20

The Terms of Reference can be found at the following link:

<http://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/committees/quality-assurance/terms-reference>

Senate Committees Members' Guidance can be found at the following link:

<https://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/committees>

The Committee identified the following priorities for 2019/20 which were approved by Senate in May 2019:

Activities cutting across the four Committees:

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

Activities for Senate Quality Assurance Committee:

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

SQAC: 18.09.19
H/02/28/02

SQAC 19/20 1J

- | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Continue to monitor the effectiveness of the operation of the Personal Tutor system |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Continue to support Schools to reflect on their patterns of degree classification outcomes |

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

18 September 2019

Annual Report to the Scottish Funding Council on Institution-led Review and Enhancement Activity 2018/19

Executive Summary

The paper is the University's annual statement on institution-led review and enhancement activity to the Scottish Funding Council (SFC).

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

The paper is relevant to the Committee's responsibility for the quality assurance framework.

Action requested

Approval of the contents of the report.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

The paper has also been presented to eSenate for noting and comment and to Court for consideration and approval. Court will be asked to return a statement of assurance to the SFC confirming that the University's academic standards and quality of learning provision continue to meet the requirements set by the Council.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

There are no specific resource implications associated with the report.

2. Risk assessment

The provision of a high quality student experience is a high level risk on the University's Strategic Risk Register, and is overseen by the Risk Management Committee reporting to Audit & Risk Committee and Court, which receives regular updates on the student experience action plan. Additionally, failure in effectiveness of the quality assurance framework, including aligning review activity with external expectations and taking action on findings, constitutes an institutional risk.

3. Equality and Diversity

Quality assurance policies and processes are subject to Equality Impact Assessment.

4. Freedom of information

The paper is open.

Key words

Quality assurance and enhancement, Scottish Funding Council, annual report

Originator of the paper

Professor Tina Harrison (Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance) and Nichola Kett (Academic Policy Manager, Academic Services), XX September 2019



The University of Edinburgh

Annual Report to the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) on Institution-led Review and Enhancement Activity 2018/19

Summary of the institutional-led review outcomes from the preceding academic year (AY) including main themes, recommendations and/or commendations

The University carries out regular reviews of its subject areas and Schools as one of the main ways in which it assures itself of the quality of its academic provision and the student experience. The reviews are carried out on a six-yearly cycle and take the form of either a taught or postgraduate programme review (TPR or PPR).

Institution-led review (Teaching/Postgraduate Programme Reviews) – 2018/19¹

- Classics (undergraduate provision)
- Engineering (combined) (undergraduate & postgraduate taught provision)
- History of Art (undergraduate provision)
- Earth Sciences (undergraduate provision)
- Philosophy (undergraduate provision)
- College of Medicine & Veterinary Medicine (postgraduate research provision)
- Edinburgh College of Art (postgraduate taught & postgraduate research provision)
- GeoSciences (postgraduate research provision)

As agreed with the Scottish Funding Council, the review of Literatures, Languages and Cultures (postgraduate taught and postgraduate research provision) was postponed from March to October 2019. As an interim measure, a meeting with current postgraduate taught students was held in March 2019 and the review team progressed with some desk-based aspects of the review.

Discussion is underway with the Scottish Funding Council to make changes to the review schedule in the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences. After completing a short review, the College have outlined changes to the schedule which will allow Schools to take a more holistic and strategic overview of their programmes. This approach is already working positively in Schools elsewhere in the College. Broadly, we propose to combine individual programme and sub-subject area reviews into single School reviews for undergraduate provision. This is common practice for postgraduate provision, where reviews are held at School level. This will result in changes for a small number of Schools, with some proposed changes requiring alternations to the current schedule. To ensure the appropriate level of granularity of scrutiny, the schedule of meetings template will be reviewed, parallel meeting sessions can be held, and we will consider engaging with an increased number of externals to ensure coverage of discipline knowledge.

¹ Reports available at: <https://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/quality/monitoringandreview/teaching-and-postgraduate-programme-review>

The Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC) receives an annual report in September each year on areas of good practice and for further development from institution-led reviews and remits actions as necessary². A progress report on actions is considered by SQAC at an appropriate point later in the academic year³. The areas of good practice and for further development from 2018/19 reviews are:

Areas of good practice

- **Student support – the support, dedication and commitment provided to students by both academic and professional services staff.** Examples include:
 - The dedication of staff teaching languages who provide extra support to students (TPR of Classics)
 - The clear commitment of Postgraduate Tutors (TPR of History of Art).
 - The dedication of the Personal Tutors, the Senior Tutor who is very active and is providing high quality training and guidance, and staff working within the Student Support and Teaching Offices who provide an outstanding service, especially with mental health support (TPR of Philosophy).
 - The strong administrative and pastoral support provided to students by the administration and student support team (PPR of Edinburgh College of Art).
- **Learning, teaching and the curriculum – including the quality of teaching, breadth of curriculum, skills development, and fieldwork opportunities.** Examples include:
 - The quality of academic staff in the subject area, the inspirational quality of academic teaching, and the emphasis on the relevance and application of teaching (TPR of Earth Sciences).
 - The cross-disciplinary Engineering 1 core course provides flexibility for students by keeping options open and a positive sense of community (Engineering TPR).
 - The diversity and breadth of programmes and courses (PPR of Edinburgh College of Art).
- **Employability and graduate attributes – engagement with alumni and employers, involvement of the Careers Service and use of placements.** Examples include:
 - The School Careers Consultant works with each subject area to develop its careers and employability profile through various activities including developing ways of further embedding employability initiatives in the curriculum. The School Marketing Officer is involved in linking recent graduates to the current cohort to promote careers options and employment opportunities (TPR of Classics).
 - The Work Placement Co-ordinator liaises with host institutions, supports students on placement, and ensures and maintains the quality of the work placements offered (TPR History of Art).
 - The use of residencies (typically run as micro-residencies held over the summer with student workshops) in Architecture, in order to make live projects coherent and visible (PPR of Edinburgh College of Art).
 - Careers Service support is integrated into the curriculum in a number of ways, including tailored sessions (TPR of Engineering).
- **Supporting and developing staff, including support for tutors and demonstrators – rewarding and recognising teaching, roles to support and mentor tutors and demonstrators, and support provided to staff by other staff.** Examples include:
 - The support provided to tutors and demonstrators in Biomedical Sciences, particularly their mentoring training programme for the joint provision with Zhejiang University (PPR of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine).

² Example from last year <https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/sqac-agendapapers-20180920-web.pdf> (Paper C)

³ Example from last year <https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/web-sqac-agendapapers-20190425.pdf> (Paper E)

- A major review of tutoring and demonstrating, which involved postgraduate research students, resulted in an overhaul of the tutor and demonstrator system, including making the application process more transparent (PPR of GeoSciences).
- The support provided by the Teaching Office and course organisers to postgraduate tutors and teaching staff, including during induction, the oversight of marking and feedback, and the coordination of implementation of adjustments for students in class (TPR of Classics).
- The School has ensured that contributions to good teaching are rewarded by promoting staff via the recognition of teaching pathway (TPR of Earth Sciences).
- **Academic community – use of societies, social activities and student-led activities.** Examples include:
 - Encouragement of student-led peer support through postgraduate societies and the SolidariTEA initiative which aims to provide an informal support and advice network for students (PPR of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine).
 - The work being undertaken to develop community, which includes degree programme lunches, changes made to the honours curriculum to develop cohort identity, and involvement of academic staff in year 2 tutorials (TPR of Philosophy).
 - Various social activities in place to encourage a sense of community between staff and students across all disciplines (TPR of Engineering).

Areas for further development (identified in multiple reviews)

- **Tutors and demonstrators.** Recommendations related to training, promoting continuing professional development opportunities, improving two-way (feedback to and from) communication, allocating reasonable time for tasks, appointing a role to provide support, and appointment processes.
- **Widening participation.** Recommendations related to increasing numbers of students from widening participation backgrounds, considering widening participation students through reviews of curriculum and induction arrangements, provision of additional management information, and the appointment of a subject area dedicated Widening Participation Director.
- **Assessment and feedback.** Recommendations focussed on quality of feedback and implementing assessment and feedback policy on formative assessment, feedback turnaround times, and scaling of marks.
- **Supporting and developing staff.** Recommendations covered the importance of staff engagement in continuing professional development and aspects of promotion.
- **Student voice.** Two out of three PPRs had recommendations relating to clarity and enhancement of the student representation system at postgraduate research level.
- **Employability and graduate attributes.** Recommendations related to embedding transferable skills and graduate attributes within the curriculum, extending writing skills support, engagement with alumni and employers, and extending the use of inter-disciplinary projects.

No significant changes were made to the institution-led review process in 2018/19. Academic Services provided review areas with key data to ensure that remit items explored during reviews are evidence-based and address key strategic issues. This approach was challenging due to the multiple sources of data, organisation of data (which required manipulation to reflect review areas) and presentation of data. During 2018/19 Student Data and Surveys, in consultation with stakeholders, developed enhanced student data dashboards for annual monitoring, review and reporting processes which make data more accessible, easily interpreted and understood. From 2019/20 these will be used for institution-led reviews. From 2019/20 the term ‘internal periodic review’ will be used rather than ‘teaching or postgraduate programme review’ to better reflect the mix of provision being reviewed.

Annual monitoring, review and reporting – 2018/19

Each September, the Sub Group that reviews School annual quality reports submits a report to SQAC on the outcomes of annual monitoring, review and reporting processes, identifying areas of good practice and for further development and remitting actions as necessary⁴. Responses to the additional School-, College- and University-level actions arising from the review of School annual quality reports are made available to SQAC throughout the year.

In response to feedback, an aide memoire process was implemented in 2018/19. In advance of the review cycle, School Directors of Quality were sent an aide memoire summarising actions proposed in the previous year's report, any additional actions requested by SQAC for the next report, and a progress report on agreed College- and University-level actions. Also in response to feedback, from 2019/20 the College annual reporting cycle will be brought forward from January to November and a revised reporting template used. Additionally, the Students' Association Vice President Education attended the Sub Group meeting in September 2019.

Themes of positive practice for sharing at University level:

Examples of good practice were identified in every School annual quality report. The following two themes reflect the areas where there was a critical mass of good practice examples.

Student Voice

This was a strong theme across many School annual quality reports. Schools provided a number of examples of how student feedback was gathered and responded to, in many cases beyond the requirements set out in the Student Voice Policy. Additionally, Schools reported that the new programme student representative system was bedding in well. Examples include:

- In the School of Economics Course Organisers are required to provide pre-course updates on new features of their courses and responses to mid-course feedback and course enhancement questionnaires. Combined with cohort level feedback events this has led to a significant rise in responses to the National Student Survey question "It is clear how students' feedback on the course has been acted on."
- In the School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences trained student consultants are invited to attend a class and then provide constructive feedback to staff.
- In the Deanery of Molecular, Genetic and Population Health Sciences online distance learning programmes continue to provide several options for communication beyond the formal mechanisms. MSc Clinical Trials students are encouraged to express constructive criticism and make suggestions in the online 'not just for problems' forum. This has led to a number of enhancements during the running of the programme.
- In the School of Biological Sciences there has been wide uptake of mid-course feedback with a broad range of collection methods being used, including postcards, TopHat, Learn discussion boards and surveys, drop-ins after lectures, comments post-boxes and online blogs. One particularly effective method was for student representatives to lead a discussion at the end of a lecture which led to a good dialogue with many issues addressed in the meeting.

Academic Community

Schools are continuing to build academic communities through a variety of activities including staff-student collaboration, engaging student representatives, and the use of Student Partnership Agreement project funding. Examples include:

- In the School of History, Classics and Archaeology there are many examples of student-staff collaboration, including a Classics Society debate, an annual staff-student cup, and the School working with the student magazine.

⁴ Example from last year <https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/web-sqac-agendapapers-20190425.pdf> (Paper C)

- Student-led innovations in the School of Health in Social Science include Creative Mondays which are run by the School's postgraduate research student representatives and are an opportunity for staff and students to explore innovative aspects of research and community building. A group of the School's postgraduate research students have launched a blog to help support other students and build community.
- The Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies is trialling coaching circles, a form of peer-to-peer support and learning, to help students to support each other during their dissertation year.
- The School of Engineering core course, Engineering Design 1, was introduced to foster creativity and independent thinking, problem solving and skills, and working in a multidisciplinary team.

Areas for further development at the University level:

- **Space.** Schools continue to identify challenges with accessing suitable learning and teaching accommodation. This included social spaces for students and staff to interact outwith timetabled sessions, appropriate space for postgraduate research students, and study space for students. Some Schools also reported challenges with suitability of staff offices, including a lack of private space to meet with students requiring support, and issues with staff and/or teaching being split across multiple sites. These issues were felt to impact on the ability to build academic communities. The importance on minimising the impact on students of estates developments at King's Building was also noted.
- **Timetabling.** The majority of Schools reported increasing issues with timetabling. Further investigation will be required to understand the specific issues. It was noted that the complexity of our provision is challenging to timetable. Challenges with the exam timetable, specifically its release date and tight timescales for marking when examinations with large cohorts happen late in the examination period, were also raised.
- **Pressure on staff time.** Schools reported that rising student numbers, especially in postgraduate taught programmes, and challenges with staff recruitment (appointing to and replacing posts) are increasing staff workloads and impacting on the student experience.
- **Assessment and Feedback.** Some Schools, with large class sizes, identified ongoing challenges in providing high-quality feedback within the 15-day feedback turnaround regulation. Further consideration will be given to feedback turnaround times.
- **Student Voice.** Several Schools questioned the purpose and usefulness of course enhancement questionnaires, particularly in the context of the recent introduction of mid-course feedback, and called for a review of student voice mechanisms.
- **IT and Systems.** A collection of individual, and sometimes recurring, items were raised by Schools under this broad heading:
 - Student record-related issues raised included annual monitoring for postgraduate research students, work and study away, special circumstances, and Boards of Examiners.
 - Student record-related workarounds and the challenges of accessing meaningful data for non-standard provision (interdisciplinary, online, and open learning) were also raised.
 - Several Schools, primarily within the College of Science and Engineering, also made requests for more support for online examinations.

Sharing Good Practice from Institution-led Review and Annual Monitoring, Review and Reporting

Alongside the report from the Sub Group, a paper outlining examples of good practice from annual monitoring, review and reporting processes in 2017/18 was considered by SQAC in September 2018⁵. This paper and the institution-led review annual report were passed to the Institute for Academic Development to identify content for Teaching Matters⁶ and, as a direct result, the April

⁵ <https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/sqac-agendapapers-20180920-web.pdf> (Paper D)

⁶ <https://www.ed.ac.uk/staff/teaching-matters>

2019 issue was on building academic communities⁷. Examples of Teaching Matters blog posts that have been identified through quality assurance and enhancement processes are tagged⁸. A University-level event to share good practice relating to academic community and assessment and feedback was held in February 2019. Good practice is also shared at College-level. Additionally, an area of the University's quality website is being developed to share good practice and resources.

Ways in which support services were reviewed

Student Support Services Annual Review – reporting on 2017/18

Student-facing support services are reviewed annually by a sub-committee of SQAC. The sub-committee submits a report on the outcomes of the review process to SQAC annually in late November/early December⁹. A new process with a revised template and an earlier timeframe to align with broader institutional planning was implemented in 2018/19 (for reporting on 2017/18). The new process also changed the focus of meetings, with the readers meeting focussing on report feedback and identifying common themes and the full sub-committee meeting focussing on discussion of the common themes and sharing good practice.

Each service receives individual feedback on their report, including commendations and areas for further consideration and reflection in next year's report. The following good practice examples were shared at the full sub-committee meeting in November 2018:

- Global Community: Refugee Advisory Group and humanitarian work, International Student Advisory Service
- Staff Development: Step Up programme, University Sport and Exercise
- Digital transformation: social media and student blogs, Student Recruitment and Admissions
- Impact Reporting: Key Performance Indicators, Student Counselling Service

The common themes that arose from service reports and discussed at the full sub-committee meeting were:

- Key performance indicators (KPIs) for the student experience
- Working in partnership to support the student experience
- Affordability and finance

As a result of the discussion, all services were asked to consider the following points for inclusion in their 2018/19 reports which will be submitted at the end of September 2019:

- Establishing KPIs (measuring impact on the student experience).
- Services report honestly on challenges and actions required to address them (both by the service and by others).
- Addressing feedback, in particular feedback on feedback – closing the loop.
- Length of submissions: keeping to guidance of 10 pages.
- Commitment to staff development, for example a staff development KPI.
- Analysis of service usage.

Additionally, the Service Excellence Programme was asked to consider:

- The importance of refining priorities and phasing priorities; and
- The need for procurement of systems that communicate with each other.

Student Support Thematic Review – 2018/19

⁷ <https://www.teaching-matters-blog.ed.ac.uk/welcome-to-the-april-issue-of-teaching-matters-building-academic-communities/>

⁸ <https://www.teaching-matters-blog.ed.ac.uk/tag/quality-enhancement-report-examples/>

⁹ <https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/sqac-agendapapers-20181206-web.pdf> (Paper G)

Thematic reviews focus on the quality of the student experience in relation to a particular theme or aspect of student support which can span both student support services and academic areas. Topics for thematic reviews are influenced by the outcomes of student support services annual review and discussion with the Students' Association.

The 2018/19 thematic review has focused on black and minority ethnic students' experiences of support at the University. The initial findings of the student consultation sessions were presented to the May 2019 meeting of SQAC¹⁰. Staff consultation meetings were held in June 2019. The final report and recommendations will be received by SQAC in September 2019.

SQAC has agreed that no thematic review will take place in 2019/20. Instead, a desk-based analysis of the outcomes of previous thematic reviews will be considered holistically in relation to equality and diversity. There will also be a review of the process.

Role and nature of student engagement in institution-led review

The Students' Association and the University work in partnership to ensure that students are central to academic governance, decision-making and quality assurance and enhancement.

Institution-led and thematic reviews both include student members on review teams. The student member of a review team will typically convene one or more meetings during the review. Membership of a review team is included in the student's Higher Education Achievement Record. In addition to having student members on review teams, engagement of students from review areas as a part of institution-led review is regarded as essential. Briefing material aimed at students outlines ways in which they can engage with reviews and actions taken in response. Parallel briefings guide Schools on how to engage their students with reviews. The remits for all reviews include items proposed by students in the review area.

Contextual information and key messages from analysis of data

The University is in the process of reviewing and reflecting on the results of the 2019 National Student Survey (NSS), Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES) and Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES). Whilst there has been modest improvement in the University's recent NSS results, in both absolute and relative terms the results still lag behind the desired position. The survey results will be considered by University Court and the Senate Education Committee in autumn 2019.

SQAC considers data annually on the degree classification outcomes of the University's undergraduate students, in the context of recent trends and Higher Education Statistics Agenda (HESA) data on Russell Group institutions. Most subject areas across the University are broadly in line with Russell Group comparators for their discipline and/or with the University average, however, there are a small number of outliers which diverge substantially. Whilst there may be good reasons for these areas to have these patterns of degree outcomes, SQAC asks the relevant Schools to give particular attention to their degree classification outcome data and provide an analysis of their context¹¹ within their School annual quality report. To date, no University-wide action has been required.

Analysis of progression data showed that the University outperformed the Scottish sector average and the UK sector averages for the relevant HESA Performance Indicators (non-continuation and

¹⁰ https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/sqac-agendapapers_20190523.pdf (Paper H)

¹¹ <https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/sqac-minutes-20190425-final.pdf>

projected outcomes), although the University is slightly below benchmark. Despite these favourable rates of retention the University is not complacent; research into retention trends and associated factors is being carried out¹².

An analysis of 2017/18 undergraduate¹³ and taught postgraduate¹⁴ external examiners' reports shows that there continues to be a high number of commendations and a low number of issues across the University. The main theme commended in undergraduate reports across all three Colleges was the assessment process, with the sub-theme of student feedback (feedback to students on assessed work) most commented on. The main sub-theme commended in taught postgraduate reports was good practice and innovation. Many commendations were course or programme specific, however the most often occurring type of commendation related to the range, quality and diversity of teaching, learning and assessment. A small number of issues raised by external examiners related to the (often timely) provision of information, follow-up on issues raised in a previous report, and the assessment process. No University-level action was required.

Our Widening Participation Strategy principles demonstrate widening participation and inclusion can and should be the lens to everything we do¹⁵. We have met the Commission for Widening Access targets of 10% of our intake to come from the 20% most deprived areas in Scotland three years ahead of schedule. Our 195 students from SIMD20 represent 11% of this year's undergraduate intake.

Summary

The previous year's institution-led review activity has identified an abundance of good practice examples across all areas of learning and teaching and it is important that these are shared across the University. There is clear evidence that staff are committed to enhancing the student experience by listening to and acting upon student feedback and other relevant data. The reviews also identified areas for further development, many of which are already a focus of ongoing work. The University's approach to improving the learning, teaching and student experience can be summarised in the ongoing and planned work outlined below.

Actions Undertaken and Planned

Strategy and Strategic Projects

Learning and Teaching Strategy

The University published its Learning and Teaching Strategy in January 2017.¹⁶ The Senate Learning and Teaching Committee reviewed progress against the agreed implementation plan at its meeting in September 2018¹⁷. The Committee was content with the direction of travel against the plan's priorities of: working in partnership with students; nurturing a learning community that supports students; recruiting and nurturing excellent teaching staff; and developing our curriculum. The Senate Education Committee¹⁸ will review progress against the agreed implementation plan at its meeting in October 2019.

¹² <https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/agendapapers20181114.pdf> (Paper B)

¹³ <https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/sqac-agendapapers-20181206-web.pdf> (Paper C)

¹⁴ <https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/sqac-agendapapers-20190227.pdf> (Paper E)

¹⁵ <https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/guidingprinciples2018-2021.pdf>

¹⁶ https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/learning_teaching_strategy.pdf

¹⁷ <https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/agendapapersa-g20180918.pdf> (Paper E)

¹⁸ Following a review of Senate committees, the Learning and Teaching Committee has become the Education Committee with an amended remit and membership

Vice-Principal Students

The University has appointed its first Vice-Principal Students who will begin in post in October 2019. This new post will have strategic responsibility for the improvement of the student experience and the culture change that underpins this.

Student Experience Action Plan

A change in approach and an associated action plan to enhance the student experience in response to disappointing NSS scores was discussed at Senate in October 2018¹⁹. In response, during 2018/19 University Executive approved and agreed to fund a holistic, multi-strand programme of work to address the student experience and move rapidly towards a culture in which our students feel cherished and our staff feel energised by their work with and for students. The Student Experience Action Plan has six major strands of work to support our goals of:

- Consistently excellent teaching;
- An inspiring curriculum;
- Excellent student support and customer service;
- Excellent facilities (physical and virtual) and inter-campus transport;
- A strong sense of belonging and community, underpinned by a strong student voice in University decision making; and
- An environment in which “things run smoothly” when it comes to the organisation and management of learning and teaching.

Underpinning this work will be:

- Enhanced leadership development and support for key leaders, focussed initially on Heads of School; and
- Strengthened internal communications for staff and students

Within these strands, there are around 50 individual work packages which will be taken forward over the next three years under the oversight of the University Executive’s Standing Committee on Student Experience. University Court considered an update on progress in June 2019²⁰. The update outlined the most significant work on student experience undertaken or initiated over the previous nine months which included: the work of the Teaching and Academic Careers task group (see below); a major review of all aspects of student support (including the Personal Tutor system); a project to create student hubs (which allow students access to a greater range of services in one place); 13 student-facing estates developments; and the lecture recording project.

Service Excellence Programme (Student Administration and Support)

The Student Administration and Support (SA&S) Programme is part of the 5-year Service Excellence Programme (SEP), which is tasked with transforming the University’s core professional services and aims to achieve a balance between effectiveness and efficiency, underpinned by core systems and digital transformation²¹.

SA&S covers the critical services and processes that support a student’s journey through the University. The purpose of the programme is to place students and staff at the heart of an excellent student administration and support environment, providing consistent, high quality and digitally enabled service across our University. That means:

¹⁹ <https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/20181003agendaandpapers.pdf> (Paper A)

²⁰ <http://www.docs.sasg.ed.ac.uk/GaSP/Governance/Court/2018-2019/20190617-Court-Web.pdf> (Paper C)

²¹ <https://www.ed.ac.uk/university-secretary-group/service-excellence-programme/projects/student-administration-support-programme>

- Empowering students to access consistent information, guidance, care and support, when and where they need it. Making sure they experience a consistently excellent quality of service regardless of course, programme or location
- Enabling our academic colleagues to focus their time on supporting their students, teaching and research
- Freeing up our professional services staff to focus on delivering consistently excellent services to students and academic staff by reducing complexity and effort spent on current processes and systems

During 2018/19, the programme delivered a number of enhancements including personalised exam timetables, lectures and tutorials to students' phones via Office365 calendars, the launch of a dedicated Student Immigration Service and the first phase of a new dedicated Study and Work Away Service for students and staff. During 2019/20, the first phase of Student Hubs will launch, streamlining students' access to key services including IT, library and finance, and a new Finance online portal will launch to provide students access to view financial transactions with the University in one place. Further projects are planned to explore opportunities for additional enhancements in student engagement and attendance monitoring to underpin student support, and an enquiry management solution to connect all student-facing services.

Plans were approved for a number of further projects to be phased over the coming three years, and the programme is currently expected to conclude by July 2022. These further projects include Postgraduate Research; Student Engagement and Attendance Monitoring; Academic Lifecycle; Assessment and Exam operations; and Course Selection.

Student Voice

In September 2018, the University and the Students' Association agreed the themes for the Student Partnership Agreement²² for 2018/19²³. The agreement serves to highlight ways in which the wider University, including all staff and students, can effectively work together to enhance the student experience. Based on feedback from students, the three key themes of academic support, promoting positive mental health and wellbeing, and student voice remained as priorities. Although the priority areas remained the same as 2017/18, under each theme specific areas that staff and students could work on together were identified. Continuity with the themes also allowed the success of the previous year to be built on and created potential for greater impact. In 2018/19 12 small project funding applications were received and 10 of those were approved. End of project reports will be reviewed to identify outcomes and positive impacts. A showcase event was held in October 2018 to present outcomes from a number of projects carried out during 2017/18. In addition, a booklet which includes information about the projects was produced and shared²⁴.

As part of a Students' Association-led project to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of student representation, a new programme representative system was introduced in 2018/19²⁵ replacing the previous class representation system. 18 Schools/Deaneries moved to the new system in 2018/19, with six Schools retaining their class representative systems. The reduction in representative numbers has led to an increase in completion of training and handover documents. Feedback was sought from staff and students and actions taken in response relate to supporting better engagement at meetings, communication (including closing the student feedback loop), and the inclusion of visiting students in the system. All Schools plan to implement the new system during 2019/20. The impact of changes will continue to be evaluated.

²² <https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/spa201819.pdf>

²³ <https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/agendapapersh-q20180918.pdf> (Paper I)

²⁴ <https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/spa-booklet.pdf>

²⁵ <https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/20190522combinedagendapapers.pdf> (Paper O)

To assist student representatives in their role, a successful pilot was carried out in 2018/19 to provide a standard high-level analysis of student feedback results to School student representatives. Proposals to roll the pilot out across the University were approved at Senate Quality Assurance Committee in May 2019²⁶. Further work is also planned for 2019/20 to enhance the operation of Student-Staff Liaison Committees, including management of escalated issues.

A follow-up evaluation of mid-course feedback was carried out²⁷. Opinion was broadly very positive, with use of mid-course feedback high and valued amongst undergraduate Course Organisers who responded to a survey. As a result, mid-course feedback is now being encouraged for postgraduate taught courses in 2019/20 with a view to adding it to policy for 2020/21. Additionally, guidance will be provided and existing examples will be shared.

Teaching and Academic Careers

In May 2018 the University Executive established a Teaching and Academic Careers task group to review processes for recognition, reward and support for teaching in academic careers. In its first phase of work the group developed and consulted widely on a set of Principles to guide the University's approach on teaching and academic careers²⁸. These were approved in November 2018 and the task group began a second phase of work focused on ensuring these principles were reflected and enacted effectively in University policies and practices. Two elements of this work were approved by University Executive in June 2019²⁹, a revised version of the Exemplars of Excellence in Student Education³⁰ and a number of recommendations on professional development in teaching. A further phase of work to be led by the Vice-Principal Students on a series of linked activities so that a newly-optimised career path can function effectively was also approved.

Careers and Employability

The careers and employability implementation plan has focussed on staff development to ensure academic staff are supported and understand the crucial role they play. This included engaging with the Boards of Studies network, contributions within Teaching Matters blogs, inputs at the Learning and Teaching Conference and a special call within the Principals Teaching Awards Scheme (PTAS). The implementation plan notes the pivotal role of the curriculum in enhancing engagement and equity in employability development and support. A curriculum mapping exercise was conducted to surface and share good practice and identify areas of development³¹. This will be followed up in 2019/20. Procedures within institution-led review have also been updated to ensure systematic inclusion of data and staff relating to careers and employability.

Enhancement-led Institutional Review

The University has addressed the recommendations from the 2015 Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) in the areas of assessment and feedback, personal tutoring, postgraduate research student experience, student representation, workload allocation models and student data dashboards³². The University is now preparing for its next ELIR which takes place in autumn 2020. The agreed areas of focus for this review, arising from contextualisation, are: teaching and academic

²⁶ https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/sqac-agendapapers_20190523.pdf (Paper G)

²⁷ <https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/20190522combinedagendapapers.pdf> (Paper F)

²⁸ <https://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/projects/teaching-and-academic-careers/principles>

²⁹ <http://www.docs.sasg.ed.ac.uk/GaSP/Governance/UniversityExecutive/2018-2019/20190625-UE-Web.pdf>
(Paper B)

³⁰ <https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/exemplarsexcellencestudenteducation.pdf>

³¹ <https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/20190522combinedagendapapers.pdf> (Paper C)

³² <https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/sqac-agendapapers-20190227.pdf> (Paper B)

careers; student community and student voices; student support; widening participation; and student skills and employability.

Indication of institution-led reviews for the forthcoming cycle

Please see Appendix 1. Please note that specific timings may be subject to change to reflect schedules in Schools.

List of subject areas/programmes reviewed by other bodies

In 2018/19 10 professional bodies carried out reviews resulting in all programmes being successfully accredited/reaccredited (Appendix 2).

9 September 2019

Appendix 1 - Internal Periodic Review forward schedule

2019/20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business and Accounting (Undergraduate provision) • Chemistry (Undergraduate & Postgraduate Taught provision) • Divinity (Undergraduate provision) • Geography (Undergraduate provision) • Politics and International Relations (Undergraduate provision) • Social Policy (Undergraduate provision) • Centre for Open Learning (Undergraduate provision) • Literatures, Languages and Cultures (Postgraduate Taught & Postgraduate Research Provision) <i>Postponed from 2018/19</i> • Education and Sport (Postgraduate Taught and Postgraduate Research Provision) • Informatics (Postgraduate Research Provision) • Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences (Postgraduate Taught & Postgraduate Research Provision) • Social and Political Sciences (Postgraduate Research Provision) • Social and Political Sciences (Postgraduate Taught Provision)
2020/21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archaeology (Undergraduate provision) • Architecture (Undergraduate provision) • Biological Sciences (Undergraduate & Postgraduate Taught provision) • History (Undergraduate provision) • Informatics (Undergraduate & Postgraduate Taught provision) • Law (Undergraduate provision, Postgraduate Research & Postgraduate Taught provision) • Music (Undergraduate provision) • Oral Health Sciences (Undergraduate provision) • Clinical Education (Postgraduate Taught Provision) • Health in Social Science (including Nursing Undergraduate provision, Postgraduate Taught and Postgraduate Research Provision) • Maths (Postgraduate Research Provision)
2021/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applied Sport Science and Sport and Recreation Management (Undergraduate provision) • Celtic and Scottish Studies (Undergraduate provision) • Maths (Undergraduate & Postgraduate Taught provision) • Psychology (Undergraduate provision)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies (Undergraduate provision) • Biological Sciences (Postgraduate Research Provision) • Divinity (Postgraduate Taught & Postgraduate Research Provision) • Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies (Postgraduate Taught Provision) • GeoSciences (Postgraduate Taught Provision)
2022/23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Art (Undergraduate provision) • Asian Studies (Undergraduate provision) • Design (Undergraduate provision) • Ecological and Environmental Sciences (Undergraduate provision) • European Languages and Cultures (Undergraduate provision) • Islamic and Middle Eastern Studies (Undergraduate provision) • Linguistics and English Language (Undergraduate provision) • Social Work (Undergraduate & Postgraduate Taught provision) • Business (Postgraduate Taught and Postgraduate Research Provision) • Economics (Undergraduate provision, Postgraduate Research & Postgraduate Taught provision) • History, Classics and Archaeology (Postgraduate Research & Postgraduate Taught provision) • Physics and Astronomy (Postgraduate Research provision)
2023/24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biomedical Sciences (Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate Provision) • Education (to include Childhood Practice & Community Education) • English Literature (Undergraduate Provision) • Medicine (Undergraduate Provision) • Physics and Astronomy (Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Provision) • Social Anthropology (Undergraduate Provision) • Sociology & Sustainable Development (Undergraduate Provision) • Chemistry (Postgraduate Research Provision) • Engineering (Postgraduate Research Provision) • Molecular, Genetic and Population of Health Sciences (Postgraduate Taught Provision) • Clinical Sciences (Postgraduate Taught Provision)
2024/25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business and Accounting (Undergraduate provision) • Chemistry (Undergraduate & Postgraduate Taught provision) • Divinity (Undergraduate provision) • Geography (Undergraduate provision)

- | | |
|--|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Politics and International Relations (Undergraduate provision)• Social Policy (Undergraduate provision)• Centre for Open Learning (Undergraduate provision)• Literatures, Languages and Cultures (Postgraduate Taught & Postgraduate Research Provision)• Education and Sport (Postgraduate Taught and Postgraduate Research Provision)• Informatics (Postgraduate Research Provision)• Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences (Postgraduate Taught & Postgraduate Research Provision)• Social and Political Sciences (Postgraduate Taught Provision)• Social and Political Sciences (Postgraduate Research Provision) |
|--|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Appendix 2 – Degree Programmes Accredited in 2018/19

Degree Programme Title	Name of Accrediting Body
BSc (Hons) Computer Science and Management Science	Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)
BSc (Hons) Mathematics and Business	Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)
LLB (Hons) Law and Accountancy	Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)
LLB (Hons) Law and Business	Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)
MA (Hons) Arabic and Business	Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)
MA (Hons) Economic History and Business	Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)
MA (Hons) Economics with Finance	Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)
MA (Hons) Economics with Management Science	Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)
MA (Hons) French and Business	Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)
MA (Hons) German and Business	Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)
MA (Hons) Italian and Business	Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)
MA (Hons) Portuguese and Business - 4 Years	Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)
MA (Hons) Psychology and Business	Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)
MA (Hons) Russian Studies and Business	Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)
MA (Hons) Spanish and Business	Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)
Business School – All Programmes	Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)
MSc Accounting and Finance - 1 Year	Chartered Institute of Management Accountants (CIMA)
MSc Banking and Risk - 1 Year	The Chartered Institute of Bankers in Scotland
MA (Hons) Economics with Finance	Chartered Institute for Securities and Investment (CISI) - Education Partner
MA (Hons) Finance and Business	Chartered Institute for Securities and Investment (CISI) - Education Partner
MA (Hons) Accounting and Finance	Chartered Institute for Securities and Investment (CISI) - Education Partner
PgCert Clinical Education (Online Learning) - 1 Year	Academy of Medical Educators (AoME)
MA Film Directing - 1 Year	Creative Skillset - Changed name to Screenskills
MFA Film Directing - 21 Months	Creative Skillset - Changed name to Screenskills
BEng (Hons) Electrical and Mechanical Engineering	Institution of Mechanical Engineers (IMechE)
BEng (Hons) Engineering for Sustainable Energy	Institution of Mechanical Engineers (IMechE)
BEng (Hons) Mechanical Engineering	Institution of Mechanical Engineers (IMechE)
BEng (Hons) Mechanical Engineering with Management	Institution of Mechanical Engineers (IMechE)
BEng (Hons) Mechanical Engineering with Renewable Energy	Institution of Mechanical Engineers (IMechE)
MEng (Hons) Electrical And Mechanical Engineering	Institution of Mechanical Engineers (IMechE)
MEng (Hons) Engineering for Sustainable Energy	Institution of Mechanical Engineers (IMechE)

Degree Programme Title	Name of Accrediting Body
MEng (Hons) Mechanical Engineering	Institution of Mechanical Engineers (IMechE)
MEng (Hons) Mechanical Engineering with Management	Institution of Mechanical Engineers (IMechE)
MEng (Hons) Mechanical Engineering with Renewable Energy	Institution of Mechanical Engineers (IMechE)
DPsychotherapy Psychotherapy and Counselling - 6 Years	COSCA (Counselling and Psychotherapy in Scotland)
DPsychotherapy Psychotherapy and Counselling (Interpersonal Dialogue) - 3 Years	COSCA (Counselling and Psychotherapy in Scotland)
Psychotherapy and Counselling (DPsych) - 4 years (full-time)	COSCA (Counselling and Psychotherapy in Scotland)
Psychotherapy and Counselling (DPsych) - 7 years (part-time)	COSCA (Counselling and Psychotherapy in Scotland)
MCouns Counselling (Interpersonal Dialogue) - 2 years	COSCA (Counselling and Psychotherapy in Scotland)
PgCert Counselling Studies - 1 Year	COSCA (Counselling and Psychotherapy in Scotland)
PgDip Counselling - 2 Years	COSCA (Counselling and Psychotherapy in Scotland)
PgDip Counselling - 3 Years	COSCA (Counselling and Psychotherapy in Scotland)
BSc (Hons) Mathematics and Statistics	Royal Statistical Society (RSS)
MSc Statistics with Data Science	Royal Statistical Society (RSS)
MSc Statistics and Operational Research	Royal Statistical Society (RSS)
BSc (Hons) Physics with Meteorology	Royal Meteorological Society (RMetS)

Annual Report to the Scottish Funding Council on Institution-led Review and Enhancement Activity 2018/19

Statement of assurance

On behalf of the governing body of the University of Edinburgh, I confirm that we have considered the institution's arrangements for the management of academic standards and the quality of the learning experience for AY 2018/19, including the scope and impact of these. I further confirm that we are satisfied that the institution has effective arrangements to maintain standards and to assure and enhance the quality of its provision. We can therefore provide assurance to the Council that the academic standards and the quality of the learning provision at this institution continue to meet the requirements set by the Council.

.....
Anne Richards
Vice-Convener of Court

.....
Date

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

18 September 2019

Enhancement Themes Institutional Plan

Executive Summary

This paper presents the University's updated plan reflecting activities for the final year of the Enhancement Theme, Evidence for Enhancement: Improving the Student Experience.

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

The paper is relevant to the Committee's responsibility for the quality assurance framework.

Action requested

The Committee is asked to note the report.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

See the 'Dissemination of Work' section of the report.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

Resource implications for any additional activities/projects will be managed by Academic Services in consultation with the relevant colleagues.

2. Risk assessment

Risks will be considered as part of individual activities/projects.

3. Equality and Diversity

Equality and diversity will be considered as part of individual activities/projects.

4. Freedom of information

Open.

Key words

Enhancement theme, evidence for enhancement

Originator of the paper

Nichola Kett, Academic Policy Manager, Academic Services
11 September 2019



Evidence for Enhancement: Improving the Student Experience

Institutional Plan for: University of Edinburgh

For year 3 of the Theme we anticipate that the balance of your work will be moving from implementation and delivery of activity to evaluation and identifying key learning points.

Context

This plan reflects the early stage of the Enhancement Theme and outlines in broad terms the approach the University will take to engaging with the Theme. The plan will be considered by the Institutional Team at its first meeting on 14 December 2017.

Context – year 2 update

Due to the timing of this report, it has not been discussed with the Institutional Team so some activities may be subject to change. It is, however, informed by Institutional Team discussions and priorities identified in year one of the Theme. It also aligns with other areas of work across the University. The plan will be considered by the Institutional Team at its next meeting on 23 October 2018.

Context – year 3 update

The proposed areas of work were developed by the Institutional Team over summer 2019. The full plan will be presented to the Institutional Team at its next meeting on 3 October 2019.

Institutional team

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Institutional lead	Professor Tina Harrison (staff), Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance	Professor Tina Harrison (staff), Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance	Professor Tina Harrison (staff), Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance
TLG staff representative	Nichola Kett (staff), Academic Policy Manager, Academic Services	Nichola Kett (staff), Academic Policy Manager, Academic Services	Nichola Kett (staff), Academic Policy Manager, Academic Services
TLG staff representative alternate	<i>Will depend on meeting content</i>	<i>Will depend on meeting content</i>	<i>Will depend on meeting content</i>

TLG student representative	Bobi Archer (student), Vice President Education, Edinburgh University Students' Association	Diva Mukherji (student), Vice President Education, Edinburgh University Students' Association	Stephanie Vallancey (student), Vice President Education, Edinburgh University Students' Association
Edinburgh University Students' Association representative	Megan Brown (staff), Academic Engagement Coordinator	Megan Brown (staff), Academic Engagement Coordinator	Megan Brown (staff), Academic Engagement Coordinator
Student Systems representative	Lisa Dawson (staff), Director of Student Systems	Lisa Dawson (staff), Director of Student Systems	Paula Webster (staff), Head of Student Data and Surveys
Learning, Teaching and Web representative	Melissa Highton/Anne-Marie Scott (staff), Director/Deputy Director	Melissa Highton/Anne-Marie Scott (staff), Director/Deputy Director	Melissa Highton/Anne-Marie Scott (staff), Director/Deputy Director
Governance and Strategic Planning representative	Lynda Hutchison (staff), Governance and Strategic Planner	Lynda Hutchison (staff), Governance and Strategic Planner	Lynda Hutchison (staff), Governance and Strategic Planner
College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences representative	Dr Lisa Kendall (staff), Head of Academic and Student Administration	Dr Lisa Kendall (staff), Head of Academic and Student Administration	Dr Lisa Kendall (staff), Head of Academic and Student Administration
Academic Services representative	Gillian Mackintosh (staff), Academic Policy Officer	Gillian Mackintosh (staff), Academic Policy Officer	Gillian Mackintosh (staff), Academic Policy Officer
College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine representative	Dr Claire Phillips (staff), Vet School Director of Quality	Dr Claire Phillips (staff), Vet School Director of Quality	Dr Claire Phillips (staff), Vet School Director of Quality
Institute for Academic Development representative	Dr Jon Turner (staff), Director	Dr Jon Turner (staff), Director	Dr Jon Turner (staff), Director
College of Science and Engineering representative	Dr Gordon McDougall (staff), College Dean, Quality Assurance,	To be confirmed.	Dr Linda Kirstein (staff), Dean of Education Quality Assurance and Culture

Planned activity: Year 1

Overall outcomes/activity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To be gathering the right data to be able to evaluate and effectively enhance the student experience. For that data to be easily accessible, understood and used by staff to evaluate and effectively enhance the student experience. To have had active engagement of students and staff in the work of the Enhancement Theme. To have shared good practice internally and externally. To have worked collaboratively across the sector.

Year 1 outcomes/activity

Institutional Team

The University has a number of existing and planned activities relating to the Enhancement Theme (detailed below), many of which have their own governance, representative and reporting structures. Therefore, the Institutional Team will have oversight of these key institutional activities relating to the Enhancement Theme, with the aim of sharing information and identifying links and synergies. They will support engagement with and work on the Enhancement Theme within the University and the sector, including the requirements set by the Quality Assurance Agency Scotland. They will also facilitate communication on the Enhancement Theme across the University and promote the use of data for enhancing the student experience.

Alignment of Activities with Sector Strands

The activities align with the following priorities for implementation from the [University's Learning and Teaching Strategy](#): 'working in partnership with students' and 'nurturing a learning community that supports students'.

Optimising Evidence

- Continuing to develop systematic access to data to support quality assurance and enhancement processes, including the development of the student data dashboard
- Developing strategic performance measurement dashboards

Student Engagement

- Implementing the priorities of the Student Partnership Agreement
- Analysing peer learning and support data (Students' Association)
- Analysing Teaching Awards data (Students' Association)
- Participating in student representative diversity work (Students' Association with sparqs)
- Enhancing student representation (led by the Students' Association)
- Developing minimum standards for the use of virtual learning environments
- Analysing student survey data

Student Demographics and Success

- Finalising and implementing the Widening Participation Strategy
- Developing learning analytics policy, procedure and governance
- Carrying out the thematic review of mature students (including students as parents/carers)
- Interim evaluation of lecture recording implementation
- Developing employability and enterprise supporting data

Year 2 outcomes/activity

A key priority in year two of the Theme will be supporting staff to make evidence-informed decisions to enhance the student experience. Proposals for how to do this include:

- Sharing good practice at relevant internal network meetings.
- Reviewing the sources of data that support key quality assurance and enhancement processes with the aim of providing staff with clarity on how to access, interpret and effectively use data.
- Developing new training opportunities for staff (examples could include: practical sessions to work through key data; an online recorded demonstration of the student data dashboard; and developing case studies of how the student data dashboard has been used).
- Holding a sector-wide event on the use of qualitative data for driving decision-making at scale, with the aim of identifying what works well.

Other activities will likely include:

- Academic Services evaluating the approach being taken for teaching/postgraduate programme reviews taking place in 2018/19 of providing areas being reviewed with key data to ensure that remit items explored during reviews are evidence-based and address key strategic issues.

- Academic Services and Student Systems evaluating the pilot to provide a standard high-level analysis of student feedback to School student representatives.
- Further work to investigate specific non-continuation challenges.
- Academic Services monitoring engagement with the staff-facing web resource on closing the student feedback loop and seeking more examples to add (including those gathered as part of sector-level work in year one of the Theme).
- Sharing the graphically designed visual representation of the new student representation system.
- The Students' Association implementing a handover document for all programme representatives to fill in at the end of their tenure.
- Exploring options for a postgraduate research strand of activity.
- Project funding.

The Institutional Team will continue to receive updates on the following projects: strategic performance measurement dashboards (Governance and Strategic Planning); analysing peer learning and support and Teaching Awards data (Students' Association); student representative diversity work (Students' Association); minimum standards for Virtual Learning Environments (VLEs) (Learning, Teaching and Web (LTW)); analysing student survey data (Student Systems); and evaluation of lecture recording implementation (LTW).

Year 3 outcomes/activity

Supporting staff at all levels (School, College and University) to make evidence informed decisions to enhance the student experience:

- Evaluation of the annual monitoring PowerBI student data dashboards developed following a review of the sources of data that support key quality assurance and enhancement processes
- Use the annual monitoring student data dashboards for internal periodic review to ensure that remit items explored during reviews are evidence-based and address key strategic issues.
- Explore support and training opportunities for staff using the PowerBI student data dashboards. This will include considering how sector resources could be used.

Other activities:

- Evaluate the provision of standard high-level analysis of student feedback to School student representatives.
- Further research into specific non-continuation challenges.
- Gather more examples of closing the student feedback loop to add to the staff-facing web resources (aligns with mid-course feedback evaluation and course enhancement questionnaire review outcomes). Continue to monitor engagement.
- Share and evaluate the student voice mechanisms graphically designed visual representation.
- Evaluate the handover document implemented for all programme representatives to fill in at the end of their tenure.
- Project funding

The Institutional Team will receive updates on the following projects:

- Strategic performance measurement dashboards (Governance and Strategic Planning)
- Learn Foundations, was minimum standards for Virtual Learning Environment (Learning, Teaching and Web)
- Evaluation of lecture recording implementation (Learning, Teaching and Web)
- Analysing student survey data (Student Data and Surveys)
- Beyond analytics: Exploring the impact of Teaching Matters on learning and teaching practices (Institute for Academic Development)

Dissemination of work

Internally: email communications; Institutional Team; Senate Quality Assurance Committee; Teaching Matters website; Learning and Teaching Conference; and a wiki.

Externally: Scottish Higher Education Enhancement Committee (SHEEC); Theme Leaders' Group (TLG); Enhancement Themes conference; and the University's website.

Dissemination of work – year 2 update

Work will continue to be disseminated as detailed above.

Dissemination of work – year 3 update

Work will continue to be disseminated as detailed above.

Closing the student feedback loop resources: <https://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/staff/closing-feedback-loop> (includes links to the outcomes of the Responding to Student Voice sector-wide student-led project).

Teaching Matters post August 2019 (update on work and promoting the conference)
<http://edin.ac/2OWZhm9>

An area of the Academic Services website to hold resources and good practice examples is under development.

Collaborative cluster work

As it has not yet been confirmed what the collaborative clusters will be, we are unable to confirm our intended level of involvement. Areas of interest for the University are: student voice; data skills for non-specialists (quantitative and qualitative); student surveys (what works); learning analytics (beyond retention); and sharing evaluation expertise. Our enhancement activities are outlined above.

Collaborative cluster work – year 2 update

As it has not yet been confirmed what the collaborative clusters will be, we are unable to confirm our intended level of involvement. Involvement in the collaborative clusters will be encouraged as in year one of the Theme.

Collaborative cluster work – year 3 update

The University is leading a collaborative cluster, partnered with the University of Aberdeen and the University of Glasgow, on the theme of improving the student experience within the strand of student demographics, retention and attainment. Early discussions have been held about using the outcomes of the Beyond the metrics: the intangibles collaborative cluster.

Wider inter-institutional collaboration

Due to the early stage of the Enhancement Theme, we have not yet held discussions with other institutions about potential collaborative work. It is anticipated that this will be facilitated through SHEEC and TLG meetings. Areas of interest and enhancement activities are outlined above.

Wider inter-institutional collaboration – year 2 update

As outlined above, we are hoping to host an event to which we will invite representatives from across the sector. Both formal and informal discussions at Theme Leaders' Group meetings in year one of

the Theme proved useful in terms of discussing common areas of work and to share ideas and this will continue in year two of the Theme.

Wider inter-institutional collaboration – year 3 update

There are no formal plans for wider inter-institutional collaboration at this stage. Both formal and informal discussions at Theme Leaders' Group meetings will continue to be useful in terms of discussing common areas of work and to share ideas.

Supporting staff and student engagement

Staff and students will be kept informed of the work of the Theme through the communication methods outlined above. Support and guidance can be provided by the Institutional Lead and Theme Leaders Group staff member. Students will be supported through the Students' Association. We are exploring with the Students' Association how we can creatively engage students with the work of the Theme as it develops. We also anticipate that we will provide funding towards Enhancement Theme-related projects/activities (either existing, planned or new).

Supporting staff and student engagement – year 2 update

As outlined above, a key priority in year two of the Theme will be supporting staff to make evidence-informed decisions to enhance the student experience. Consideration will be given to different ways of working with students and staff as the plans for delivering our activities are developed. Staff and student workshop events on particular topics proved effective in year one of the Theme and are likely to be used in year two.

Supporting staff and student engagement – year 3 update

A key priority for year three remains supporting staff to make evidence-informed decisions to enhance the student experience. Students and staff will be involved in evaluation activity. We also anticipate that we will provide funding towards Enhancement Theme-related projects/activities.

Evaluation

Progress will be monitored through Institutional Team meetings. Consideration will be given to evaluation of impact as the areas of work develop.

Evaluation – year 2 update

The Theme Leader participated in a telephone discussion as part of the formal Theme evaluation work and the University will continue to contribute to this important area of work as requested.

In terms of our activities, progress will be monitored through Institutional Team meetings and individual activities will be evaluated as outlined above.

Evaluation – year 3 update

Evaluation templates for smaller projects have been submitted for:

- Sharing good practice at relevant internal network meetings

- Holding a sector-wide event on the use of qualitative data for driving decision-making at scale, with the aim of identifying what works well
- Academic Services monitoring engagement with the staff-facing web resource on closing the student feedback loop and seeking more examples to add (including those gathered as part of sector-level work in year one of the Theme)

The Institutional Team will discuss the evaluation of other projects/activities at its first meeting of 2019/20.

Year 1 sign-off

Plan author:	Professor Tina Harrison and Nichola Kett
Date:	17 November 2017

Year 2 sign-off

Plan author:	Professor Tina Harrison and Nichola Kett
Date:	13 September 2018

Year 3 sign-off

Plan author:	Professor Tina Harrison and Nichola Kett
Date:	12 September 2019

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

18 September 2019

Internal Periodic Review Responses

Executive Summary

The following 14 week responses from Internal Periodic Reviews 2018/19 are published on the Committee wiki:

14 week responses 2018/19:

Postgraduate Programme Review of College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine

Postgraduate Programme Review of GeoSciences

Teaching Programme Review of Classics

Teaching Programme Review of Earth Sciences

Teaching Programme Review of Education

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

The paper is relevant to the Committee's responsibility for the quality assurance framework.

Action requested

14 week responses: For comment and consideration of the recommendations. The Committee is asked to confirm that they are content with progress.

PPR/TPR	Recommendation	Comment
PPR College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine		We look forward to hearing about progress on the recommendations in the year on response
PPR of GeoSciences		We look forward to hearing about progress on the recommendations in the year on response
TPR of Classics		We look forward to hearing about progress on the recommendations in the year on response
TPR of Earth Sciences		We look forward to hearing about progress on the recommendations in the year on response
TPR of education		We are interested in the sharing good practice sessions noted in recommendation 2. We look forward to hearing about progress on the recommendations in the year on response

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Comments on the progress towards completion of recommendations will be reported back to the School/Subject Area. The responses will be published on the Academic Services website.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

No additional resource implications.

2. Risk assessment

No risk associated.

3. Equality and Diversity

An Equality Impact Assessment was carried out on the internal review process.

4. Freedom of information

Open.

Key words

Internal Periodic Review, Postgraduate Programme Review, Teaching Programme Review, PPR, TPR, 14 week response.

Originator of the paper

Gillian Mackintosh
Academic Policy Officer,
Academic Services
12 September 2019

The University of Edinburgh

Internal Periodic Review

14 week response report

PPR of: College of Medicine & Veterinary Medicine

Date of review: 13 & 14th March 2019

Date of 14 week response: 13th August 2019

Date of year on response: 7 May 2020

The College is responsible for reporting on progress with all recommendations, including those remitted to other areas of the University for action.

If any recommendation has been fully addressed please record the action taken and date completed. Any barriers to progress should be highlighted on this report.

Recommendation no	Recommendation	Timescale for completion	Comment on progress towards completion and/or identify barriers to completion	Completion date
1	<p>Thesis Committee</p> <p>The review team recommends that Thesis Committees are implemented consistently across the College and in particular, the role of the Principal Supervisor in these committees should be clarified.</p> <p>The review team recommends that the 10 week review meeting should be standard practice across the College and that it includes training needs analysis discussion with students. Training needs analysis should also be a standard part of all annual progression reviews.</p> <p>The review team recommends that there should be clear procedures for the formation of Thesis Committee membership and in particular, membership should not be allocated by the supervisor. The College should ensure consistency of allocation, clarity of roles and a truly independent Thesis Committee Chair. This will support the College remit item on equality of student experience.</p>	1 year	<p>The Graduate School will take steps to streamline thesis committee processes across the College of Medicine & Veterinary Medicine (CMVM). This will be achieved by reviewing current practice in all Deaneries and producing a single set of Guidelines and Principles for formation and function of a Thesis Committee (this process is already underway). Clear processes will be identified for formation of the Thesis Committee, with the anticipation that the Thesis Chair will be selected from a pool of experienced senior staff. The 10 week review will be promoted as standard practice. Training needs analysis will be built into the process, probably by inclusion of an Appendix to the Thesis Committee Form mapping training opportunities against postgraduate student lifecycle.</p> <p>Students and staff will be involved in the review and revision of the Thesis Committee process via Postgraduate Researcher Experience Committee (PG REC) and direct communication with supervisor groups and postgraduate societies. The new guidelines and forms will be made available on the College Wiki, and will be promoted to staff and students through Deanery Postgraduate Deans, PG REC, Supervisor Briefings, welcome events/ inductions and direct communication to supervisor groups and postgraduate societies.</p> <p>Responsibility: College.</p>	13 th March 2020
2	<p>The review team recommends that the College considers separating pastoral support from the Thesis Committee and ensures support for pastoral issues is available in all areas.</p>	2 years	<p>Separating pastoral support from the assessment component of the Thesis Committee is seen as a preferred option. The review and revision of the Thesis Committee process will include consideration of a mechanism to provide students with a suitable individual/individuals to provide pastoral support. For example, it could be envisaged that the Thesis Committee Assessment meeting will be followed by a meeting with a different member(s) of staff</p>	13 th March 2021

			with a role in student welfare/ support. This will require identifying, recruiting and training suitable individuals. It is conceivable that these members of staff should also be selected to ensure that they are not close colleagues of the other staff members of the Thesis Committee. Responsibility: College (liaison with Student Welfare)	
3	<p>Communication</p> <p>The review team found evidence of variable student experience of induction, particularly where students arrive before or after the start of the academic year. There was also evidence of inconsistency in the information available to new students. The review team recommends the College ensure standardisation of induction and that all students have access to induction.</p> <p>The review team recommends that the College consider developing a central repository for information relevant to all postgraduate research students, such as tutoring opportunities, seminars and student representatives and ensures that students are aware of where to find this information.</p>	1 year	<p>Communication is complicated by the complex structure of CMVM and the geographical spread of different Deaneries, Schools, Centres, and Institutes. It is further complicated by the increasing number of students completing considerable percentages of their study away from the University.</p> <p>CMVM will work with recruitment and admissions teams to streamline College Welcome and Induction events with those provide centrally (by the University) and locally (by Centres/ Research groups). A student representative has been added to PG REC and this individual will liaise with Postgraduate Societies at the 4 main Campuses (Little France, Easter Bush, Western General Hospital, Central Campus) to disseminate information and feedback to the College. The Director of Experience will set up a structured programme of presentations/discussions with students in Cohort-based doctoral programmes.</p> <p>Responsibility: College</p>	13 th March 2020
4	<p>Student Voice</p> <p>The review team recommends that the College explore ways to support sustainability of societies, including administrative support and formalised constitution of societies to promote transparency.</p> <p>The review team recommends that the College consider a more formalised structure for using the Postgraduate Student Reps in reporting up and down between students and College. The College should ensure appropriate training is available for all Reps, the sustainability of these roles and that Rep contact details are communicated to the student body.</p>	3 years	<p>Discussions have begun with Chairs of Postgraduate societies to identify ways to support and promote these groups. Steps already taken include involving representatives from the postgraduate societies in Welcome events/ inductions and setting up communication links with societies at the different campuses.</p> <p>The inclusion of a postgraduate representative on PG REC is intended as the first move in formalising a structure for reporting between postgraduate students and the Graduate school. This will be developed further.</p> <p>Strategies for sustainable support for postgraduate societies, including administrative support and training for reps, combined with greater transparency, will be explored within CMVM and in discussion with IAD.</p> <p>Responsibility: College (in collaboration with IAD)</p>	13 th March 2022
5	The review team recommends the College ensures there is visibility and transparency in the publicising of and recruitment to teaching and tutoring opportunities for students. There may be opportunities for the College to explore the availability of demonstrating positions in the College of Science and Engineering to increase opportunities	5 years	This is desirable but challenging, as the College Graduate School does not administer these positions. Considerable effort expended at University level to increase transparency and equality of opportunity has had only limited effectiveness. The College will liaise with teaching organisations (MTO, BMTO), CSE, postgraduate	13 th March 2024

	for its students. Supervisors should offer encouragement to all students to take up these opportunities.		student organisations and supervisors to determine what steps can be taken to improve this situation. Responsibility: College (in collaboration with teaching organisations, CSE, postgraduate student organisations, supervisors).	
6	The review team recommends the College ensures that the University Mental Health Strategy and its implementation, are relevant for the specific issues faced by postgraduate research students within the College. The College should ensure that College support and activities related to wellbeing are better communicated to students, with clear sign-posting to support routes within Deaneries.	5 years	This will be a continual and progressive process, building on changes already introduced and implemented. Meetings have already been held with Student Welfare and the Counselling Service to address issues raised in the review; particularly those raised by students. Implementation of the University Mental Health Strategy will be reviewed for postgraduate students; including consideration and adoption of the new Support for Study Regulations . Plans are underway to introduce a CMVM “Postgraduate Special Circumstances Committee” to improve process, transparency and resources for dealing with student support and welfare issues. Support structures will be presented to the students at Welcome/ Induction events, through direct presentation to students in postgraduate societies and in cohort-based doctoral programmes, through Supervisors and thesis committees, and by placing relevant information on the College Postgraduate Wiki. Staff will be informed of support structures through supervisor briefings, thesis committee information, and via the College Postgraduate Wiki. Responsibility: College (in association with Student Welfare and Counselling, and in collaboration with the other colleges).	13 th March 2024
7	The review team recommends the College ensures clarity on supervisory team appointment and responsibilities and monitors support for students during medium term supervisor absences.	2 years	New procedures will be introduced to monitor supervisory teams and projects for new students, with clear guidance on the recommendations and requirements for formation of an acceptable supervisory arrangement. This will include clarification of the roles and responsibilities of Principal Supervisor and Co-supervisors in a co-supervisory arrangement. It will also include clarification of the role of non-University staff in student support roles (e.g. as Advisors to students studying abroad). This process will require interaction with the other colleges as it has implications for supervision across the University. Discussion will need to take place with Human Resources so that understanding of these roles is reflected in grading and promotion processes. This information will be disseminated to staff and students through Welcome/ Induction events (for staff and students), relevant postgraduate and postdoctoral societies, supervisor briefings, Thesis committees, cohort-based doctoral programmes, and supervisor briefings. Support for students during medium term supervisor absences should be arranged by the supervisory team and, if necessary,	13 th March 2021

			<p>through the Thesis Committee. Monitoring supervisor arrangements at this level would be a considerable change of approach for the College and would not be straightforward. Discussions will be arranged through the postgraduate Board of Examiners and PG REC, combined with revision of the Thesis Committee structure, to identify whether this level of monitoring can be achieved. Since this has implications for supervision in other Colleges, discussions will be had on this subject with the other College Postgraduate Deans.</p> <p>Responsibility: College (in collaboration with Academic Services, Human Resources, and the other colleges).</p>	
8	<p>The College and the review team identified obtaining clear, relevant progression and completion, and equality and diversity data to inform quality assurance and management decisions as a challenge. The review team recommends that the College explore with Student Systems how data provision might be improved and supplied to the College in a more usable format.</p>	2 years	<p>Discussions are already underway in the Graduate School to improve clarity and reliability of progression and completion data. Through discussions on the Quality Assurance and Enhancement (QAE) Committee, processes have been introduced to provide Deaneries with completion data for inclusion in Deanery Quality reports. It is considered desirable that completion and progression information are also monitored for individual supervisors; this has stimulated discussion at People Committee and with College Human Resources about data protection (GDPR) and transparency. Obtaining Equality and Diversity (E&D) data is desirable but it is unclear how feasible it is to obtain this information and, perhaps more importantly, it is not clear how the data would be used. Discussions at People Committee indicated that the Widening Participation Strategy appears to have omitted Postgraduate students (the suggestion being that E&D considerations for this cohort only becomes relevant at progression from Undergraduate to Postgraduate: this seems a mistake). Efforts will be maintained to include Postgraduate E&D within the remit of the Widening Participation project. Discussions will also be initiated with the other Colleges to investigate their approach to postgraduate E&D (initial enquiries suggest the situation in CMVM is replicated in the other colleges).</p> <p>Responsibility: College (in collaboration with People Committee and the other colleges).</p> <p>Response from Student Systems: Given the timeframe for redoing the dashboards we were unable to cover metrics related to PGR provision given the complexity of the population. This is a priority for development though. In the meantime the student numbers benchmarking report does cover PGR students and gives benchmarking on size, shape and student</p>	13 th March 2021

			<p>mix so colleagues can look at equality and diversity at a subject level.</p> <p>We can commit to developing and getting agreement on how we should be measuring progression and completion for PGR students.</p>	
9	The review team recommends that the College consider with Academic Services the value of restructuring future postgraduate programme reviews.	1 year	<p>Informal discussions on this matter have already begun. It is felt very strongly in the CMVM Graduate School that the process was extremely valuable for reviewing and enhancing the Function of the College in supporting students in a rapidly changing environment. It became evident during the preparation process for the review that the system was not well designed to reviews run at College level. There are clear alterations to the process that could be introduced relatively easily to make it smoother and less labour intensive to organise and implement. Not least, some clearer continuity for the next review would help the organisers. Since Postgraduate student support is co-ordinated and managed at a College level, through the Graduate School, it would be preferable to develop the review process to fit the organisation than to revise the organisation to fit the review process.</p> <p>Responsibility: College (in collaboration with Academic Services).</p>	13 th March 2020
	Please report on steps taken to feedback to students on the outcomes of the review	Feedback on the review to students has been provided through PG REC, with the inclusion of a postgraduate student representative whose remit is to feedback to postgraduate student societies. In addition, the Director of Experience has attended postgraduate student society meetings to discuss the outcomes of the review.		

The University of Edinburgh

Internal Periodic Review

14 week response report

PPR of: School of GeoSciences

Date of review: 20 & 21 March 2019

Date of 14 week response: 9 August 2019

Date of year on response: 1 May 2020

The School is responsible for reporting on progress with all recommendations, including those remitted to other areas of the University for action.

If any recommendation has been fully addressed please record the action taken and date completed. Any barriers to progress should be highlighted on this report.

Recommendation no	Recommendation	Timescale for completion	Comment on progress towards completion and/or identify barriers to completion	Completion date
1	The review team strongly recommends that the planned model for Advisors is implemented and that Advisors meet students twice per year, and be available as needed for pastoral support.	Sept 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will be implemented from September 2019. Students will meet their Advisor twice in the first year (at the start and to prepare for the Confirmation Panel) and at least once in year 2 and 3 to prepare for the annual reviews. Advisors will also reach out half-way through year 2 and 3 to ask how things are going and offer an optional meeting should the student wish to have one. 	
2	The review team recommends that the first year confirmation process is used as the basis for the first year annual review, and subsequent reviews should take place annually.	Sept 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will streamline the confirmation and annual review process in Year 1, providing better guidance and avoiding duplication where possible. However, the two activities have slightly different objectives and there are potential conflicts in the best timing for both activities (confirmation between month 6 and 9; annual review between month 9 and 12). This will require some careful thought over the coming year and will be implemented in AY 2020/2021. 	
3	The review team recommends a system of oversight to ensure the minimum threshold of supervisory meetings is met, as stated in the University's Code of Practice for Supervisors and Research Students.	Sept 2020 Sept 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Code of practice requires 2 meetings per 3-month period, and the University-wide annual review form already asks whether there have been supervisor meetings twice per semester. We will request that the annual review form is harmonised to reflect the Code of Practice We will also add this requirement to a template of topics for the Advisor to discuss during meetings with the student and during annual reviews. 	

4	The review team recommends that a workload allocation model is implemented that reflects the work of co-supervision.	Sept 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was agreed by SPARC (Social Policy & Resource Committee) in November 2018 that Advisors would get a tariff when the new workload model is implemented in AY19/20. A tariff of 5-7 hours per year per student was discussed but has not been finalised yet. 	
5	The review team recommends that the School identifies appropriate space for informal/social discussions, including coffee/tea facilities on each of their sites.	Sept 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each site has a coffee room with coffee and tea facilities, which are used to different degrees by PGR students – we will continue to encourage their use of this space, e.g. during welcome week. • More broadly, the School has been investigating options regarding reallocation of space, and this recommendation will be discussed at the School’s SPARC management committee meeting. However, there are considerable issues regarding lack of space across the School (especially within Grant and the Crew buildings), and any significant action would require a radical review of how space is used, and a major investment in capital, which may be difficult to secure. We will continue to investigate all possibilities and make the most of any available opportunities. 	
6	The review team recommends that the School ensures that Course Organisers (CO) adopt best practice consistently in inducting, training, and supporting tutors and demonstrators (T&D)	Sept 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our T&D training has received good feedback, but we acknowledge that at course level there is variability in practice. • We will review and expand the guidance given to Course Organisers to help with training and supporting their tutors and demonstrators • We will ask CO’s to hold briefing sessions with their T&D’s halfway through semester and again at the end of semester to ensure they are supported and any gaps in knowledge/ experience identified and addressed. • The new Academic Head for T&D will hold twice-yearly feedback events with all T&D’s to gather their feedback and input on what we could do to further support them, and ensure any issues around training. Induction or support are resolved. • Student Services Projects team will be piloting a regular newsletter for PGR students involved in Tutoring and Demonstrating. This will contain information on various opportunities related to training and personal development, and we will use this as a means to regularly 	

			showcase and signpost the Edinburgh Teaching Award scheme, along with other training and CPD opportunities.	
7	The review team recommends that the School resources additional supports for the anticipated increase in international student numbers.	<p>Oct 2019</p> <p>Oct 2019</p> <p>Nov 2019</p> <p>Jan 2020</p> <p>March 2020</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Before requesting additional resource, we will need to ensure we are making efficient use of existing resources, identify any specific additional support required and ascertain whether the numbers support a business case for more resource. • We will improve sign-posting to student support outside the School, in collaboration with IAD and English Language Communication • We will assess and monitor trends in increases in international student intake • We will use focus groups to understand awareness and uptake of available support, including study skills, academic support and socialising opportunities • We will then work with GCRF (Global Challenge Research Fund) team to explore what can be offered and whether we need to make request for additional resource to SPARC. • We will also work with the Students' Association to explore the merits of introducing a School buddy system in Sept 2020, as well as signposting other support initiatives by the Students' Association to our students (Global Buddies and Tandem Language cafes) 	
8	The review team recommends that the School ensures that students are aware that clear structures exist for elected student reps to feed into School level meetings, including the Equality and Diversity Committee.	<p>Jan 2021</p> <p>March 2021</p> <p>June 2021</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We will develop and implement a policy for this which will include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Providing an overview of committees with PGR representation (or link to suitable webpage) on the PGR LEARN student hub , with descriptions of the roles ○ Ensuring committee names accurately represent the purpose, remit and membership of the committee ○ Implementing a transparent application process for appointing student representatives 	
9	The review team encourages any planned activity to streamline and edit the website content, and recommends that there is a strategic review of the website to include scope for self-editable research	Jan 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We will update a review of PGR-specific web pages carried out a year ago and make a proposal for the required changes and resources needed to undertake this 	

	student profiles, an overview of current activities, opportunities, and funding across the School.	Sept 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our School's IT support is working on system to allow students to create and edit their own website • We are unable to make any major changes to website infrastructure for PGR alone, as this is a planned School-wide project for the next few years and will require dedicated, School funded resource 	
10	The review team recommends that the Service Excellence Programme prioritise required changes to the EUCLID system to ease administrative burden on managing annual reviews.	uncertain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have strongly indicated to the Service Excellence Programme to prioritise relevant changes to EUCLID and know that other Schools have done the same. We have not been given any information on timelines for the improvements. <p>Response from Service Excellence Programme: this recommendation is not part of the scope of the Student Administration and Support programme within SEP.</p>	

The University of Edinburgh

Internal Periodic Review

14 week response report

TPR of: Classics, University of Edinburgh

Date of review: 14 & 15 November 2018

Date of 14 week response: 24 May 2019

The School/Subject Area is responsible for reporting on progress with all recommendations, including those remitted to other areas of the University for action. If any recommendation has been fully addressed please record the action taken and date completed. Any barriers to progress should be highlighted on this report.

Recommendation no	Recommendation	Timescale for completion	Comment on progress towards completion and/or identify barriers to completion	Completion date
1.	The Review Team recommends that the subject area appoint a dedicated Widening Participation Director (or equivalent) from the current departmental staff who can lead the work of a Widening Participation and Outreach Committee. This individual should ensure that initiatives are developed in partnership with the School and the College, in line with the University's Widening Participation Strategy.	2019- <i>ongoing (to be reviewed 2021)</i>	The Department has recently re-established the Outreach Committee with a chair and new committee members, with new remit specifically focused on WP (as well as its current remit on outreach with local primary schools ('Literacy through Latin' project), School Teachers' events (one organised already in May 2019), and further liaisons with secondary schools). In line with the recommendations of the new University WP strategy, this committee will work closely with the new School WP champion to ensure that Classics continues to develop its overall WP strategy within the School's strategic aims.	
2.	The Review Team recommends that the subject area create a role for a dedicated Classics staff member to act as an Equality and Diversity Officer with a view to monitoring and enhancing the department's profile for diversity in admissions and for finding new ways of embedding equality and diversity throughout the curriculum.	2020	At the moment the practice is to have a School Equality and Diversity Director (currently a Classicist), with Classics representative on the School E&D committee. Changes to the current system (i.e. to create Departmental E&D officers) would have to be decided at School level. Discussion to be held at School level.	
3.	The Review Team recommends that the Curriculum Officer review the process of course allocation at Honours level and moves away from the lottery system. The new system should be operated by professional services staff and made as transparent as possible to students and staff.	Completed	Taking lots to decide Honours course allocation has always been a last resort, and the Curriculum Officer has written a document which contains careful explanation of a number of steps are taken to allocate students fairly and consistently before the need of a lottery in a small minority of cases. Allocation will be administered once again by the Lead Teaching Organisation Administrator, with academic oversight and communication by Curriculum Officer and consultation of the Head of Department in case of queries.	05/2019

4.	The Review Team recommends that the subject area ensure that transferable skills be embedded in all Classics programmes, in a consistent way, by being delivered within compulsory core courses. These transferable graduate skills should link visibly to the pathways on offer and future avenues for employment.	2020	The Classics Teaching Committee and then the whole Department at a dedicated Away Day met to discuss how best to embed transferable skills. A number of important transferable skills for programmes were agreed upon and will be written into course descriptions both on EUCLID and in course handbooks, and where applicable in course proposals. Oversight and consistency will be ensured by the Classics Teaching Committee. The process has been partially completed and will be reviewed in the 2019-20 academic session.	
5.	The Review Team recommends that the School Co-ordinator of Adjustments and the Head of Subject Area remind all staff that lecture slides should be provided to all students through LEARN at least 24 hours in advance of each class.	Completed	This has been carried out.	05/2019
6.	The Review Team recommends that the plans to introduce a new subject-area lead administrator be progressed as a way of strengthening subject-area identity and aiding staff professional development. This role should include direct student interaction within SSLC meetings and involvement with teaching planning.	Completed	The role was approved this academic session (2019-20) and the person is in post.	05/2019
7.	The Review Team recommends that the profile of the Student Support Team be raised amongst first- and second-year students in the Classics Subject Area and that its role is clearly defined.	Completed and ongoing – review in 2020	Recommendation noted. The School has gone to considerable lengths to raise the profile of the Student Support Team among students and the Head of Classics will continue to liaise closely with the School DoPS and UG Director of Teaching to ensure students in the Classics Department are fully aware of the team’s role.	
8.	The Review Team recommends that the private meeting space identified by the School be furnished and made available to the Student Support Team as soon as possible.	Completed	The School has carried out this action.	05/2019
9.	The Review Team recommends that the School work in partnership with the Dean of Students to identify ways of enhancing the operation of the Personal Tutor System, including reviewing the support for staff dealing with rising cases of mental health among students.	During 2019/20 academic session	The College is working closely with the Director of Student Wellbeing to ensure staff in student facing support roles have access to suitable training and support resources to deal with rising number of complex mental health cases among students. The Director of Student Wellbeing is currently working on a Student Support Team Professional Development Framework, in addition to the support available to staff through existing University Services including the Counselling Service and Chaplaincy. A recent meeting between Health in Social Science and the Director of Student Wellbeing also discussed these concerns, which the College plans to explore through a wider forum. The College operates a Student Support Forum that acts as a network for sharing ideas and providing information to Student Support	

			<p>Officers. The College also operates a Network for School Senior Tutors to discuss concerns and share good practice in personal tutoring and student support.</p> <p>A university-wide review of the Personal Tutoring system is shortly to begin, but recommendations for improvements to the system in the interim period across CAHSS were incorporated in the recent College review of the PT system overseen by the Dean of Students. This document was circulated to all Schools in CAHSS and Heads of Schools were asked by the Head of College to consider the key recommendations as part of their student experience action plans. Meetings will be arranged with individual Schools to discuss local challenges, as and when required. A meeting can be arranged with the Classics subject area, or the School of History, Classics and Archaeology, to address local concerns and discuss possible ideas for enhancement.</p>	
10.	The Review Team recommends that the Dean of Students and the Assistant Principal Academic Support further explore the link between promotion and teaching and administrative duties across the University, potentially as part of the University-wide review of the Personal Tutor System.	During 2019/20 academic session	<p>The College recently undertook a detailed review of the Personal Tutor system. As part of this review, the links between annual appraisal and personal tutoring were examined. One of the key recommendations to Heads of Schools was that personal tutoring should form part of the formal appraisal process in Schools. The review was shared with the Assistant Principal Academic Support and Deputy Secretary Student Experience for consideration as part of the University-wide review of the Personal Tutor System. This will no doubt investigate the links between promotion, teaching and wider academic/pastoral support roles.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Assistant Principal is currently engaged in a review of academic career paths which will consider these issues. A major challenge will be to establish an evidence base for the quality of PT support provided by individual PTs – essential for any link to promotion and reward. However, the Assistant Principal’s findings to date suggest that the use of student evaluations in this context is being resisted implacably by a subset of University staff. As of May 2019, there is a University-wide, nothing-off-the-table, review of the PT system, led by the former PG Director of the School.</p>	
11.	The Review Team recommends that the School change the practice of re-assigning Study Abroad students to the International Officer to act as Personal Tutor. This will ensure that students undertaking a year abroad keep their original Personal Tutor in addition to the extra support provided through the International Officer.	Completed	The School never had this practice. The Classics Department on two previous occasions adopted this practice as a temporary solution but it is no longer its policy.	05/2019

12.	The Review Team recommends that the subject area find ways of promoting the PGCAP and Edinburgh Teaching Award opportunities to all Postgraduate Tutors at the earliest possible stage in their careers and systematically builds a schedule of further professional development opportunities into a reflective mandatory annual teaching review.	Session 2020-21	It is possible for graduate tutors to take the PGCap, but it is not usually done because of the amount of time it takes (most graduate tutors are only going to be doing 300-400 hours of teaching and marking in their careers); the IAD normally point them towards a less time-consuming range of courses to enhance their teaching practice. Oversight by supervisors and mentors ensures a careful schedule of professional development. The School is introducing a local iteration of the Edinburgh Teaching Award.	
13.	The Review Team recommends that the Head of Subject Area find a clearer way of communicating the option of an annual teaching review to Postgraduate Tutors.	Completed	The Head of Classics has written to all GH tutors offering them an annual teaching review. This will be the standard practice every year from now on.	
	Please report on steps taken to feedback to students on the outcomes of the review	The Classics department's Student Staff Liaison Committee will share the report and recommendations, and this set of responses, with the students in advance of the meeting in semester 1 of academic session 2019-20. Any points raised by the students will be discussed by the Classics teaching committee/ departmental meeting and fed back to the students at the following SSLC.		
For Year on response only	Any examples of a positive change as a result of the review			

TPR of Earth Science UG programmes. School of GeoSciences:

Date of review: 11 & 12th March 2019

Date of 14 week response: 13th August 2019

Date of year on response: 15 May 2020

The School/Subject Area is responsible for reporting on progress with all recommendations, including those remitted to other areas of the University for action. If any recommendation has been fully addressed please record the action taken and date completed. Any barriers to progress should be highlighted on this report.

No.	Recommendation	Timescale for completion	Comment on progress towards completion and/or identify barriers to completion	Completion date
1	The panel recommends that the School review its processes for maintaining student welfare by instituting uniform attendance monitoring at least for practicals, record keeping and triage systems; in particular, it is recommended that the School maintain formal attendance monitoring for practicals, using University systems to support this.		<p>We currently use paper sign-in sheets for practical classes across all Earth Science programmes. These sheets are passed to the Teaching Organisation, data transferred to Excel files, and then used for various purposes (including monitoring). We will remind all staff of the importance of ensuring that this process continues. However, the School lacks resources to enact the recommendation in full, especially regarding the use of attendance monitoring for triaging. As we highlighted during the 2 day visit, this is due to a lack of investment by the University in software for monitoring student attendance and/or engagement. Current software does not readily facilitate uploading and transfer of attendance data between systems. There are various workarounds of current systems which can be used to monitor attendance (e.g. TopHat). However, there is no efficient and effective way of transferring or processing the volumes of data produced to enable the type of universal triaging process proposed. This would require a system where attendance data could be automatically synced with Euclid student records (or something equivalent). Currently, all attendance data would have to be transferred into student records manually, one student at a time. We could potentially use paper sign-in sheets and a simple database (or set of Excel sheets) to monitor attendance, although this would be time and resource intensive. The system would also again be standalone, and information would have to be continually processed and shared. We lack the resource to do this.</p> <p>As a School, we have a robust Student Support system which we believe offers a high level of support for our students, and is held up as a good model for Student Support across the College. Our SSC team provide a high level of care to students, and receive very favourable feedback from students. We would, however, be strongly supportive of any investment by the University which allows us to use data on student attendance and/or engagement to further this support.</p>	Reminders to be sent prior to start of S1 19/20

			<p>As noted during the 2-day visit, an investment by the University in this area would also be beneficial in understanding universal issues with declining student engagement.</p> <p>We further note that there is a University-level review of policy on attendance monitoring expected in 2020/2021, as part of the Student Engagement and Attendance Monitoring (SEAM) project.</p>	
2	<p>The panel recommends that the School institute mechanisms to improve the collection of data in order to make informed decisions and implement change. The data should include information on student retention, transfers, progression and graduate destinations.</p>		<p>We maintain a high level of record-keeping within the School, including full data on student progression, student transfers, completion rates, and course pass rates. This data is used across the School for various purposes, and feeds into reviews of Teaching delivery.</p> <p>As highlighted in the reflective report, the issue here concerns University-level systems for record keeping, and as such, is external to the School. Data passed onto the School ahead of the TPR contained a number of significant errors. Information on student progression, in particular, was unreliable, and in some cases, 1/3 of students were missing from the data provided. This highlights a worrying deficiency in the accuracy of University student records systems. The TPR Liaison (GB) has already flagged specific data issues with the Internal Review Support team.</p> <p>We also anticipate rollout of the new power BI Quality Reports in summer 2019, which will provide us with more accurate data in these areas.</p>	N/A
3	<p>The panel recommends that the School re-purpose the Teaching and Assessment Working Group to focus on enhancing the staff and student experience, to include the following remit items: timing and modes of assessment, curriculum review including thread review, academic guidance, and optimising spaces and resourcing.</p>		<p>As recommended, the remit of the Teaching and Assessment Working Group (TAWG) has been broadened to include complete curriculum review across all taught degree programmes delivered by the School (including all Earth Science programmes reviewed in this TPR). In May, the TAWG agreed a timeline for this process, which will begin with an IAD (ELDeR) led review of the geology programme in late 2019. This will focus on the overall syllabus and student/learning progression, but with considerable focus on timing and purpose of assessments. There will be subsequent reviews of other programmes.</p> <p>Aside from the work of the TAWG, we note that the TPR report comments favourably on the culture of reflection within the School (Section B 1.2). The DoT (UG) is keen to further encourage reflection and review of UG teaching through individual annual course review (by CO/DPC), annual programme review (by DPC and TO) and the regular work of the TO. This climate of reflection feeds into descriptions of roles, and expectations of role holders (CO, DPC, ESC etc) recently agreed by the Teaching Committee and circulated to all staff.</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>Full review of Geology programme by January 2020. Review of other ES programmes by Jan 2021.</p>
4	<p>The panel recommends that the School introduce more clarity and better communication on the Personal Tutor role to staff and students, more in line with the</p>		<p>We use a PT model across the School where pastoral issues are largely handled by SSCs, with PTs responsible for academic guidance. However, this system is flexible, and tutees are encouraged to engage with PTs regarding non-academic issues if both parties are comfortable doing so. We also advertise the fact that students should feel confident bringing up any issues with either their PT or</p>	<p>To be completed by Sept. 2019</p>

	University's guidance on Personal Tutors		<p>SSCs, who can then guide the student towards an additional service if appropriate. This model has been held up as good practice by both College and University.</p> <p>However, in light of the recommendation, we will clarify policy with students and provide more guidance on roles and responsibilities. We will review information given to students in Welcome Week (for 2019/2020 onwards), and ensure that a clear description of the PT and SSC roles, in addition to the School's student support policy, are available on our LEARN Student Information Hubs (which provide a one stop shop of resources and signposting for our student body).</p> <p>We also note that review of the University PT and student support systems is ongoing. Both are additionally being considered as part of the Service Excellence Review. We await recommendations.</p>	Ongoing
5	The panel recommends that the University increase provision of support services, including counselling services, on site at King's Buildings		<p>Response from Gavin Douglas, Deputy Secretary, Student Experience</p> <p>SCS (Student Counselling Service) have access to 2 counselling rooms at Murchison House, and SDS (Student Disability Service) have access to 1 room (all 5 days a week). Director of SDS has brokered a deal with Director of Student Careers Service for temporary use of another room 4 days a week until the move into the Health and Wellbeing Centre in February 2020</p> <p>Both services would welcome more space at KB- SDS has around 800 students registered with the service in Schools based at Kings. Ideally we could provide counselling (including groups), some assessor capacity, more mental health mentors and some management cover/ drop-in and problem-solving capacity. The Director of Student Wellbeing has raised this with the CSE College Office in the first instance.</p>	
6	The panel recommends that the School improve information to staff and students on feedback dates, have a uniform approach to the of quality of feedback provided within and across courses, and that it abide by the 15 working day rule set by the University.		<p>We will continue to impress upon staff the importance of adhering to the 15 working day rule for feedback. In addition, we are taking action on 4 fronts to improve return:</p> <p>-The School's TO have been collecting data on return rates for all UG and PG assessments during 2018/2019. This data is processed using a traffic light system to highlight issues, and distributed to DPCs to disseminate to staff and discuss at teaching meetings across the School. The ESC has also been flagging specific failings within the Earth Science programmes with staff line managers. In 2019/2020, as a change in policy, we will freely distribute all data of assessment return rates to staff across the School. This new policy of full transparency means that all staff will be aware of instances where work is returned late.</p>	From Sept 2019 onwards

			<p>-The School's TAWG is tasked at reviewing timing and purpose of assessments. One objective of this review is to reduce the number of assessments across Earth Sciences which, compared to other programmes within the School, remains high. A reduction in number of assessments should result in an improvement in return rates.</p>	<p>Full review of Geology programme by January 2020. Review of other ES programmes by Jan 2021.</p>
			<p>-The LEARN Foundations project, which will roll out in summer 2019, will provide a new template for LEARN course pages which gives clear, easy to find information on assessment deadlines and feedback dates.</p> <p>-The Teaching Committee has revised their role descriptors for teaching posts across the School, including the role of Course Organiser. These will be advertised to all staff, and make the responsibilities of COs clear, including ensuring that good quality feedback is given in a prompt and timely manner in accordance with University guidelines.</p>	<p>From Sept 2019 onwards</p> <p>Completed</p>
7	<p>The panel recommends that the School improve academic guidance on course choice in pre-honours years, particularly courses in or adjacent to Schools which consolidate essential skills for honours years.</p>		<p>All knowledge and skills required in Earth Science degree programmes are delivered within compulsory courses. Choice of optional courses in PHs (where applicable) is open, and students are free to take courses from across the University. Rather than prescribing certain courses, we believe that there is equal benefit to students engaging in courses closely related to their chosen programme as there is with engaging in courses which are in very different subject areas. Students meet with PTs during Welcome Week to discuss choices of optional courses, and in Welcome Week literature/presentations, are given guidance on choosing optional courses. However, in light of this recommendation we will:</p> <p>-review information given to students during Welcome Week, and in 2019/2020, trial using 3rd/4th year students to deliver short talks to incoming students on course choice. We will also review information given to PTs about advising students with option course selection.</p> <p>-Produce, as part of the ELDeR (Edinburgh Learning Design roadmap) curriculum review process, a short summary of learning outcome, knowledge and skills training for all Earth Science programmes. A version of this can be distributed to students. This will help them to reflect on any particular optional courses which might provide additional training in any area they feel less confident.</p>	<p>September 2019</p> <p>September 2019-ongoing</p>

8	<p>The panel recognises the challenge of building the identity of the Earth Sciences cohort when operating across multiple sites, and recommends that the School review and seek to improve the provision of spaces to enhance the student and staff experience, this to include social space, teaching space and quiet study space.</p>		<p>The School has been investigating options regarding reallocation of space, and this recommendation will be discussed at the School's Planning and Resources Committee (SPARC) meeting. However, there are considerable issues regarding lack of space across the School (especially within Grant and the Crew buildings), and any significant action would require a radical review of how space is used, and a major investment in capital. We will continue to investigate all possibilities and make the most of any available opportunities.</p> <p>Lack of quiet study space is a general issue across the King's Buildings Campus. Refurbishment of Murchison House, and improvement in provision, has been warmly received by students within Earth Sciences. As such, we would encourage the University to continue to invest in support on the King's Buildings Campus.</p>	On-going
9	<p>The panel recommends that the University support the long-term in-position career progression, development and promotion of the Earth Sciences professional services staff in order to allow continuity in Schools.</p>		<p>Response from Stephen Barnes Head of HR for CSE:</p> <p>The University P&DR cycle provides the opportunity for staff to discuss their development needs and future career aspirations with their line manager and for them to agree the staff member's development plan for the year. This is a plan that should be kept alive and discussed as the year progresses.</p> <p>The University provides a range of learning and development resources and opportunities open to all staff. For example, the resources in the Online Development Toolkit but also the externally facing subscription to LinkedIn Learning that is now available to all.</p> <p>On the basis that some of the most effective development comes from 'experience' and 'exposure' rather than formal learning, the local Senior HR Advisor will discuss this recommendation with the Director of Professional Service for Geosciences to establish how HR can support the team further.</p> <p>In terms of personal development time for professional services staff, that is up to the school leadership team to determine.</p>	

10	The panel recommends that the School continue to improve training for tutors and demonstrators by encouraging them to engage with CPD, including Higher Education Academy (HEA), Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice (PgCAP), and The Edinburgh Teaching Award (EdTA).		<p>The PgCAP is generally not appropriate for postgrad Tutors and Demonstrators (T&D). The Edinburgh Teaching Award (Level 1) and the <i>Introduction to Academic Practice</i> module are much more suitable than the Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice for T&D seeking formal accreditation for their teaching. We currently support PG students wishing to engage with this training, although will improve how this is communicated to students:</p> <p>-We will review and improve information given to T&D during induction and training events.</p> <p>-The Student Services Projects team are trialling a regular newsletter for PGR students involved in Tutoring and Demonstrating. This will contain information on various opportunities related to training and personal development, and we will use this as a means to regularly showcase and signpost the Edinburgh Teaching Award scheme.</p>	Sept 2019
11	The panel recommends that the School institute and communicate to tutors and demonstrators a process for them to provide feedback to the School and that it address issues relating to the common marking scheme, payment for tasks undertaken and staff-student ratios raised during the review.		<p>Following this recommendation, for 2019/2020 we will trial a group feedback system for PG tutors and demonstrators. This will consist of surveys and a meeting chaired by one of the Earth Science DPCs.</p> <p>Role descriptors recently developed by the TC will remind COs of the need to fully liaise with T&D on all courses to receive feedback. We will additionally request that this feedback is also obtained and commented upon during end-of-course reviews which COs complete.</p>	Sept 2019-onwards
12	The panel recommends that academic staff members (non-tutors and demonstrators) be present and engaged with all practical sessions		Following this recommendation we are changing policy within the School. This recommendation relates to 2 specific year 1 courses. From 2019/2020 onwards, academic staff will be required to be in attendance for at least part of each and every practical session.	Sept 2019
13	The panel recommends that the School highlight the rich information which already exists on their webpages to the incoming cohorts, to provide them with sufficient knowledge and background to make well-informed course choices on arrival		<p>A complete web site review is being planned by the School, but is resource dependent. Programme web pages will be refreshed on a rolling basis by the Marketing, Recruitment and Communications team. We are also looking at setting up Facebook groups for incoming students to help them connect, share information and ask questions before they arrive to begin their programme. We also now have the LEARN Student Information Hubs, which provide resources and signposting for all students.</p> <p>We will also review information given to incoming students in Welcome Week</p>	In progress

	Please report on steps taken to feedback to students on the outcomes of the review	The TPR Liaison will send a copy of the TPR report to all Earth Science UG students, along with a shorter explanation of all commendations, recommendations and actions arising.
For Year on response only	Any examples of a positive change as a result of the review	

The University of Edinburgh

Internal Periodic Review

Year on Response Report

TPR of Education Programmes

Date of review: 14 & 15 March 2018

Report Received by MHSE 30 Aug 2018

Date of 14 week response: provided 25 Oct 2018 (due 6 Dec 2018)

Date of year on response: due 31 August 2019 , received 10 September 2019

The School/Subject Area is responsible for reporting on progress with all recommendations, including those remitted to other areas of the University for action.

If any recommendation has been fully addressed please record the action taken and date completed. Any barriers to progress should be highlighted on this report.

Rec no	Recommendation	Timescale for completion	Comment on progress towards completion and/or identify barriers to completion	Completion date
1.	The review team recommends that the clear vision is more widely communicated at all levels of the School to enable implementation at an operational level. 1.2	Sept 2018- Dec 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ITE Landscape Consultation and Development group was established consisting of ITE Programme Directors and Programme team members. This group membership also included ITE members involved in degree programme curriculum developments plus respective Heads of Institutes. However, in 2019, when all the three (3) scheduled ITE landscape meetings had successfully been held, the ITE Landscape Consultation and Development group was disbanded as the group was deemed to have served its purposes. Further ITE programme development groups specific to subject areas have been identified to spearhead the developments towards re-accreditation or design of new programmes. • As stated in the 14 week response, a portal was established on School Intranet as document repository for the ITE Landscape group. This enabled emerging / draft documentation for revalidation and reaccreditation to be available to all staff in the School. • ITE Programmes (MA Physical Education and PGDE Primary & Secondary) Programme Directors have identified MHSES staff to attend residential curriculum development workshops. Once these groups have amended or developed new programmes for re-accreditation, these will be submitted to 	<p>July 2019</p> <p>October 2018</p> <p>Ongoing</p>

			<p>the School and College committees. All papers submitted to the group will be made available to all staff on School intranet.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entry requirement changes to the BA Community Education new programme developments are being discussed with Student Recruitment and Admissions Office. This will support the widening participation strategy. • A new development, British Sign Language (BSL) Programme, is being developed in response to the Scottish Government’s Languages 1+2 Strategy. The lecturer in Deaf Education is leading on this development. • All new programme developments are being discussed with the Director of Professional Services (DOPS) regarding resourcing required of new programmes. For example, proposals for a new British Sign Language Programme have been reviewed by the DOPS’ office. • The School has appointed a new Communications Officer and who has developed a strategy for communicating developments (vision and updates) within the school. 	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p>
2.	<p>The review team recommends the School build on these to consider diversifying assessment practice, identifying creative ways of using formative assessment and feedback, assessment weightings, focusing on helping students develop skills more broadly through feedback and not just on essay-specific feedback and involving students as co-creators in the assessment process 2.7.3</p>	<p>Sept 2018- Dec 2020</p>	<p>SUGSC (School Undergraduate Studies Committee) reviewed progress in Sept 2017 on assessment and feedback. The following actions on feedback for 2018-19 were agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actions related to this recommendation were first discussed in May 2018 during SUGSC. Students have expressed their desire to meet with the member of staff who marked and provided feedback on their coursework. At SUGSC strategies to facilitate this were proposed, there are challenges for some of the courses with large cohorts because some markers are on Guaranteed Hours contracts, so additional meetings with students have not been costed in which make additional meetings difficult to facilitate and there could have been issues of equity. Programme Directors leading large cohorts where several tutors are involved in the marking assessments but not directly providing feedback on marked scripts, have identified at least one course within their programme which will trial a ‘meet the marker’ opportunity to discuss feedback in detail. Programmes have reported back on this development at SUGCS meetings and this will continue to be monitored. 	<p>Implemented and Ongoing</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MHSES created a bespoke logo which can be used on Learn pages and on documents to highlight to students opportunities for feedback. The use of the logo across courses to help students associate all of the opportunities for 'feedback' within a course should help to move away from a view that feedback is only written and provided after essays. The Director of UG and PG, members of SQAEC, both continue to participate in Quality Assurance meetings where planning of workshops to showcase best practices have been conducted. The Deputy DQAE is leading the development of seminars or lunchtime sessions for sharing of good practice. A subgroup of the School quality committee (SQAEC) are offering fortnightly sharing good practice sessions The DQAE who is a member of SUGSC will be asked to support the review of NSS 2019 responses focusing on assessment and feedback. Furthermore, the DQAE works closely with student reps to gather their input on the feedback process which is shared with UG and PG committees and students. As stated in the 14 week response report, the DUGS will continue to liaise with the DQAE to ensure examples of good practice related to cohort feedback and feedforward are shared. The DQAE and Project Administrator have redesigned the QA webpages in SharePoint where good practice will be shared. <p><u>Additionally</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage use of elective feedback within courses- consider adding this to assessment rubrics Ensure Turnitin feedback includes generic feedback/ feedforward statement as well as feedback linked to agreed success criteria feedback See also response to recommendation 5 in relation to taking a "lean" approach to assessment design. 	<p>April 2019</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>April 2019</p> <p>Ongoing</p>
3.	The review team recommend that the School review <u>staffing models and succession planning</u> particularly for the larger ITE programmes and where the imbalance between permanent and seconded staff is not equal. 1.3	2018-2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hol teams continue to attend to staffing plans. Actions taken include successful recruitment of staff to support programme developments. Staffing plans were discussed at the School's Planning and Resources Committee (SPRC) and approved. 	Ongoing

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HoI teams have identified potential course organisers and programme directors who have been involved in the writing of content for the new Programmes target for cohort entry of 2021 and 2022: BACE (2021); PGDE Primary and Secondary (2021 and MA in Physical Education (2021). • ETL: the sunsetting of MA Primary Education ‘with’ programmes (2018-2021) will impact positively on staffing balance • SPEHS: The Institute has recruited staff capable of supporting future proofing of UG programmes. Developments have been proposed for the changes to Physical Education, Applied Sport Science and Sport and Recreation Management programmes. These new developments will be linked to the internal capabilities as well as the subject area trends across the HE sector. • ECS - Developments of the new BA Community Education have progressed well. Feedback from critical friends has been positive and current staff identified course organisers and allocated writing tasks which were carried out as planned ready for review by school and college committees. Staff implications have been considered and other resource implications will be discussed at SPRC late this academic year. • The new DOPS together with the Directors of UG and PG consulted the outgoing Deputy Head of School to provide historical examples of how programme costing has been done within the school. A formula of costing courses and programmes was requested by the three MHSES Directors so as to pass down to their respective programmes. It was highlighted that there are inconsistencies both at college and University levels regarding approaches utilised to undertake costings. The DOPS will continue to investigate further suitable course and programme costing systems to share with Directors of UG/PG and their respective programmes 	<p>July 2019</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>April 2019</p> <p>Ongoing</p>
--	--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

4.	The review team recommend that the School consider the suggestions raised during the review around restructuring of the PGDE programmes and ensure that although the School wishes to learn from the MSc programme and from the MA Primary programme that they embrace this opportunity for change and to future proof the programmes. 2.3.10	Sept 2018- Dec 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through the ITE Landscape development meetings, the mandate (to develop Level 11 courses under two pathways) offered to the Directors of PGDE Primary and Secondary Programmes have been undertaken to enable the development of a joint PGDE Primary and Secondary Programme. • These developments have explored the option for a return to study after achieving the PGDE qualification to achieve 60 credits towards a Masters qualification. A residential workshop is planned to support the structure and implementation mechanisms of these PGDE development plans. • Involvement of key stakeholders (i.e. STEM Staff) will be encouraged to ensure staff are fully consulted to help support the future proofing of current and new programmes. • A meeting between the Programme Directors for PGDE (Primary and Secondary) together with key STEM teaching staff was organised by the marketing team to explore ways of supporting recruitment to STEM subjects and overall support for the sustainability of two programmes. 	April 2019 Ongoing Ongoing March 2019
5.	The review team recommends that the School further reflect on the outcomes identified through its recent engagement with the LEAF programme in the context of this student feedback 2.3.3	Sept 2018- Dec 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further developments to those reported in the 14 week response include: New programme development are adopting the use of an assessment grid to ensure that over the 4 years of study; planning and implementing a diverse range of assessment mechanisms for both formative and summative assessments. Emphasis is placed on making sure that the range of assessment tools help achieve the learning outcomes as well as enable the development of graduate attributes for each programme. • For example, MA Primary Education with Gaelic and BA Community Education have completed this grid during the development of their revised/new programmes. Support from IAD assessment and feedback specialist staff is encouraged for 	Ongoing August 2019

			all new programme developments or amendments to existing programmes.	
6.	The review team recommend refining and clarifying the expectations of the role for the benefit of both Personal tutors and Students. 2.1.4	Sept 2018- Sept 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Senior Personal Tutor provides support to new personal tutors. This includes clarity of roles of a PT. The Senior Personal Tutors (PG/UG) are working on updating of the Personal Tutor Handbook which will provide further clarity on PT roles, including the generic academic support expected of PTs. Course organisers and their teaching teams remain responsible for offering subject specific feedback. The Service Excellence Programme is reviewing the Student Support and Personal Tutor System. Colleagues in the school have taken part in consultation events to inform the review. Although the outcome of the review is not known, within the School we have updated the information in Programme Handbooks to help clarify the roles staff undertake to support students. As reported in the 14 week response, all Education Programmes which had started to implement the 'meet the marker' trial sessions in 2018-9 will be asked to provide an update in September and October 2019 SUGSC meetings. This will be reviewed to support action plans to roll out to all courses. 	Sept 2019 Ongoing Sept/Oct 2019
7.	The review team recommends that the School progress with a number of ideas discussed during the review to evince improvements at the operational level. Such improvements would include the development of communication, access to and exchange of information, and clarity of expectations between the University, student and school tutor in relation to placements. 2.3.15	Sept 2018- Dec 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Service Excellence Programme, Study and Work Away Service (SWAS) created as part of the Service Excellence Programme has centralised the organisation of placements from MHSES to Edinburgh Global. Staff in the MHSES Placement Unit have already moved after they were required to re-apply for their jobs under the new SWAS structures. MHSES staff familiar with the Student Placement System will continue to support MHSES placements for ITE programmes and for other programmes through a centralised management system outwith MHSES. These changes will make it challenging 	Sept 2019

			<p>for the UG Directorate to affect the operations of student placements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The University of Edinburgh Teacher Education Partnership working group continues to work with key stakeholders within Local Authorities and Programme Directors to provide information about placements, expectations and guidance for all involved in supporting students on ITE programmes. The MHSES website now hosts documents for all programmes which makes it easier for all to access information as the SPS only provided two members of school staff with access so this development should help information to be accessed and shared with those that need it to support students. <p>The following plans from the 14 week review will continue to be monitored:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional Experience and Practice course booklets and Placement booklets will be updated annually to incorporate any changes arising from external examiner comments or other QAE sources of information. PDs will analyse NSS qualitative comments and CEQs annually for insights into ways to enhance student placement experiences. Students and Schools will be provided with clear information about University contacts in all documentation. The establishing of 'Place to Be' at Moray House in September 2018 will provide an additional layer of helpline and counselling support for PGDE students while they are 'studying away' on placements. This funded pilot will run for 2 years. Representatives from Teacher Education Partnership (TEP), Early Phase group will be invited to join Programme development groups for new Programmes. 	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p>
8.	The review team recommends the School explores opportunities for synergies across the programmes and works with the GTCS on making the SPS work to the betterment of the programmes 2.3.7	2018 - 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The School Academic Coordinator for Placement has facilitated the creation of national survey of ITE institutions and local authorities about placement organisation and management. The Evaluation survey data collection was conducted in 2018. Universities and Local 	August 2018

			<p>Authorities/Schools completed a similar survey that invited them to record their individual experiences of a range of pre-determined issues pertaining to placement management by the General Teaching Council of Scotland's Student Placement Scheme (SPS)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following survey analysis, a report was submitted with recommendations for improvements to the working relationship between the General Teaching Council's Student Placement Scheme (SPS) and stakeholders (ITE Institutions and local authorities). • Members of the MHSES are working with SPS (Student Placement Scheme) management group to respond to the recommendations. 	<p>Sept 2018</p> <p>Ongoing</p>
9.	To further support effective communication and the exchange of information, the review team recommends that the PSG develop a section in the partnership portal to link to resources. 2.3.15	Sept 2018	All Programme Placement Handbooks available on PSG website for start of academic session 2018-19.	1 Sept 2018
	Please report on steps taken to feedback to students on the outcomes of the review	The final TPR report and the initial response were discussed at SUGSC & School Executive. This 1 Year Response together with the 14 week response will placed on the School SharePoint, and open for discussion in various Staff Student Liaison Committees for Semester 1 2019-2020.		
For year on response only	Any examples of a positive change as a result of the review	<p>The review resulted in setting up the ITE Landscape Group. The group consisted of ITE and non-ITE subject experts (plus Heads of Institutes). The positive change that resulted from the formation of this group as a result of the review are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The sessions explored synergies across ITE programmes and identified how to address some of the required efficiencies in the use of the School's resources. 2. The group aimed to work collaboratively supporting programme directors to future proof their respective programmes and also to help support a strategic design of the School's ITE portfolio. For example, best practice sharing in programme development from the recent innovative MSC Transformative Learning and Teaching was considered. 3. The outcomes of the ITE Landscape discussions continue to support what is a tight schedule of GTCS reaccreditation of four ITE programmes. By 9th September 2019, MA Primary Education with Gaelic Programmes (Learners 5 Years and Fluent Speakers 4 Years) were successfully reaccredited. MA in Primary Education, PGDE Primary and PGDE Secondary have all been supported via the ITE Landscape Group and are due for GTCS submission in 2020. 		

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

18 September 2019

Positive Outcomes from Internal Periodic Review 2017/18

Executive Summary

The paper identifies examples of a positive change as a result of the internal periodic review as noted in the year on response.

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

The paper is relevant to the Committee's responsibility for the quality assurance framework.

Action requested

For information.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

This will be agreed if specific actions arising from the outcomes are identified.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

There are no additional resource implications associated with this paper at this point.

2. Risk assessment

The paper is a report on activity and no risk assessment is required.

3. Equality and Diversity

The paper itself does not require an Equality Impact Assessment. The Equality Impact Assessment for internal periodic review processes is published at:

<https://edin.ac/2p3B7WZ>

4. Freedom of information

The paper is open.

Key words

Internal review, TPR, PPR, positive outcomes

Originator of the paper

Gillian Mackintosh, Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services
12 September 2019

The University of Edinburgh
Internal Periodic Review 2017/18

Examples of a positive change as a result of the review (noted in year on response)

TPR/PPR	Examples of a positive change as a result of the review
TPR Physics and Astronomy	The weekly Theoretical Physics lunchtime seminar series (item 10) has proved popular with students and we plan to extend this to other degree programmes, in particular Physics. This is our largest degree programme, which means that these students can feel less of a sense of belonging than the smaller cohorts taking our more specialised degrees
TPR English Literature	Under recommendation 3, the department appointed Dr Suzanne Trill to lead the pre-hons curriculum review over the next two years (with the intention of a new first-year programme to be in operation in 2020-21; and the second-year programme the following year). We are consulting with students (through the SSLC committee) so that their views are integral to the process and they are fully briefed about any changes we plan to make.
TPR Medicine	The review helped to address some ongoing concerns raised by the school in terms of staffing structures. There is still progress to be made but the additional support within the MTO will help with the day to day running of the programme. Access to the Learning Technology Adviser will also help to develop our online presence and further enhance our Learn site.
TPR Social Anthropology	<p>There is improved communication around teaching related roles and responsibilities. The TPR helped us identify items that needed to be made easily available to staff via the Subject Area SharePoint. Many items identified by the TPR were already being actioned either at School or University level, and so positive change from those is indirectly linked to the TPR.</p> <p>The Staff Away Day focusing on the Strategic Vision for Teaching generated new ideas to invigorate and renew the curriculum and was useful in that it identified that the key strength that singles Social Anthropology at the University of Edinburgh from many other UK Social Anthropology departments is our focus on research-led teaching, and learning through research.</p>
TPR Biomedical Sciences	<p>Several initiatives to deal with the increasing numbers and diversity of students on the programmes have been developed. These include the development of Senior Academic Tutor roles, the role of Dignity and Respect Advisor, and the development of further guidance for all Academic Advisors. The Academic Families programme continues to run. A focus on careers will be embedded in a core Y4 course in 2019-20. The ZJE Undergraduate Programme Committee continues to develop its remit of reviewing and promoting best practice in teaching, in association with similar activities under the remit of the BMTO L&TC.</p> <p>Development and approval of a number of policies and regulations at the Institute.</p>

	<p>The importance of reviewing the timing of assessments has been reinforced and has resulted in immediate action and change implemented in 2018-19, which will continue going forward.</p> <p>The programme team have been encouraged to seek out more opportunities for engagement with Edinburgh-based BMS students. The Winter School will run for the foreseeable future, and ZJE students have the opportunity to carry out research projects, including their Hons projects, at UoE</p>
TPR Education	<p>The review resulted in setting up the ITE Landscape Group. The group consisted of ITE and non-ITE subject experts (plus Heads of Institutes). The positive change that resulted from the formation of this group as a result of the review are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The sessions explored synergies across ITE programmes and identified how to address some of the required efficiencies in the use of the School's resources. 2. The group aimed to work collaboratively supporting programme directors to future proof their respective programmes and also to help support a strategic design of the School's ITE portfolio. For example, best practice sharing in programme development from the recent innovative MSC Transformative Learning and Teaching was considered. 3. The outcomes of the ITE Landscape discussions continue to support what is a tight schedule of GTCS reaccreditation of four ITE programmes. By 9th September 2019, MA Primary Education with Gaelic Programmes (Learners 5 Years and Fluent Speakers 4 Years) were successfully reaccredited. MA in Primary Education, PGDE Primary and PGDE Secondary have all been supported via the ITE Landscape Group and are due for GTCS submission in 2020.
TPR Sociology & Sustainable Development	<p>The major positive changes signalled in this report are indicated under points 1, 4, 5 and 9. Specifically and in that order:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements to staffing and coordination of pathway responsibilities in SD. • Formalisation of within-subject teaching administration in the Undergraduate Teaching Team, including a coordinating teams for all pre-honours courses and their development. • Of particular significance, an agreed School strategy to level of growth in students numbers over the coming two years, recruiting new staff to improve s/s ratios at the same time (especially a concern for other subjects areas with worse ratios than Sociology). <p>Doing a better job of closing the circle on student consultation and feedback via the activities of the SSLC.</p>
PPR Chemistry	<p>The social space is being widely used by the Postgraduate student community in our School and has become a central focus of social activities.</p> <p>As part of the induction, all members of the Postgraduate Committee introduce themselves to the new cohort of PhD students and explain their roles as postgraduate advisors. Furthermore, supervisors are now required to leave the room at the end of the annual progression review meeting, giving the students the opportunity to raise with their assistant supervisors any concerns they may have about their supervisors. As a result of these changes, the students now have a heightened awareness of the levels of support that they have, and the ways to raise concerns</p>

PPR Clinical Sciences	<p>The PPR helped to focus our strategy, reinforcing concepts and themes already identified by individuals in PG management roles. Particularly useful were recommendations that identified a perceived disconnect between College/Deanery strategy and implementation of that strategy. This guided the operation of our newly formed PG management group (which currently serves as a combined L&T, QA/E committee) and gave impetus to organisational restructuring, necessary to provide a secure foundation for growth and development by effectively targeting resource to those programmes that have capacity to expand.</p>
PPR Engineering	<p>Our induction meetings, the School Research Conference and PGR BBQ this year have been the best attended to date. Students have been invited to 4 meetings with the new Head of School since he started this year, at which positive feedback was received.</p>
PPR Molecular, Genetic and Population Health Sciences	<p>It was helpful to have advice from the review team to consolidate our existing programmes to ensure sustainability before attempting to expand our student numbers. We have now been able to do that by appointing a dissertation and research co-ordinator and a co-director for one of the larger programmes. We have now started to develop plans for potential expansion. The review helped to raise the profile of online learning within the Usher Institute, with greater official recognition of the level and quality of activity, the income generated by programmes, our future potential but also the very real challenges that programme teams face, with real commitment to support programme teams. Our on-campus programme has made links with the careers service and had a presentation from them in Welcome week and have held 2 careers focused sessions for students with NHS colleagues.</p>

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

18 September 2018

**Personal Tutor System
Oversight Group**

Executive Summary

This report updates the Committee on activities in relation to the mainstreaming of the Personal Tutor (PT) system within School QA processes.

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

The paper is relevant to the University's Strategic Goal of 'excellence in education' and the Strategic Theme of 'Outstanding student experience'.

Action requested

The Committee is asked to note and comment on the ongoing activities to mainstream the PT system within School QA processes.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

No resource implications are identified.

2. Risk assessment

No risks are associated with the paper as it ensures alignment with current University policy.

3. Equality and Diversity

Equality and diversity was considered in the development of the Personal Tutoring system and this paper does not make any substantive changes to University policy or practice. Therefore equality impact assessment is not required.

4. Freedom of information

Yes.

Key words

Personal Tutor

Originator of the paper

Brian Connolly, Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services

Personal Tutor System Oversight Group Update

The Personal Tutor (PT) System Oversight Group has met on two occasions since the last meeting of SQAC in June 2019.

At the meeting held on Thursday 20 June 2019 the Group reviewed and approved the School Personal Tutoring Statements for the 2019-20 academic session.

The Group reviewed each statement to ensure alignment with the standard template and to ensure information is current. The statement performs a twofold function: (a) acting as a guide for Personal Tutors (PTs) and tutees by setting out exactly what each should expect of the other in relation to the general features of the PT system across the University and the specific elements delivered locally by the School; (b) acting as a light touch QA mechanism for the University to ensure that each school is broadly in line with the rest of the institution by meeting the minimum PT system framework requirements, as set out in the template. The Group also approved a number of late submissions via email correspondence.

The Group also held a meeting via email correspondence between Monday 19 and Monday 26 August 2019. This electronic meeting (the first in this new format) enabled the Group to consider trends and implications of the results of this year's student surveys for both Schools and the University.

Members were invited to consider the data on the PT system from this year's surveys at the following Power BI links:

- [National Student Survey \(NSS\)](#)
- [NSS Free Text](#)
- [Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey \(PTES\)](#)
- [PTES Free Text](#)

Comments were then fed into the September meeting of the Senate Quality Assurance Committee group considering the School Annual Quality Reports (which in turn made recommendations to Schools, Colleges, and the University).

The next meeting of the Group is due to be held in June 2020 (again to consider School Personal Tutoring Statements for 2021) however this may be superseded by the outcome of the current Personal Tutor and Student Support Review.

Brian Connolly
Academic Services
September 2019

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

18 September 2019

Report from the Knowledge Strategy Committee

Executive Summary

To update SQAC on certain matters considered by the Knowledge Strategy Committee.

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

Not applicable.

Action requested

SQAC is invited to note the report.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Not applicable.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

Where applicable, as covered in the report.

2. Risk assessment

Where applicable, as covered in the report.

3. Equality and Diversity

Where applicable, as covered in the report.

4. Freedom of information

This paper is open.

Key words

Knowledge Strategy Committee

Originator of the paper

Dr Lewis Allan, Head of Court Services

REPORT FROM THE KNOWLEDGE STRATEGY COMMITTEE

24 May 2019

1 Core Systems Programme Update and Presentation

The Deputy Chief Information Officer provided an update on the programme to replace HR, Finance, Payroll and Procurement systems. The supplier contract was signed in April, with a due diligence period using subject matter experts across the University concluded. The following points were discussed:

- The importance of wider staff communications as part of the preparatory work prior to implementation, to reach regular users in addition to specialist staff;
- Presenting an implementation timeline similar to the procurement timeline to aid the Committee in monitoring progress and to include other key milestones (e.g. Research Excellence Framework 2021 deadlines) that may impact on timings; and,
- Staff involved were congratulated on a successful procurement process.

2 Near Future Teaching Outcomes Presentation

Findings from the Near Future Teaching Outcomes project were presented, a project intended to co-design a values-based future for digital education at the University. Themes that had emerged included concerns over ‘too much tech’ that may be added on to traditional courses rather than fundamentally re-thinking course design in a digital world and whether digital provision may increase any distance on-campus students may feel. Instead, digital education should place the University community at its heart, with the student and staff experience central to all educational technology development, decision-making and procurement.

The Committee discussed incorporating findings within the distance learning at scale pilots and wider dissemination through the Institute for Academic Development staff development courses and the Edinburgh Learning Design Roadmap (ELDeR) process. The boundary challenging element of the outcomes – that digital education should be lifelong, open and transdisciplinary was welcomed, with a vision that all course content is open to all enrolled students. Future updates to the Committee were requested.

3 Plan S Update

An update on the initiative from predominantly European funding agencies to accelerate the transition to full and immediate open access to research publications was reviewed. Initial indications of revised guidance to be published by the funding agencies shortly is positive, with the likelihood that changes made will incorporate feedback from universities to extend the implementation period to 2021 and a number of technical compliance improvements. The Research Policy Group and College-level committees will continue to monitor developments closely, with Knowledge Strategy Committee to receive regular updates. Members discussed the importance of open access for research not funded by external awards, predominantly in the arts, humanities and social sciences, with Library Committee exploring open access monograph provisions, and links with open access requirements for the Research Excellence Framework 2021.

4 Network Project Update

The Director of IT Infrastructure provided an update on the project to upgrade the University's IT network. The contract award has been made following an 18 month competitive dialogue process and will enable significant improvements in speed reliability, security and can enable student and staff experience projects that could include location-based notifications, in-building wayfinding and asset tracking. Communicating the student and staff benefits were discussed, as well as re-profiling the budget to match the competitive contract price achieved and the two year timescale to completion.

5 Information Security Update

The Chief Information Security Officer presented a regular update on current and planned work being undertaken to address the information security threat facing the University. The Committee discussed the intention to deploy a password manager system for student and staff use, with a five year trial for users expected. This was agreed as a sensible strategy.

6 General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR): Implementation Overview

An overview of the implementation of GDPR at the University one year after introduction was considered. Improving the proportion of staff who have completed the mandatory data protection training from the current level of 55-60% was discussed, acknowledging the likely undercount of the proportion completed given student ambassadorial staff and other temporary or visiting staff. Introducing refresher training for permanent staff was encouraged as appropriate.

7 Main Library Masterplan

An update on the Main Library Masterplan, a project to greatly increase the number of study spaces along with other improvements, was reviewed. Planning requirements are in development and are subject to consultation with Historic Scotland, with a target date for completion of Autumn 2028. A range of smaller improvements are planned in the interim, including converting existing space for use as student study space. It was agreed that the planned short-term and longer-term improvements should be communicated to students in consultation with EUSA.

8 University Computing Regulations

Proposed minor revisions to the University Computing Regulations were recommended to Court for approval.

[Secretary's note: Court approved the revisions, available at:

https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/golden_computing_regulations_2019-20_0.pdf].

9 Sir Charles Lyell correspondence

The intention to launch a fundraising campaign to purchase the correspondence of noted Scottish geologist Sir Charles Lyell was welcomed.