

H/02/27/02

**Meeting of the Senatus Academic Policy and Regulations Committee (APRC)
to be held at 10.00am on Thursday 19 September 2019 in the Raeburn Room, Old
College**

A G E N D A

1. **Minutes of the meeting of the Curriculum and Student Progression Committee held on 30 May 2019** Enclosed
2. **Matters Arising**
For Discussion
3. **Curriculum approval arrangements for Edinburgh Futures Institute (EFI)** APRC 19/20 1A
4. **Special Circumstances and Coursework Extensions Project - Extensions Policy Changes for 2020/21** APRC 19/20 1B
For information and formal business
5. **APRC Membership and Terms of Reference 2019/20** APRC 19/20 1C
6. **Knowledge Strategy Committee Report** APRC 19/20 1D
7. **Any Other Business**

The University of Edinburgh

**Minutes of the Senatus Curriculum and Progression Committee (CSPC)
held at 2.00pm on Thursday 30 May 2019 in the Assembly Room, Edinburgh Centre for
Carbon Innovation (ECCI)**

Present:

Professor Alan Murray (Convener)	Assistant Principal, Academic Support
Professor Graeme Reid (Vice-Convener)	Dean of Learning and Teaching (CSE)
Dr Paul Norris	Associate Dean (Academic Progress), CAHSS
Ms Philippa Burrell	Head of Academic Administration (CMVM)
Dr Lisa Kendall	Head of Academic and Student Administration (CAHSS)
Professor Neil Turner	Dean of Undergraduate Learning and Teaching (CMVM)
Dr Jeremy Crang	Dean of Students (CAHSS)
Dr Antony Maciocia	Representative of Researcher Experience Committee
Ms Ellie Tudhope	Advice Place Senior Academic Adviser
Ms Diva Mukherji	Vice President Education Students' Association
Ms Steph Vallancey	Vice President Education Students' Association (incoming)
Dr Adam Bunni	Head of Governance and Regulatory Framework Team
Dr Cathy Bovill	Institute for Academic Development
Ms Anne-Marie Scott	IS Learning, Teaching and Web
Ms Lisa Dawson	Director of Student Systems and Administration

In attendance:

Ms Sue McGregor	Director, Academic Services (incoming)
Miss Theresa Sheppard	Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services

Apologies for absence:

Ms Claire Vallance	Head of Academic Affairs (CSE)
Professor Lesley McAra	Assistant Principal, Community Relations
Dr Geoff Pearson	Dean of Students (CMVM)
Mr Stephen Warrington	Dean of Student Experience (CSE)

1. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the previous meeting held on Thursday 21 March 2019 were approved as an accurate record.

2. Matters Arising

- a) **Electronic business 11 April 2019 - Postgraduate Taught Master's degrees involving a dissertation/research project**
- b) **Electronic business 11 April 2019 - Joint PhD Programmes: Public Thesis Defence**
- c) **Electronic business 7 May 2019 - External Examiners for Taught Programmes: policy review**

The Committee noted the three items of electronic business which had been conducted since its last meeting.

3. Academic Misconduct - Revised Investigation Procedures and Proposed Future Work (CSPC 18/19 5 A)

Dr Charlotte Matheson introduced the paper, which discussed draft changes to clarify and streamline the Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures, and proposed some potential future work to bolster the guidance relating to academic misconduct.

The Committee approved the revised version of the University's Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures.

The Committee discussed proposed options for future work relating to academic misconduct, agreeing that its preferred option for future work would involve the creation of additional guidance, either for the University's web pages, or to be appended to the Procedures. The guidance would cover definitions relating to academic misconduct offences, the difference between proofreading and editing, and the use of text-matching software such as Turnitin.

In discussion, the Committee noted that the guidance document linked to the policy should be user-friendly and link to sources of support for students. The Committee also highlighted the importance of addressing the causes of academic misconduct, and felt that work done by Learning and Teaching Committee's Support for Curriculum Development Group to consider approaches to assessment should explore this issue.

Action: Academic Services to take forward work to produce guidance on academic misconduct.

Action: Academic Services to raise CSPC's comments regarding academic misconduct and assessment design with the Convener of the Support for Curriculum Development Group.

4. Update on Special Circumstances and Coursework Extensions Project

Ms Lisa Dawson introduced the paper. The Committee reflected on the Special Circumstances and Coursework Extensions Project. The Committee raised some concerns about the level of attendance at the staff and student workshops and requested that the Project ensure that this is as high as possible. In keeping with CSPC's commitment to work hand-in-hand with the project, members requested more detailed feedback about the workshops, and the next stages of the project. The Director of Student Systems and Administration confirmed that these would be circulated electronically.

A finalised set of policy changes for coursework extensions will be brought to the next meeting of CSPC for approval.

Action: Director of Student Systems and Administration to circulate more detailed feedback from workshops to CSPC via electronic business.

5. Coursework Extensions and Special Circumstances: Financial issues

Dr Adam Bunni introduced the paper. The Committee discussed the proposals to amend the grounds for consideration of coursework extension requests and special circumstances; the paper included benchmarking on the position of other institutions with regard to considering financial issues as a basis for special circumstances.

In discussion, the Committee agreed with the proposal to remove reference to “financial issues” and “death of a pet” from the list of circumstances unlikely to be accepted as valid reasons for coursework extensions or Special Circumstances; these will not, however, be added to the list of circumstances likely to be accepted.

Action: Academic Services to make agreed revisions to the Special Circumstances Policy and Taught Assessment Regulations.
--

6. Support for Study

Mr Gavin Douglas, the Deputy Secretary, Student Experience, introduced the paper, which invited the Committee to approve the revised Support for Study Policy, for implementation in the academic year 2019/20.

The Policy, previously discussed by the Committee at its meeting on 24 January 2019, proposed a three stage approach to assisting the small number of students whose behaviour gave cause for concern; modifications to the proposals had been made following ongoing, constructive discussions with the Students' Association, The Advice Place, Colleges and other stakeholders. Chief of these had been focusing the policy on cases where students' behaviour was causing harm to others, rather than those where it was only causing issues for the student themselves.

The Students' Association recorded its thanks for the work in responding to its feedback, while confirming that it remained opposed to the proposal to add stage 3 to the process on the basis that they felt that it would remove the agency from students who reached this stage.

In discussion, members of the Committee agreed that it was preferable that the University should not have recourse to place a student on an interruption of studies against their will, but accepted that it was likely to be necessary in rare cases. The Committee was satisfied that this would only directly affect a very small number of students. There was agreement among the Committee that the priority was to ensure that students received good care, and to support the wider student community and staff.

The Committee approved the proposals on the basis that it would review the operation of the new Policy after a year, and that this review would encompass the operation of all three stages of the support for study process. The review should involve oversight of the data and evidence of how the Policy was working in practice.

Action: Academic Services to schedule a year-on review of the Support for Study Policy by the Committee.

7. Proposed change to Withdrawal and Exclusion from Studies Procedure

Ms Lisa Dawson presented this paper, which proposed minor changes to the Withdrawal and Exclusion from Studies Procedure to reflect the new online registration process which will be part of matriculation for continuing students from 2019/20. The Committee approved the proposed change to the Withdrawal and Exclusion from Studies Procedure, requesting an amendment to the wording in paragraph 33.ii to clarify the definition of “anniversary date.”

Action: Academic Services and Student Systems to finalise proposed wording of the changes.

8. Dual, Double and Multiple Awards Policy

Ms Theresa Sheppard presented the paper. The Committee reviewed the Dual, Double and Multiple Awards Policy, noting that, while there should continue to be scope for the University to enter into a dual award arrangement where there are no alternative options, dual/double/multiple awards were not the preferred option when entering into collaborative agreements with other institutions, and CSPC should continue to have oversight of all proposals at an early stage. The Committee therefore agreed that the Policy should remain unchanged.

9. Postgraduate Taught Assessment and Progression

Dr Bunni presented the results of the consultation undertaken by Academic Services regarding the proposal to remove the Postgraduate Taught progression hurdle and adjust the awarding criteria for Master’s level degrees.

The consultation had not yielded a clear consensus in favour of this proposal, with colleagues raising significant concerns regarding the impact upon supervisors of supporting students whose performance in the taught component had been weaker, and the risk to students of undertaking research for which they may not be adequately prepared. The Committee agreed that the current arrangements with regard to progression and award criteria should remain unchanged.

However, the Committee agreed that it would be desirable for the University to return to the issue in the future as part of discussions relating to curriculum reform, which should include PGT provision in their scope. The Committee also registered its concern that students would be charged fees for elements of the programme which they were being prevented from undertaking. The Committee therefore agreed that the Convener would submit a paper to Fees Strategy Group on the issue of partial refunds of fees for full-time students who did not progress to the dissertation stage of the programme.

Action: Academic Services to draft a paper to Fees Strategy Group, for approval by the Convener.

10. Taught Assessment Regulations 2019/20 – Tier-4 Students

Ms Lisa Dawson presented the paper. The Committee approved the proposed changes to the sections of the Taught Assessment Regulations relating to re-sit attempts for Tier-4 students.

The Committee noted that clarification would be provided on the status of null-sits in relation to re-assessment and commented that the guidance accompanying the regulation would need some modification in relation to the role of the Board of Examiners.

Action: Director of Student Systems and Administration to raise requested changes to accompanying guidance with Student Immigration Service.

11. Draft Taught Assessment Regulations 2019/20

The Committee approved the draft Taught Assessment Regulations for the academic year 2019/20, noting the following:

- Regulation 27.9 (null sits) – it would be useful to review the operation of the regulation, should the decision to allow students to retain the highest mark achieved following a null sit lead to any undesirable results regarding students' attitude towards assessment.
- Regulation 64 (Boards of Examiners reconvening) –future changes to the Special Circumstances process are likely to involve late submission of Special Circumstances being passed to a dedicated central team, rather than the Board of Examiners. This regulation will need to be reviewed when the new process is due to come into effect.

Action: Academic Services to finalise and publish the revised regulations.

12. Draft Postgraduate Assessment Regulations for Research Degrees 2019/20

The Committee approved the draft Assessment Regulations for Research Degrees for the academic year 2019/20.

Action: Academic Services to finalise and publish the revised regulations.

13. Student Discipline Committee Membership 2019/20

The Committee approved new staff and student members of the Student Discipline Committee from 1 August 2019.

14. Student Appeal Committee and Student Fitness to Practise Appeal Committee 2019/20

The Committee requested that the proposed membership receive College approval before being submitted to CSPC, and agreed to consider proposals electronically once this approval had been obtained.

Action: Academic Services to circulate the membership to Colleges and seek approval from CSPC via electronic business.

15. Jointly delivered PhDs with European partners – public defence

The Committee noted the paper, which summarised the agreed position on assessment for these proposed collaborations.

16. Senate Themes for 2019/20 Meetings

The Committee noted the following possible themes for the Presentation and Discussion section of Senate in 2019/20

- Support for BME students
- A report on the Student Experience Action Plan
- Student and Staff Wellbeing

<p>Action: Academic Services to pass the proposed themes to the Principal for consideration.</p>

17. Performance Sport Policy

The Committee approved the proposals to consult colleges and other key stakeholders to produce accompanying guidance and examples of the application of the Policy.

18. Knowledge Strategy Committee meeting 22 March 2019

The Committee noted the report of the Knowledge Strategy Committee on its meeting on 22 March 2019.

19. Any Other Business

The Convener thanked Professor Graeme Reid for his work on CSPC over a number of years.

The Convener also thanked Diva Mukherji and Theresa Sheppard for their contributions to CSPC over the past year.

Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee

19 September 2019

Curriculum approval arrangements for Edinburgh Futures Institute (EFI)

Description of paper

1. The EFI education vision is to offer courses and programmes different from those currently offered by the University. While some models for interdisciplinary education already exist, EFI's programmes (e.g. the planned PGT 'pathway' programmes) will involve substantially more Schools than any current offerings, and will also be distinctive in the extent of interdisciplinarity at course level. The EFI education vision is also distinctive in its emphasis on challenge-led, data-focused, and externally-engaged approaches.
2. This paper sets out collective approval processes for the EFI UG and PG educational portfolio, proposing the establishment of an EFI Curriculum Oversight Board, which would:
 - Move beyond current approval processes, which are built on a mono-disciplinary model of ownership which hinders the building of connections and shared ownership across Schools and disciplines;
 - Ensure the EFI educational portfolio is aligned with the broader EFI education vision;
 - Give Schools a strong stake in these approval processes, and a genuine sense of confidence in the quality of the EFI offer; and
 - Enable the University to test approaches which may assist it to deliver its long term aims and aspirations for learning and teaching.
3. We propose that these arrangements would be **interim until the end of 2021-22**, by which time the initial EFI UG and PGT portfolio will have secured approval and EFI's ongoing management and operational structures will be in place. At that point, EFI would work with the relevant Schools and Colleges to consider the appropriate curriculum approval frameworks for the longer-term. In practice, this means that these arrangements are likely to apply to a small number of validation events (e.g. one for the planned suite of PGT 'pathway' programmes and their core courses, and one for the planned UG programmes), combined with some lighter-touch activities to review other courses.
4. The proposals apply to the academic contributions of Schools in CAHSS (the majority of the Schools contributing to the first wave of EFI courses and programmes). Following discussion with the Head of CAHSS, the CAHSS Head of Academic and Student Administration, and the CAHSS Deans of Undergraduate and Postgraduate Studies (as well as the many broader discussions which have taken place between the EFI leadership team and Heads of Schools over recent years about the academic vision for EFI), the CAHSS

Planning and Resources Committee has confirmed its support for these proposals.

5. We anticipate that Schools from the College of Science and Engineering and the will also contribute to these EFI courses and programmes, and we are also in discussion with the College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine about potential contributions. Once the nature of their contribution is clearer, we will discuss with them how to approach curriculum approval processes for their contributions.

Action requested / recommendation

6. Under the University's Terms of Reference for Boards of Studies, the Committee is required to approve the establishment of Boards of Studies that operate at College or University level (rather than normal School level arrangements). The Committee is therefore invited to **approve** the establishment of the EFI Curriculum Oversight Board, on the basis set out in this paper.

Background and context

7. The University has established a new institute – the Edinburgh Futures Institute (EFI) – which will:
 - Provide a rich student experience that combines research, creative thinking, challenge-led approaches and data fluency;
 - Develop cutting edge digital and data education programmes;
 - Create an environment and community for cross-disciplinary working;
 - Partner with external organisations to help solve their challenges; and
 - Provide space in the Old Royal Infirmary building for teaching, co-working, key partners, events, and incubation.
8. The EFI educational vision is to be: interdisciplinary; challenge led; online/offline; data focused; future facing; critical; and engaged (with industry, community, government).
9. While located within CAHSS in governance terms, EFI will work with Schools across the University to deliver its educational vision.
10. EFI is planning:
 - A range of new interdisciplinary postgraduate taught programmes (first two scheduled to launch in 2019-20 and 2020-21, lots more – including a suite of 'pathway' programmes from 2021-22) – aiming for 200+ entrants by 2021-22, rising substantially over subsequent years;
 - New undergraduate provision from 2022-23;

- PhD students - aiming for c. 15 per year (we already have some scholarships); and
- In due course, CPD, Executive Education and other types of education provision

11. We anticipate that, while all the teaching for EFI programmes and courses will be delivered by academic staff in Schools (and therefore the teaching load will be attributed to Schools), EFI will have formal administrative responsibility (sometimes referred to as administrative 'ownership') for most of the programmes and some of the courses within the EFI portfolio. This is likely to be the most effective way to facilitate EFI's vision and to provide meaningful identity, community and support for the students, particularly for the highly interdisciplinary programmes and core courses involving input from multiple Schools. We are in discussions with key stakeholders (eg Student Systems, Governance and Strategic Planning) about the practical implications of this approach, and the related issue of how to deliver support services (eg 'teaching office' functions) for EFI programmes and courses.

Discussion

Objectives of the planned arrangements

12. Developing, approving and delivering interdisciplinary provision within conventional School structures involves multiple School Boards of Studies considering proposals in parallel. Such an approach has always proved cumbersome for more conventional interdisciplinary offerings, and will not be feasible for the timely development and approval of the radically-interdisciplinary EFI portfolio. The proposed EFI Curriculum Oversight Board would provide **an efficient framework for approving the programmes and courses that EFI has formal administrative responsibility for**, while ensuring all the Schools contributing teaching are engaged in, and feel ownership of, the approval process.
13. While EFI is likely to have formal administrative responsibility for most of the programmes and some of the courses within the EFI portfolio, it is also possible in some cases that individual Schools will have formal administrative responsibility (for example where courses have a predominantly mono-disciplinary focus, and for those programmes which – while interdisciplinary in approach – only involve two Schools). It is important that **any programmes administered by Schools nonetheless align sufficiently with EFI's educational vision**. The EFI Oversight Board would be able to ensure this by fulfilling the level 2 scrutiny role for programmes (a role normally undertaken by the relevant College committee).
14. Committees and Boards responsible for considering proposals for courses and programmes need to **combine an understanding of the strategic, disciplinary, pedagogical, resourcing and administrative context with sufficient externality to allow them to scrutinise the proposals**. The proposed EFI Curriculum Oversight Board membership would have an

appropriate balance between these different objectives, by including key academic and professional services staff leading the development of the EFI portfolio, as well as key School and College staff who would normally have roles in scrutinising course and programme proposals, and some externality to the University.

15. While the Curriculum Oversight Board would streamline the formal stage of curriculum approval, it would be **the final stage of an extensive process of dialogue with Schools regarding the disciplinary and management / resourcing aspects of the proposals**. This would include discussions led by academic staff seconded to develop the courses and programmes, dialogue between the EFI Director of Education and School management, and discussions at College Undergraduate and Postgraduate Studies Committees (on which all Schools are represented). Once we have produced fully-developed course and programme proposals, we would also encourage Schools to discuss with the relevant academic communities (e.g. via their Boards of Studies) and management the elements that they would have responsibility for delivering, so that their Conveners of Boards of Studies can represent their views at the EFI Curriculum Approval Board meeting. In addition, where a School has formal administrative responsibility for a course, their Board of Studies would continue to have responsibility for scrutinising and approving that course.
16. The EFI vision is to create innovative educational provision. Having a single Board for considering proposals for EFI courses and programmes creates the opportunity to develop in the Board members a common understanding of EFI's vision and of the **appropriate levels of risk-taking and creativity** for the EFI portfolio.

Proposed membership, remit and operation of EFI Curriculum Oversight Board

Membership

17. Core (expected to attend):

- CAHSS Dean of Quality Assurance and Curriculum Approval (due in post January 2020) (Convenor)
- EFI Director (Education), Prof Sian Bayne
- EFI Undergraduate Education Lead, Dr Sabine Rolle
- CAHSS Finance and Planning representative
- One student member nominated by the Students' Association (ideally a student with a particular interest in the EFI vision)
- One academic representative external to the University (e.g. an External Examiner with expertise in interdisciplinary education)
- A member with an industry or community focus (if we can identify a suitable person able to comment on all the portfolio)

18. Crucially, the board would include 'supplementary' members where the Board is considering a proposal that they or their School has a stake in:

- The Convener(s) of the Boards of Studies for the Schools that have lead responsibility for or are contributing to the delivery of proposed EFI courses and programmes would attend as full members and represent their Schools' views (taking account of their Schools' prior academic and management discussions on the proposals); and
- The UG and PGT academic secondees (EFI Fellows) would also attend (though not as formal members), if the EFI Board is considering proposals for courses or proposals that they have developed.

Remit

19. The Board will decide whether to approve all new programmes within the EFI portfolio (whether formally administered by EFI or not), all new courses administered by EFI, along with changes to these programmes and courses, with reference to:

- Whether the proposals align with the vision for EFI's portfolio; and
- The University's Policy on Programme and Course Approval and Management

www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/prog_course_approval.pdf

20. In addition, for the programmes and courses that EFI administers, the Board will fulfil functions that the University normally requires School Boards of Studies to undertake (for example, overseeing the production of programme handbooks).

Levels of approval

21. When EFI plans to hold overall administrative responsibility for a course or programme, the EFI Curriculum Oversight Board would fulfil both the level 1 and level 2 review functions (the former of which is normally undertaken at School level, the latter normally at College). The breadth of membership, including externality, would allow it to fulfil both these functions.

22. Where – likely to be in limited cases – an individual School plans to have formal administrative responsibility for a programme, the relevant Schools' Board of Studies (and management team, for the business case) would fulfil the level 1 function, and the EFI Board would fulfil the level 2 function.

23. When an individual School plans to have formal administrative responsibility for a course, normal arrangements would apply - the relevant Schools' Board of Studies would fulfil the level 1 function, following consultation with any other Schools inputting to the course.

Responsibility for reviewing business cases

24. For programmes that are the administrative responsibility of EFI, the EFI Curriculum Oversight Board would review the overall business case information when considering proposals (with CAHSS Management inputting through CAHSS

Finance and Planning membership of the Board). In the limited number of cases where an individual School has administrative responsibility, the relevant School would be responsible for reviewing the relevant case through its normal management structures.

25. The CAHSS Finance and Planning team would also need to sign off proposals for tuition fees before seeking Fee Strategy Group approval.

Mode of operation

26. The EFI Board would operate in a Committee format, and via one-off validation events as appropriate. It is likely that the Board would operate in a 'validation event' format when considering proposals for the PGT 'pathway' programmes (proposals expected in Spring 2020), and the proposals for UG programmes (proposals expected in Autumn 2020) since this would create a more open and creative format for exploring a large number of inter-related proposals.

27. In order to be quorate, the Board would require the Convener, the Director of Education, and at least two Conveners of Schools Boards of Studies to participate.

Resource implications

28. The EFI Project Management Office will work with the EFI academic leadership to support the curriculum development process. The CAHSS College Office will support the operation of the Board, including providing a secretary to the Board.
29. The successful delivery of the EFI portfolio will rely on Schools being able to deliver the necessary teaching input, and we will work with Schools to identify and explore solutions to any resourcing issues. While these approval processes will not in themselves solve those issues, they will ensure that programmes and courses are not launched until solutions are in place.

Risk management

30. The proposed arrangements will assist EFI to deliver its educational portfolio on schedule, while ensuring that the programmes and courses are of a high quality.

Equality & diversity

31. The Board will operate according to the University's Policy on Programme and Course Approval and Management which sets out how Boards of Studies take account of equality and diversity issues when considering curriculum proposals.

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

32. EFI will take responsibility for communicating with Schools and Colleges regarding the implementation of these arrangements. These arrangements would

be interim until the end of 2021-22, and EFI would evaluate the effectiveness of them at that stage.

Author

Professor Sian Bayne (Director of Education, Edinburgh Futures Institute)
Tom Ward (Head of Education Administration and Change Management, Edinburgh Futures Institute)

Presenter

Tom Ward (Head of Education Administration and Change Management, Edinburgh Futures Institute)

4 September 2019

Freedom of Information

33. This paper is Open

Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee

Thursday 19 September 2019

**Special Circumstances & Coursework Extensions Project- Extensions Policy
Changes for 2020/21**

Description of paper

This paper consists of proposed changes to the Taught Assessment Regulations on Late Submission of Coursework, with edits and comments for review and approval.

Action requested / recommendation

1. For approval – Committee members are asked to approve this first draft revision of the TAR for 20/21, section 28 on Late Submission of Coursework.

Background and context

2. The Special Circumstances & Coursework Extensions project is part of the 'Student Administration & Support' sub-strand of the Service Excellence Programme. This project is to set up a new simple online application system to ensure an easier and more transparent process. There will be a dedicated team within Student Systems to receive and process applications for coursework extensions, special circumstances and learning adjustments. The team will make decisions on applications' validity and evidence requirements, with outcome decisions remaining in Schools.

The team and Schools will be supported by a new decision support framework, providing a clear and consistent process for both students and staff, with guidance for submitting applications.

A communications pack on the project is available to view here for APRC members, including a workflow for staff and students:

https://uoe.sharepoint.com/sites/SpecialCircumstancesandCourseworkExtensions/APRC_documents

Discussion

3. Please see the attached appendix of the changes to the Taught Assessment Regulations for 2020/21 in order for the system and service to go live from July 2020. Key changes to existing regulations are as follows:
 - Decisions on validity of applications will no longer be made in Schools & Deaneries
 - Students no longer need to provide evidence for coursework extension applications
 - The Student Support Operations team are responsible for keeping records on decisions
 - Learning Adjustment applications will be processed through the system

4. Special Circumstances & Coursework Extensions:

The information below is to provide APRC with an overview of the project, with more detailed information on the link above. It shows what work has taken place, major decisions and agreements by the user group and decision group, and future work to be done, including considerations to be made by APRC.

Special Circumstances & Coursework Extensions (SCEC)

<p>Assessment Support: Activity is underway to create a new dedicated professional service in the University, providing students with a single point of access system for applying for coursework extensions and special circumstances (Assessment Support, decided in a student poll). Eligibility, evidence review and validity will be performed by a dedicated service in Student Systems and Administration, with support and academic outcome decisions remaining in Schools.</p>		
<p>Learning Adjustments: Creation of new workflow for students to apply existing LA's to coursework</p>	<p>Coursework Extensions: Creation of a new system and service with responsibility for managing requests for coursework extensions</p>	<p>Special Circumstances: Creation of a new system and service with responsibility for managing requests for special circumstances</p>
<p>What is confirmed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students will notify use of agreed adjustments to individual assessments through the system • Students will not need to use the coursework extension process to have these adjustments applied <p>What has still to be decided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who in Schools needs to be told when a student informs use of their learning adjustment • How we make it visible for those who need to know 	<p>What is confirmed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extension confirmation sits within the new Service based in Student Systems & Administration • Students will apply for extensions through the secure system • Coursework extensions will be granted subject to validity confirmation for up to seven days and self-certified • Schools can set assessments to be inapplicable for extensions e.g. short Physics set questions • Schools can identify set times e.g. 3 day extension only, though APT • Extension requests for longer than 7 days will go to an expedited Special Circumstances process <p>What has still to be decided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School data of course structures & deadlines into APT, and how this is managed • Extensions on group work • What number of extension applications triggers an escalation to Schools? 	<p>What is confirmed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students will use the system to apply for Special Circumstances • The team is based in Student Systems & Administration • The team will assess the completeness and validity of each application, liaising with the student through the secure system • Specific roles in Schools will have access to the online system • Valid applications will be sent to Schools for outcome consideration • Non-valid applications will be brought to the attention of School roles • Schools will use the system to record decisions on outcomes, which will feed back to the student • A framework will underpin policy to provide guidance on outcomes <p>What has still to be decided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How the framework will look • Deadlines for pending evidence • How to deal with late & retrospective applications • How are student outcome preferences worded • How to expedite SC's on late penalties and emergency cases

Resource implications

5. Resource Implications are being managed through ongoing people & change work sitting within the SEP Programme. Cost of the dedicated team in Student Administration & Systems is owned by Lisa Dawson. There will be an overall reduction of staff time in Schools spent on the transactional parts of these processes.

Risk management

6. The project has a comprehensive risk log managed by the Project Manager, and reported to the Project Sponsor and SA&S Programme. It has already been accepted that the validity decisions do not need to be made by academics. Risks for APRC to consider are as follows:
 - The academic framework underpinning policy is not accepted by or used in Schools
 - A potential increase in applications across both extensions and Special Circumstances

Equality & diversity

7. An Equality Impact assessment has taken place conducted by the project team, with ongoing work throughout the project lifecycle to 'go live'. The aim of the new system is to make the process more accessible and less onerous for all students, including those with protected characteristics.
 - The introduction of a consistent framework may reduce the chance of decisions being made on the basis of any unconscious bias and ensure a more consistent student experience
 - There is the potential for the system to improve the implementation of reasonable adjustment for students and therefore reduce the chance of any disadvantage. It may also help with the monitoring of this and help guide future decisions

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

8. APRC to inform Project decision, which is fed back to project team. Initially to be communicated through Service Excellence Programme communications channels, and subsequently through Academic Services changes to policy channels. The project will be implemented in the 20/21 academic year, and reports back to APRC, the SEP board and Deputy Secretary of University are expected.

Author

*Sarah McAllister, Shirley McCulloch,
Rebecca Shade*

Presenter

*Sarah McAllister, incoming Head of
Student Support Operations*

27 August 2019

Freedom of Information

Open

Taught Assessment Regulations Academic Year 2020/21

Regulation 28 Late submission of coursework

Students need to submit assessed coursework (including research projects and dissertations) by the published deadline. Where the student **meets the criteria** for late submission, **the Student Support Operations service, (informed by information provided by Schools via course details)** will consider accepting late submission of up to seven calendar days without **applying a** penalty.

Application of the regulation

28.1 If assessed coursework is submitted late without an agreed extension to the deadline for an accepted good reason, it will be recorded as late and a penalty will be **applied by the School**. For coursework that is a substantial component of the course and where the submission deadline is more than two weeks after the issue of the work to be assessed, that penalty is a reduction of the mark by 5% of the maximum obtainable mark per calendar day (e.g. a mark of 65% on the common marking scale would be reduced to 60% up to 24 hours later). This applies for up to seven calendar days (or to the time when feedback is given, if this is sooner), after which a mark of zero will be given. The original unreduced mark will be recorded by the School and the student informed of it.

28.2 Schools may choose not to permit the submission of late work for particular components of assessment where the specific assessment and feedback arrangements make it impractical or unfair to other students to do so. **This will be entered onto the academic framework of the Assessment Progression Tool by Schools. This entails (a) whether an extension can be permitted on the assessment or not, (b) the assessment deadline date and time, and (c) whether the extension period will be less than 7 calendar days.** If Schools do not permit the submission of late work for particular components of assessment, they must publicise this to students on the relevant course.

28.3 Where Schools accept late submissions of coursework, they will consider cases for accepting late submissions up to a maximum of seven calendar days without **applying a** penalty. This will be in addition to any extensions offered in line with a student's Schedule of Adjustments. Students are responsible for submitting their **requests cases and supporting evidence** in advance of the published deadline for the coursework, using the **Assessment Support online system managed by the Student Support Operations team. Within this team, processing of applications will be prioritised according to coursework deadline dates and times. A maximum turnaround time for applications will be set to 2 working days.**

28.4 ~~The Course Organiser, Programme Director, or equivalent member of academic or professional services staff assigned this responsibility by the School,~~ **The Student Support Operations team** decides whether the student has provided good reason ~~and sufficient supporting evidence~~ to justify an extension, and, if so, determines the length of extension to grant up to a maximum of seven calendar days **within the academic framework provided on the Assessment Progression Tool.**

28.5 ~~The requirement for evidence should be proportionate to the weighting of the component of assessment and the length of extension sought, and should also take into account the student's ability to obtain documentary evidence.~~ Self-certification will provide sufficient evidence in ~~some~~ **all**

circumstances. ~~The School~~ **Student Support Operations team are** responsible for ensuring a record is kept of the decision and the information which substantiates the reason for late acceptance.

28.6 **Accepted Good** reasons for coursework extensions are unexpected short-term circumstances which are exceptional for the individual student, beyond that student's control, and which could reasonably be expected to have had an adverse impact on the student's ability to complete the assessment on time. **Accepted Good** reasons may include:

- Recent short-term physical illness or injury;
- Recent short-term mental ill-health;
- A long-term or chronic physical health condition, which has recently worsened temporarily or permanently;
- A long-term or chronic mental health condition, which has recently worsened temporarily or permanently;
- The recent bereavement or serious illness of a person with whom the student has a close relationship;
- The recent breakdown in a long-term relationship, such as a marriage;
- Emergencies involving dependents;
- Job or internship interview at short notice that requires significant time, e.g. due to travel;
- Victim of a crime which is likely to have significant emotional impact;
- Military conflict, natural disaster, or extreme weather conditions;
- Experience of sexual harassment or assault;
- Experience of other forms of harassment;
- Exceptional and significant change in employment commitments, where this is beyond the student's control;
- Exceptional (i.e. non-routine) caring responsibilities.

28.7 In addition to these unexpected circumstances, ~~Schools~~ **the Student Support Operations team** will also consider requests for coursework extensions in relation to:

- A student's disability where the student's Schedule of Adjustments includes relevant provisions, **giving them access to a process enabling them to use their adjustments efficiently on the system. This will notify Schools for cascade.**
- Representation in performance sport at an international or national championship level, in line with the University's Performance Sport Policy:
www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/performance_sport_policy.pdf

28.8 The following are examples of circumstances which would not be considered **accepted good** reasons for coursework extensions:

- A long-term or chronic health condition (including mental ill-health or similar ill-health) which has not worsened recently or for which the University has already made a reasonable adjustment;
- A minor short-term illness or injury (e.g. a common cold), which would not reasonably have had a significant adverse impact on the student's ability to complete the assessment on time;
- Occasional low mood, stress or anxiety;
- Circumstances which were foreseeable or preventable;
- Holidays;
- Pressure of academic work (unless this contributes to ill-health);
- Poor time-management;
- Proximity to other assessments;
- Lack of awareness of dates or times of assessment submission;
- Failure, loss or theft of data, a computer or other equipment;
- Commitments to paid or voluntary employment.

28.9 Where a student has **accepted good** reason for requiring a coursework extension of more than seven calendar days, the student should submit the coursework when able to do so and apply via the Special Circumstances process **through the Assessment Support System** for the Board of Examiners to disregard the penalty for late submission.

Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee (APRC)

19 September 2019

APRC Membership and Terms of Reference 2019/20

Description of paper

1. Membership of the Committee and Terms of Reference 2019/20

Action requested / recommendation

2. For information

Background and context

3. Routine annual paper detailing membership of the Committee and Terms of Reference.

Discussion

4.

Name	Position/School	Composition	Term of Office
Professor Alan Murray	Assistant Principal, Academic Support	Convener	Ex Officio
Dr Jeremy Crang	Dean of Students (CAHSS)	Vice-Convener and College representative	
Dr Paul Norris	Associate Dean (Academic Progress), CAHSS	College representative	
Dr Lisa Kendall	Head of Academic and Student Administration (CAHSS)	College representative	
Kirsty Woomble	Head of PGR Student Office (CAHSS)	College representative (PGR)	
Professor Judy Hardy	Dean of Learning and Teaching (CSE)	College representative	
Stephen Warrington	Dean of Student Experience (CSE)	College representative	
Claire Vallance	Head of Academic Affairs (CSE)	College representative	
Dr Antony Maciocia	Dean of Postgraduate Research (CSE)	College representative (PGR)	
Philippa Burrell	Head of Academic Administration (CMVM)	College representative	

Name	Position/School	Composition	Term of Office
Professor Neil Turner	Dean of Undergraduate Learning and Teaching (CMVM)	College representative	
Dr Geoff Pearson	Dean of Students (CMVM)	College representative	
Dr Paddy Hadoke	Director of Postgraduate Research and Early Career Research Experience	College representative (PGR)	
Stephanie Vallancey	Vice President Education, Students' Association	Students' Association sabbatical officer	Ex Officio
Gemma Riddell	Advice Place Senior Academic Adviser, Students' Association	Students' Association	
Dr Rayya Ghul	Institute for Academic Development (IAD)	IAD	
Dr Adam Bunni	Head of Governance and Regulatory Framework Team	Academic Services	
Sarah McAllister	Student Systems and Administration	Student Systems and Administration	Ex Officio
Anne-Marie Scott	IS Learning, Teaching and Web	IS Learning, Teaching and Web Services	1 August 2017 - 31 July 2020

5. See Appendix 1 for Committee Terms of Reference. These are technically draft until reviewed and approved by e-Senate in September 2019.

Resource implications

6. There are resource implications with regard to attendance at meetings and any required follow-up

Risk management

7. No key risks

Equality & diversity

8. No major equality impacts

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

9. Terms of Reference and Committee membership list available at www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/committees

Author

Ailsa Taylor, Academic Services

5 September 2019

Freedom of Information
Open

The University of Edinburgh

Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee Terms of Reference

1. Purpose and Role

- 1.1. The Academic Policy and Regulations Committee is responsible, on behalf of Senate, for the University's framework of academic policy and regulation, apart from those aspects which are primarily parts of the Quality Assurance Framework.

2. Remit

- 2.1. Oversee the development, maintenance and implementation of an academic regulatory framework which effectively supports and underpins the University's educational activities.
- 2.2. Ensure that the academic regulatory framework continues to evolve in order to meet organisational needs and is responsive to changes in University strategy, and in the internal and external environments.
- 2.3. Scrutinise and approve proposals for new or revised academic policy or regulation, ensuring that policy and regulation is only introduced where it is necessary, and that all policy and regulation is suitably accessible to its intended audience.
- 2.4. Act with delegated authority from the Senate on matters of student conduct and discipline.
- 2.5. In taking forward its remit, the Committee will seek consistency and common approaches while supporting and encouraging variation where this is beneficial, particularly if it is in the best interests of students.
- 2.6. Consider the implications of the Committee's work and its decisions in the context of external initiatives and compliance and legal frameworks, particularly in relation to equality and diversity.

3. Operation

- 3.1. The Committee reports to Senate, acting with delegated authority to take decisions regarding the regulatory framework for the University's educational activities.
- 3.2. The Committee may bring matters to the attention of the University Executive as required.
- 3.3. The Committee will meet at least four times each academic year and will interact electronically, as necessary.
- 3.4. The Committee will follow a schedule of business set prior to the start of the academic year and which is agreed through consultation with Senate, the Conveners of the other Senate Committees, and other relevant members of the community.
- 3.5. The Convener, or Vice-Convener will have delegated authority, on behalf of the Committee, to make decisions on student concession cases, and this business may be conducted electronically where appropriate.
- 3.6. From time to time, the Committee will establish working groups or commission individuals to carry out detailed work under the Committee's oversight.

4. Composition

Role	Term
Assistant Principal, Academic Support (Convener)	Ex Officio
3 x senior staff members from each College with responsibility for academic governance and regulation, and maintaining and enhancing the quality of the student experience at all levels	
1 x senior staff member from each College with responsibility for postgraduate research	
1 x Edinburgh University Students' Association sabbatical officer	Ex Officio
1 x member of the Edinburgh University Students' Association permanent staff	
1 x member of staff from Student Systems and Administration	Ex Officio
1 x member of staff from the Institute for Academic development	
1 x member of staff from Academic Services	
1 x member of staff from Information Services' Learning, Teaching and Web Services Division	
Up to 3 co-options chosen by the Convener	Up to 3 years

- 4.1. Before the first meeting of the academic year, the Committee will identify a Vice-Convener for the Committee from amongst its membership. The Vice-Convener should serve for a period of at least one year.
- 4.2. The Convener can invite individuals for specific meetings or agenda items.
- 4.3. Substitutions of members (i.e. due to inability to attend) will be at the discretion of the Convener of the Committee.

5. Responsibilities and Expectations of Committee Members

- 5.1. Be collegial and constructive in approach.
- 5.2. Attend regularly and participate fully in the work of the Committee and its task / working groups. This will involve looking ahead and consulting / gathering input in order to provide the broad spectrum of thoughts and opinions which are necessary for proper consideration of the area being discussed.
- 5.3. Take collective and individual ownership for the issues under the Committee's remit and for the discussion and resolution of these issues. In taking ownership of the work of the Committee, members must take steps to ensure that they are empowered to take decisions on behalf of academic and managerial colleagues.
- 5.4. Be committed to communicating the work of the Committee to the wider University community.

August 2019

KNOWLEDGE STRATEGY COMMITTEE REPORT

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.