The University of Edinburgh
Senate Quality Assurance Committee

**Meeting to be held on Thursday 20 May 2021 at 10am
via Microsoft Teams**

A G E N D A

1.	**Welcome and Apologies**	
2.	**Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 22 April 2021**	SQAC 20/21 5A
3.	**Matters Arising**	
	For Discussion	
4.	**Curriculum Transformation**	Verbal
5.	**Student Voice Policy**	SQAC 20/21 5B
6.	**Student-Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC):** – Guidance Update	SQAC 20/21 5C
7.	**Annual Monitoring and Internal Periodic Review Themes 2019/20:** – University Level Actions Update	SQAC 20/21 5D
8.	**Thematic Review:** – Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) Students 2018-19 Progress Update	SQAC 20/21 5E
9.	**Scotland's Rural College (SRUC) Accreditation Committee:** – Annual Report 2019/20	SQAC 20/21 5F
10.	**Operation of Senate Standing Committees:** – Annual Report of the Senate Standing Committees – Themes for 2020/21 Senate Meetings – Annual Review of Effectiveness of Senate Standing Committees	SQAC 20/21 5G SQAC 20/21 5H SQAC 20/21 5I
	For Information and Formal Business	
11.	Any other business	
12.	Provisional meeting dates 2021-22 (all meetings take place between 2-4pm, via MS Teams): – **Thursday 16 September 2021** – **Thursday 9 December 2021** – **Thursday 24 February 2022** – **Thursday 28 April 2022** – **Thursday 19 May 2022**	

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

**Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 22 April 2021
at 2pm via Microsoft Teams**

Present:

Professor Tina Harrison **(Convener)**	Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance
Brian Connolly	Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services
Dr Gail Duursma	School Representative (Engineering), College of Science and Engineering
Olivia Eadie	Assistant Director and Head of Operations and Projects, Institute for Academic Development
Dr Jeni Harden	School Representative (School of Molecular, Genetic and Population Health Sciences), College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine
Dr Katherine Inglis	School Representative (Literatures, Languages and Cultures), College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences
Fizzy Abou Jawad	Vice President (Education), Students' Association
Nichola Kett	Head of Quality Assurance and Enhancement Team, Academic Services
Professor Linda Kirstein	Dean of Education Quality Assurance and Culture, College of Science and Engineering
Stuart Lamot	Edinburgh University Students' Association Representative
Dr Paul Norris	Dean of Quality Assurance and Curriculum Approval, College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences
Dr Claire Phillips	Dean of Quality Assurance, College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine
Professor Leigh Sparks	Deputy Principal, University of Stirling
Paula Webster	Head of Student Analytics, Insights and Modelling, Student Systems and Administration

In Attendance:

Hannah Melville	Senior Analyst, Insights and Modelling, Student Systems and Administration

1. **Welcome and Apologies**

2. **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 25 February 2021**

   The Committee approved the minutes of the previous meeting.

3. **Matters Arising**

   There were no matters arising.

4. **Convenor's Communication**

   4.1 Enhancement Led Institutional Review

   The Convenor updated the Committee on the recent Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR). The University was judged to have "effective arrangements for managing academic standards and the student learning experience", a positive judgement and the best possible outcome for an ELIR.

   The review team commended the University for: commitment to working in close partnership with students; the work of the Institute for Academic Development (IAD) in supporting staff development and sharing good practice; the development and expansion of Peer Support/Peer-Assisted Learning Schemes; support for student involvement in Internal Periodic Reviews. The review team identified a number of areas for further development, the majority of which the University is already working towards. There are two areas in particular where the University has been asked to make significant progress over the course of the next academic year: personal tutoring/student support and assessment and feedback.

   It was noted that the Convenor had produced a Teaching Matters Blog on the outcome of the ELIR and the final report will be published by the middle of July (and then circulated widely). The University is required to take action on the areas for further development and to report on this to the Quality Assurance Agency Scotland (who run the ELIR process) one year after the publication of the report. The Committee will consider how to oversee the response to the recommendations and how this can be aligned with existing areas of work.

   4.2 Scotland's Rural College

   The Convenor reported that the annual meeting of Scotland's Rural College (SRUC) Accreditation Committee had been held on Wednesday 21 April 2021. It was noted that the Accreditation Committee had affirmed continued accreditation of SRUC programme, 'Environmental Resource Management (BSc)'. A full report will be submitted to the Committee at the next meeting in May.

   4.3 Academic Integrity Charter

   The Convenor reported that the University had signed up to the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) Academic Integrity Charter for UK Higher Education

For Discussion

5. **Data Monitoring**

The Convenor noted that one of the Committee's current priorities is to examine data and methodological options for the systematic monitoring of retention, progression, and attainment data.

The Committee noted that this work was prioritised in response to the 2017-18 Thematic Review of support for Mature Students and Student Parents and Carers and the 2018-19 Thematic Review considering black and minority ethnic (BME) students' experiences of support at the University which recommended that the Committee implement systematic monitoring of retention, progression, and attainment data.

Both reviews had stressed the importance of using data to understand the extent to which student needs have been supported by the University particularly in regard to the 'distance travelled' by these groups of students and the 'value added' by the University. The review panels were also in agreement that the University had a duty of care to support all of its students and provide them with an equal opportunity to succeed at their studies.

Members welcomed a more systematic approach to monitoring student data but noted concerns that staff confidence in centrally held data would need to be nurtured, particularly through greater clarity when using data snapshots, more data granularity and appreciation of local contexts.

5.1 Data Task Group

The Committee received an update from the Group tasked to examine data and methodological options for the systematic monitoring of retention, progression, and attainment data. It was noted that due to the pandemic the work of the Group had been progressed at a slower pace. This year the Group focused on the following action remitted to the Committee by the Online Remote Examinations and Assessment (OREA) working group report:

*   The outcome of future online assessments should be prospectively mapped to a variety of student characteristics, to understand whether there is any change in systematic advantage or disadvantage of particular student groups. This should be reported through standard data dashboards and Schools asked to reflect on the data and outcomes in annual QA reports.

It was noted that guidance on interrogating dashboards to explore this data is in preparation for this year's round of QA reporting. During the summer 2021 student interns will be recruited to examine the available data and identify possible gaps in relation to different student groups across the University. The Group will then explore options for enhancing and systematising the way the Committee oversees student data.

5.2 Data

The Committee considered a set of papers analysing data on student outcomes and progression for the year 2019/20. It was noted that whilst trends had been identified,

it was important to acknowledge that 2019/20 had been an exceptional year due to the ongoing pandemic and therefore trend data should be treated with caution.

The Committee considered the following papers:

- **Degrees Awarded Analysis** – an analysis of the proportion of first class and higher classification degrees awarded by the University in 2019/20. The awards were benchmarked against the Russell Group and attainment gaps between key student groups examined.

- **Differential Attainment Analysis** - a more detailed statistical analysis of undergraduate student attainment to supplement the Degrees Awarded Analysis paper.

- **Disability Attainment & Satisfaction Differences** - an analysis combining multiple data sources to look at the attainment and satisfaction gaps between disabled students and their non-disabled peers.

- **Course Marks Analysis** - an analysis of different demographic groups and the attainment differences between them.

- **Progression** - an analysis of the progression rate of 1st year undergraduate students undertaken to compare the favourable progression of different student groups.

The following was noted:

- **Degree Classification Outcomes**

  The Committee noted that nearly all Russell Group members had seen an increase in the proportion of first class degrees awarded and most had seen a smaller increase in the proportion of high classification degrees awarded. However, the increase in first class awards at Edinburgh was greater than the Russell Group average (13 percentage points between 2018/19 and 2019/20 compared with 8 percentage points) and placed Edinburgh in the top third of the Russell Group for firsts awarded this year (ranking the percentage of firsts awarded last year placed Edinburgh at 17th out of 24).

  The Committee was in agreement that due to the effects of pandemic the 2019/20 academic year should be regarded as a statistical outlier as trend data for the year would be difficult to interpret reliably. Therefore the Committee would not be in a position this year to reliably identify specific subject areas where patterns in degree classification outcomes diverged substantially from either the institution average or disciplinary comparators. However it was agreed that comparisons could be made between different student groups within the academic year 2019/20, particularly in relation to attainment gaps.

- **Ethnicity**

  The Committee noted that the black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) attainment gap for first class degrees had increased to -10.3 percentage

points and that Edinburgh had moved to just below the Russell Group average for this metric. Whilst the gap for achieving a high classification degree had narrowed at Edinburgh between 2018/19 and 2019/20 (from -6.6 percentage points to -4.5 percentage points) the gap for first class degrees had widened (from -6.2 percentage points to -10.3 percentage points). Comparing the attainment gap for firsts with the Russell Group average showed a year-on-year increase in the gap. This year the attainment gap at Edinburgh was slightly below the Russell Group average where in previous years it had trended above. Furthermore, in 2019/20 the uplift in the proportion of firsts was 12 percentage points for BAME students but 16 percentage points for White students. Concerns were also noted in relation to the attainment gap between Scottish domiciled students and students from the rest of the United Kingdom.

- **Disability**

  The Committee noted that disabled students are less likely to achieve a first or a higher classification degree than their peers with no known disabilities (39.8% of disabled students and 43.9% of students with no known disability achieved firsts in 2018/19). Furthermore, the attainment gap at Edinburgh is wider than the Russell Group average in 2019/20 (-3.5 percentage points) and has been for the last five years.

  The Committee also noted that undergraduate (UG) disabled students at the University have lower pass rates and course marks than their non-disabled peers. For all courses at the University the average pass rate attainment gap for UG disabled students has consistently been between 2% and 3.6% lower than their non-disabled peers. Furthermore, between 2015/16 and 2019/20, disabled students have seen lower levels of favourable progression than their non-disabled peers.

  The Committee noted that disabled students also show lower levels of satisfaction with their overall experience at the University as demonstrated in the in the National Student Survey (NSS) and in the monthly Pulse Survey. In the 2020 NSS, disabled students show lower levels of satisfaction than their non-disabled peers across all of the NSS main themes. In all of the main questions in the Pulse Survey relating to Teaching & Learning and Belonging, disabled students show lower levels of agreement than their non-disabled peers. Over the 4 months included in the Pulse Survey analysis, the percentage of disabled students who agreed they had access to the resources they needed, was on average 15.7% points lower than their non-disabled peers.

  The Committee agreed that more qualitative work was needed to understand the differential attainment gap for disabled students.

  Action: Head of Student Analytics, Insights and Modelling, Student Systems and Administration to submit a proposal for further qualitative analysis to the next meeting of the Committee.

  Concerns were raised that the category 'Disabled' may not be sufficiently granular to be helpful.

Action: Head of Student Analytics, Insights and Modelling, Student Systems and Administration to discuss data granularity with the Director of the Student Disability Service.

Action: Schools/Deaneries will be asked to reflect on student progression and outcomes data, and in particular the differences in attainment, during this year's cycle of annual quality assurance reporting.

The Committee commended Paula Webster and Hannah Melville for the quality of the student data papers.

6.   **Annual Monitoring**

6.1 Reporting Templates

The Committee discussed arrangements for this year's annual quality assurance reporting cycle. It was noted that the programme, School and College report templates had been updated to reflect the extension to the interim reporting process. The streamlined reporting template will be used again but Schools/Deaneries will be asked to complete all three questions this year (question 1 was optional for the 2019-20 reports). The reporting timeline will revert to the usual dates, with late August once again the key deadline date for school submissions.

The Committee agreed that Schools/Deaneries will be asked to reflect on student progression and outcomes (focussing on the difference in attainment of groups of students, rather than comparing against other years) and student feedback.

It was noted that at the conclusion of the extended interim reporting process, the Committee will take a decision on when and how to return to normal annual monitoring, review and reporting processes, including on any changes to the normal process. The recommendations from the Digital Maturity assessment and how the quality processes can support the Curriculum Transformation programme will be considered as part of changes.

The Committee approved minor changes to the annual monitoring, review and reporting templates for reporting on 2020/21 to reflect the decision to extend the interim reporting process.

Action: Student Systems to provide Directors of Quality with new guidance (by mid-June) on using data for annual reporting and update online data training videos.

6.2 University Level Actions

The Committee considered the responses to issues identified as areas for further development in School Annual Quality Reports 2019-20.

It was noted that at the December 2020 meeting the Committee had approved actions at University level and requested a response from each of the individuals and areas responsible. A report on these issues was also submitted to the February 2021 meeting of the University Executive.

Action: Committee members invited to send further comments on the responses to the Committee Secretary.

7. **External Examiner Reporting System (EERS):**
    Postgraduate Taught Reports - Thematic Analysis 2019/20

    The Committee considered an analysis of data from the External Examiner Reporting System (EERS) covering postgraduate taught programmes for the academic year 2019/20. The report included an analysis of External Examiners comments in relation to the Covid-19 pandemic.

    The report noted a high number of commendations across the University and a low number of issues that required attention. Of the commendations, it was noted that the main theme across all three Colleges was the assessment process and many of the commendations were course or programme specific. As in the previous year, the most often occurring type of commendation in this theme related to the range, quality and diversity of teaching, learning and assessment. Of the issues raised the main theme was the provision of information to examiners, with the most common issue raised related to receiving material in too short a time before the Board meeting.

8. **Senate Committee Planning: SQAC Priorities 2021-22**

    The Committee discussed the following set of priorities for the 2021-22 academic session:

    – Develop and oversee the implementation of a plan of action in response to the 2021 Enhancement Led Institutional Review (ELIR).
    – Implement the recommendations from the Digital Maturity report and consider how quality processes and the data that they produce can support the Curriculum Transformation programme.
    – Continue to examine data and methodological options for the systematic monitoring of retention, progression, and attainment data.
    – Continue to review the approach to gathering student feedback across the University from Course Enhancement Questionnaires (CEQs).
    – Engage with quality assurance and enhancement-related aspects of the Scottish Funding Council review of coherent provision and sustainability.

    The Committee approved the priorities for 2021-22.

9. **Student Voice Policy (Principles)**

    The Committee considered a proposal from the Course Enhancement Questionnaires (CEQ) Review Board for a new Principles section in the revised Student Voice Policy.

    The Committee discussed the principles that underpin student feedback and representation activities at the University. The following was noted:
    – feedback should involve a level of co-creation;
    – the process for escalating issues must be clearly articulated;
    – extra guidance is needed for short-fat courses;

- must avoid wording that may simply lead to default end of course feedback (suggested text: 'all courses should provide the opportunity…');
- must be 'effective' and 'constructive' feedback (valuable phrases);
- student reps have stressed the importance of an anonymous feedback mechanism;
- the policy must include a clear statement on data transparency (students should be informed about data gathering from the process).

The Committee agreed that a full policy document should be submitted to the May meeting.

Action: Committee members invited to send further comments on the principles to the Head of Student Analytics, Insights and Modelling, Student Systems and Administration.

Action: CEQ Review Board to develop the full policy document and present to the Committee at the next meeting in May.

10. **Quality Code Mapping: Concerns, complaints and appeals**

The Committee noted the minor changes made to the mapping (updating links, reflecting the new Complaints Handling Procedure and referencing the Expected Behaviours Policy) approved by Convener's action. It was noted that the updated mapping was available at: 3concerns.pdf (ed.ac.uk)

For Information and Formal Business

11. **Internal Periodic Review: Reports and Responses**

The Committee approved the following Internal Periodic Review (IPR) final reports (and noted the commendations and recommendations):

- School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences (postgraduate provision) Final Report 2020-21;
- Oral Health Sciences (undergraduate provision) Final Report 2020-21;

The Committee confirmed that it was content with progress in the year-on response for the School of Literatures, Languages and Cultures (PGR & PGT).

The Committee also noted a paper providing examples of positive changes resulting from the IPR process (as noted in year on responses).

12. **Any Other Business**

There was no other business.

13. **Date of Next Meeting:** Thursday 20 May 2021, 2pm, MS Teams

The University of Edinburgh
Senate Quality Assurance Committee

20 May 2021

Student Voice Policy

Description of paper
1. Attached is the new Student Voice Policy.

Action requested / recommendation
2. SQAC are asked to **approve** the new policy.

Background and context
3. SQAC approved the principles embedded in the policy at the last meeting. This version provides an update based on the discussions at the last meeting.

4. University Executive approved the move away from centrally managed to locally managed course feedback last summer.

5. An Equality Impact Assessment has now been completed on the policy.

Discussion
6. The policy has been developed following extensive consultation with staff and students.

7. The policy provides a new framework for student feedback at the University of Edinburgh.

8. Supporting guidance and a toolkit will be developed, in consultation with Schools and Colleges, over the summer.

Resource implications
9. There will be resource implications for the development of a new approach to course level feedback in Schools however it is anticipated that this resource cost will be compensated by the time saved as Schools no longer have the administrative burden of Course Enhancement Questionnaires. The Policy encourages Schools to develop approaches to feedback collection that are appropriate and proportionate – there is no requirement for Schools to make a like for like replacement of end of course feedback surveys.

Risk management
10. N/A

Equality & diversity
11. EQIA completed and attached.

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

12. Communications planned with Schools, Colleges and to students via the Students Association and Student Representatives.

<u>Author</u>   **<u>Presenter</u>**
CEQ Review Board   **Paula Webster**,
17/05/21   Head of Student Analytics, Insights & Modelling

Freedom of Information – open

Student Voice Policy

Introduction

The University has a clear commitment to excellence in learning, teaching and postgraduate research and to enhancing the student experience at all levels of study and across degree programmes.

To maintain a high-quality student experience, it is essential that all students have opportunities to reflect on and evaluate their experiences of academic study and the wider service offering. To this end, we engage our students through a variety of mechanisms with a view to learning from and responding to their feedback individually, collectively and through their representatives.

Our commitment to working in partnership with our students is articulated at the highest level in the University's Strategy 2030. We work in partnership with the Students' Association to:
- ensure that students are central to governance and decision making;
- ensure that students are central to quality assurance and enhancement;
- provide opportunities for students to become active participants in their learning;
- foster collaboration between students and staff.

Throughout this Policy, the student experience encompasses the learning, teaching and assessment experience and the wider student experience, including the experience of student support services. By its nature, experience is subjective and context specific. Student feedback is therefore an important counterpart to other quality measures such as summative assessment, employment destinations or the professional accreditation of programmes and the professional recognition of staff.

Students are not a homogenous group and as such there will be a range of student voices within the University. All conversations with students should recognise that our student body is diverse and that students will have varied views on issues. When seeking feedback from students, colleagues should ensure that conversations are inclusive and enable all students to participate so that as many student voices as possible may be captured.

Students' views of their University experience and student voice mechanisms are an essential part of the University's (including Colleges and Schools) Quality Assurance and Enhancement framework.

Quality Assurance Agency expectations

The UK Quality Code for Higher Education sets out the expectation that students are actively engaged, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience.[1] This includes engaging students in the development, assurance and enhancement of the quality of their educational experience. Formal structures of collective student representation and individual student feedback are twin core elements.[2]

---

[1] The Revised UK Quality Code for Higher Education, 2018, 3, at https://www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code#.
[2] UK Quality Code for Higher Education Advice and Guidance: Student Engagement, 3–5, at https://www.qaa.ac.uk//en/quality-code/advice-and-guidance/student-engagement.

Student engagement should be strategically led but widely owned by both students and staff at all levels, with students considering, deliberating and developing informed views independent of the University. The purposes of engagement are enhancement, innovation and transformation, and their effectiveness should be monitored and evaluated regularly, including via key performance indicators. Engagement should be inclusive and adequately resourced and supported, with responses to feedback communicated back to students.

Senate Quality Assurance Committee, as a key part of the University's Quality Assurance and Enhancement framework, ensures adherence to these external expectations. Schools are required to report on student feedback and actions taken in response through their Annual Quality Report and periodically via Internal Programme Review, which also includes reflection on the effectiveness of the School's approach to student voice activities.

Underlying principles for student voice activities

- **Be enhancement-focused:** Ensuring each student has a voice, whether via representation or other feedback mechanisms, enables students to be co-creators of an improved educational experience.

- **Include all students:** It is essential that student representation and feedback activities be inclusive and accessible to all.

- **Celebrate and share positive practice as well as identify areas for improvement:** Representation and feedback should be valued by all as opportunities to celebrate strengths as well as to identify and share concerns, and student voice activities should enable both to be captured.

- **Involve students in the co-creation of feedback mechanisms:** To ensure greater engagement by students, and open, honest and balanced feedback, students should, as far as possible, be given opportunities to collaborate in the design and delivery of feedback activities[3]. Students should be made aware of the opportunities they will have to give feedback.

- **Adhere to ethical standards and be conducted with dignity and respect:** Feedback mechanisms must adhere to ethical standards, and feedback should be given and received in accordance with the University's Dignity and Respect Policy[4]. Students should be free to give honest feedback with no undue influence.

- **Adhere to data protection regulation:** Any activities that involve the gathering and storing of data must adhere to the University's Data Protection Policy[5]. This includes ensuring the use of compliant software (such as survey and polling tools). Where feedback results are shared, steps should be taken to protect respondent anonymity unless the student or students have consented to share their feedback without anonymity.

---

[3] Good practice examples of
[4] dignity_and_respect_policy.pdf (ed.ac.uk)
[5] Policy and handbook | The University of Edinburgh

- **Be transparent**: When feedback is collected from students, it should be made clear why it is being collected, what will be done with it, how it will be used and by whom. There should be clearly outlined escalation routes for when feedback cannot be responded to directly. When decisions are made, or changes are effected as a result of student feedback, this should be highlighted.

- **Be considered and responded to:** Students should be made aware of the information gathered, the conclusions drawn and, where relevant, the actions taken and why. Feedback may not automatically lead to change or action but should always result in a response and explanation.

Roles and responsibilities

Role	Responsibilities
Students	- Give open and constructive feedback - Ensure feedback is in line with the University's Dignity and Respect Policy
Course Organisers/ Programme Directors	- Offer at least one opportunity for students to provide feedback on their course each year - Ensure that all students have an opportunity to provide feedback - Engage with students in the design of feedback collection and explain how students can provide feedback on their course - Listen to student feedback and let students know how their feedback has or has not been acted on and why
Heads of School	- Set out the School's approach to collecting course, programme and School level feedback, ensuring that the principles in this Policy are followed - Ensure that all students are offered appropriate ways of providing feedback at course, programme and School level - Ensure that students are engaged in the design of feedback processes - Ensure that School approaches to student feedback are reported and reflected on in the School's Annual Quality Report
Senate Quality Assurance Committee	- Ensure that there are a range of appropriate ways for students to provide feedback - Review School Annual Quality Reports to ensure student voice activities are in line with the expectations in this Policy
College Committees	- Provide fora for sharing best practice and resources - Advise on areas for development in the student voice guidance and toolkit

When can students expect to be able to give feedback?

This list is not exhaustive. Links to relevant policies and guidance are included.

Course feedback	All courses should offer at least one opportunity for students to provide feedback. This can be in the middle of the course, towards the end or both.
Student representatives[6] / Student–Staff Liaison Committee[78]	All appropriate School, College and University committees include student members who are supported to enable meaningful student participation.
School-specific channels	Schools may offer town hall meetings or other opportunities to provide feedback on School-specific issues.
University-wide surveys	Annual surveys offer an opportunity to provide feedback on a range of issues and more general feedback on how the University is doing. All feedback is anonymised and respondent anonymity is protected in published results.
Student Panel	Participation enables students to provide feedback on specific questions and to shape service design and delivery.
Have Your Say mailbox	Students may post comments about specific issues. These are shared with the relevant team and summaries of comments received are published on the University website.

Monitoring student voice activities

All Schools are expected to set out their approach to course, programme and School-level student voice activities. It is good practice for these approaches to be agreed with student representatives as part of SSLC discussions. Schools should report on their approach to student voice activities in their Annual Quality Report.

---

[6] Student representation | The University of Edinburgh

[8] sslcguidance.pdf (ed.ac.uk)

Equality Impact Assessment Template

Before carrying out EqIA, you should familiarise yourself with the University's EqIA Policy Statement and Guidance and Checklist Notes, and undertake our online training on Equality and Diversity and EqIA. These, along with further information and resources, are available at www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/equality-diversity/impact-assessment

EqIA covers policies, provisions, criteria, functions, practices and activities, including decisions and the delivery of services, but will be referred to as 'policy/practice' hereinafter.

A. Policy/Practice (name or brief description): Student Voice Policy
B. Reason for Equality Impact Asessment (Mark **yes** against the applicable reason): • **Proposed new policy/practice** • Proposed change to an existing policy/practice • Undertaking a review of an existing policy/practice • Other (please state):
C. Person responsible for the policy area or practice: Name: Job title: School/service/unit:
D. An Impact Assessment should be carried out if any if the following apply to the policy/practice, if it: • affects primary or high level functions of the University • is relevant to the promotion of equality (in terms of the Public Sector Equality Duty 'needs' as set out in the Policy and Guidance)? • It is one which interested parties could reasonably expect the University to have carried out an EqIA?
E. Equality Groups To which equality groups is the policy/practice relevant and why? (add notes against the following applicable equality group/s) • Age • Disability • race (including ethnicity and nationality) • religion or belief • sex • sexual orientation • gender reassignment

- pregnancy and maternity
- marriage or civil partnership[1]

The Student Voice Policy replaces the old Course Enhancement Questionnaire and Student Voice Policies. As part of the policy development process the Review Group consulted students and staff about the existing approaches to collecting student feedback – particularly at course level. Staff reported concerns that female staff and staff from BAME backgrounds were disadvantaged under the old system and pointed to evidence in academic literature that some groups are systemically disadvantaged. The decision to collect anonymous feedback at course level prevented us testing whether students from different populations were more or less likely to express satisfaction.

The new Student Voice policy emphasises the need to consider and be inclusive of all students and recognises that there is not one homogenous student voice. The policy requires colleagues to consider how they can make the collection of student feedback inclusive so different student voices are captured.

The policy will be relevant to all the equality groups listed above as it is essential as part of our Quality Assurance processes to test whether students in different groups report significantly higher or lower levels of satisfaction or engagement and to understand why this might be the case. This supports the University in its work to ensure all students have an excellent student experience.

The policy emphasises the need to be mindful of respondent anonymity to ensure students feel able to share their experiences. Anonymity should be presumed unless students explicitly consent to their feedback being shared.

The policy has been developed via consultation with staff and student groups and will be communicated widely. Guidance and a toolkit are being developed to support staff in implementing the policy. The group who developed the policy are working with the Students Association to ensure that students are aware of the changes.

F. Equality Impact Assessment Outcome

Select one of the four options below to indicate how the development/review of the policy/practice will be progressed and state the rationale for the decision

Option 1: No change required – the assessment is that the policy/practice is/will be robust.

Option 2: Adjust the policy or practice – this involves taking steps to remove any barriers, to better advance equality and/or to foster good relations.

Option 3: Continue the policy or practice despite the potential for adverse impact, and which can be mitigated/or justified

Option 4: Stop the policy or practice as there are adverse effects cannot be prevented/mitigated/or justified.

---

[1] Note: only the duty to eliminate discrimination applies to marriage and civil partnership. There is no need to have regard to advancing equality or opportunity or fostering good relations in this respect.

G. Action and Monitoring

1. Specify the actions required for implementing findings of this EqIA and how the policy or practice will be monitored in relation to its equality impact (or note where this is specified above).
   Senate Quality Assurance Committee will review Schools' approaches to collecting student feedback as part of Annual Quality monitoring. Equality impact should be considered as part of this process.

2. When will the policy/practice next be reviewed?
   Annually.

H. Publication of EqIA

Can this EqIA be published in full, now? **Yes**/No

If No – please specify when it may be published or indicate restrictions that apply:

I. Sign-off

EqIA undertaken by (name(s) and job title(s)):
Paula Webster, Head of Student Analytics, Insights & Modelling

Accepted by (name):
[This will normally be the person responsible for the policy/practice named above. If not, specify job-title/role.]

Date:

Retain a copy of this form for your own records and send a copy to
equalitydiversity@ed.ac.uk

The University of Edinburgh
Senate Quality Assurance Committee

20 May 2021

Student-Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC)
Operational Guidance – Change to Membership

Description of paper
1. This paper outlines a change to the recommended membership of Student-Staff Liaison Committees (SSLCs).

Action requested / recommendation
2. To approve the changes to the recommended membership.

Background and context
3. The Operational Guidance sets out the recommended membership for SSLCs.
4. The current guidance states 'Where appropriate, Society Office Bearers of relevant academic societies within the School or subject area may attend SSLC meetings; their details are available via eusa.ed.ac.uk/societies.'
5. In partnership with Academic Services and the Students' Association, we are proposing that the wording is changed to include 'Where appropriate, Society Office Bearers of relevant academic societies and Leaders of relevant Peer Learning and Support schemes may be invited to attend SSLC meetings; their details are available via eusa.ed.ac.uk/activities/societies and eusa.ed.ac.uk/activities/peerlearningsupport respectively.'

Discussion
6. The Students' Association supports and oversees over 60 student-led Peer Learning and Support Schemes across the University, consisting of over 30 Peer Assisted Learning Schemes (PALS), 21 Peer Support Schemes, and 7 Peer Mentoring Schemes.
7. PLS schemes are a key hub for community building activity in Schools and Subject Areas.
8. While these Schemes are separate from the student representation structures also supported by the Students' Association, their activities may generate additional student feedback on students' academic experience, pastoral support, and sense of belonging, specifically from first year students.
9. Each PLS Scheme has a student Committee with an appointed Coordinator who oversees the running of the Scheme, as well an appointed Academic Liaison Coordinator, who is responsible for working collaboratively with Schools.
10. Our proposal is that, where appropriate, the Academic Liaison Coordinators from relevant Schemes should be invited to attend School or Subject Area SSLCs on behalf of their Scheme.
11. The role of the Academic Liaison Coordinator who attend SSLCs will be as follows:
    a. To ensure that feedback and student perspectives gathered through the Scheme's activities are represented at the meetings;

  b. To share updates on the Scheme's activities with those present at the SSLC, building effective working relationships with relevant student leaders and staff to support and develop their Scheme;

  c. To feed back to the PLS Scheme regarding any relevant discussions at the SSLC.

12. While Student Representatives – both Programme and School Representatives – remain the core student members of SSLCs, expanding the recommended membership to include both Society Office Bearers and PLS Scheme Leaders increases the scale and scope of student feedback being brought to those meetings, enabling students and staff to work collaboratively to enhance the student experience, and ensuring the feedback loop is closed by sharing outcomes with as many students as possible.

Resource implications

13. While staff responsible for coordinating SSLCs will be required to extend the invitation to relevant Society Office Bearers and PLS Scheme Leaders, they will be supported in identifying these contacts by the Students' Association.

Risk management

14. While there are no risks associated with this proposal, there are significant potential risks from ineffectively gathering and responding to student feedback, which this proposal aims to avoid.

Equality & diversity

15. An Equality Impact Assessment was carried out on the normal process. No additional equality and diversity implications have been identified as a result of the proposed changes.

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

16. The guidance will be updated by Academic Services and will be available on the Academic Services and Student Voice webpages. Communication will also be sent to key stakeholders to notify them of the update and to encourage Schools to invite appropriate Society Office Bearers and Peer Learning and Support Leaders.

<u>Author</u>
Natalie Hay, Jilly Burdge and Rohanie Campbell-Thakoordin, Edinburgh University Students' Association
May 2021

<u>Presenter</u>
Fizzy Abou Jawad, Edinburgh University Students' Association

Freedom of Information

17. Open

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

20 May 2021

Annual Monitoring and Internal Periodic Review Themes 2019/20:
University Level Actions

Description of paper

1. This paper updates the Committee on University level actions agreed in response to issues identified as areas for further development in School Annual Quality Reports 2019-20 and themes that emerged from teaching/postgraduate programme reviews held in 2019-20.

Action requested / recommendation

2. For information.

Background and context

3. Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC) approved actions at University level in response to issues identified as areas for further development in School Annual Quality Reports 2019-20 (at the December 2020 SQAC meeting) and themes that emerged from teaching/postgraduate programme reviews held in 2019-20 (at the September 2020 SQAC meeting).

4. A report on these issues was submitted to the University Executive (February meeting) and a response requested from each of the individuals and areas with remitted actions.

Discussion

5. See paper below.

Resource implications

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

Risk management

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

Equality & diversity

8. The actions encompass equality and diversity issues.

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

9. Academic Services will inform relevant areas.

<u>**Author**</u>   <u>**Presenter**</u>
Brian Connolly   **Brian Connolly**
Academic Services   Academic Services

Freedom of Information
Open

The University of Edinburgh
Senate Quality Assurance Committee

Annual Monitoring and Internal Periodic Review Themes 2019/20: University Level Actions

School Annual Quality Reports 2019-20

The following responses were received in relation to issues raised in the School Annual Quality Reports 2019-20:

Area for Further Development	Remitted Action	Response
Staff Welfare Schools reported concerns that the pandemic has exacerbated existing issues in relation to staffing and workload pressures. A strong positive theme throughout the reports was the sense of community evoked by the pandemic and support that academic and professional service staff provided for their students and each other within Schools. However there is concern that the ongoing situation is having a significant impact on staff well-being and the potential impact that this might have on the student experience.	**University Secretary**	The University is committed to supporting mental health and wellbeing at work. The Wellbeing Hub (http://www.ed.ac.uk/staff/health-wellbeing) aims to bring together all University services and support into one location. Wellbeing is especially important in the current circumstances and every member of staff is encouraged to play a part in looking after their colleagues. Support is offered in a number of ways: • **Promoting a healthy working environment and working practices** including physical, mental, environmental, financial and emotional aspects. Recognising additional workload challenges the organisation has given 2 additional respite days at Easter 2020, 3 at Christmas and 2 at Easter 2021. Those unable to use at the time have been able to reschedule a break. By stopping as much activity as is feasible this has allowed as many staff as possible to take a real break without worrying about meetings or emails. Additional online wellbeing and mental health services have been made available to staff through the wellbeing hub. Also allowed staff to

| | | carry over 10 days holiday into this academic year, and announced same for 2022 whilst continuing to encourage everyone to take regular breaks.
 • **Taking care of one another every day** – aligned to our value of fostering a supportive and inclusive environment where discrimination, prejudice, harassment and bullying is not tolerated.
 • **Signposting to mental health support in times of difficulty** - access to the advice and guidance to support mental health, acknowledging that everyone is different in what they need so different support is available including information, the opportunity to speak to someone, self-help resources as well as specialist external support. Wellbeing hub as mentioned above and Staff Counselling has pivoted to enable staff to have digital referrals once face to face became unrealistic because of Lockdown.
 • **Operated a 'best endeavours' for all staff throughout lockdown** and, one of few in Scotland, have made furlough available to staff with additional caring responsibilities as well as those who needed to shield with approximately 3,330 taking up this support.
 • **Made additional spaces available for all management development programmes** to ensure managers have the right skills to support staff. All eligible delegates accepted with increased capacity at all levels (Aspiring Manager +780%, Edinburgh Manager +740%, Edinburgh Leader +230%). Also increased places on Aurora to support female staff from 40 last year to 160+ in this academic year with good feedback from all programmes.
 • Planning for next year is **taking into account learning from this year**, including planning for a more campus centric expectation, operating to UK delivery time, synchronous delivery and activities timetabled.
 • Planning to **rerun the hybrid working survey** to understand how people's views have changed over lockdown as well as reviewing |

		what has worked well that we want to retain and what we need to do differently.
Communication A theme that emerged across the School reports was University communications to students and staff and the need to ensure that University level communications to students align with local communications and plans as a key element to managing student expectations. There was also a widespread desire from staff for more information and clarity in relation to initiatives or projects that were halted due to the pandemic, such as the Student Support and Personal Tutor Review, the Student Experience Action Plan, and the Curriculum Review, to assist Schools in their own curriculum and student experience plans.	**Adaptation and Renewal Team**	CAM distribute each Thursday an update on key progress, issues and general awareness pertaining to the University's response and mitigations to the COVID19 pandemic. In so doing this regular email update alerts 'Heads of' to planning underway for AY21/22 as a key example and crucially provides warning of imminent student communications to ensure colleagues are briefed and prepared. Professor Colm Harmon Vice Principal (Students) sent an email to all staff (on 21 April 2021) to herald the soft launch of the Curriculum Transformation programme. Opening the door to a period of institutional engagement across the next calendar year specifically. Recent USG and Principal's Town Hall events have also placed this programme on the radar with specific presentations from Com Harmon and Gavin Douglas.
Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion Schools highlighted in a number of reports the impact of the pandemic on students with protected characteristics, caring	**Convenor of the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee**	The Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee will add these impacts as evidence to the strategic EqIA to support decision making with regard to COVID mitigations. I will ensure these issues are also raised with the Curriculum Transformation Board so that inclusion and reducing the attainment gap are attended to as developments are progressed.

responsibilities, and students from widening participation backgrounds.		
Extensions and Special Circumstances (ESC) Schools broadly welcomed the new ESC service and were able to recognise the longer-term benefits, but reported that the initial implementation had caused additional workload for staff, due to systems issues and response times, at a time when they were already under pressure. Some simplification of the process is in discussion as part of the recently announced assessment mitigation measures, in anticipation of a further increase in ESC requests from students. Looking ahead, the value of the ESC service will be in monitoring the ESC data to identify potential 'at risk' students, but the service needs to have the capacity to do this.	**Deputy Secretary, Student Experience**	It was agreed that new Extensions and Special Circumstances (ESC) service should launch in semester 1 20/21 however the ESC software to support new ways of working for both students and staff was only launched in February, later than planned due to delays caused by strike action and Covid-19. This approach (of launching the service without the new software fully in place) was approved by the ESC Project Board, which has representations from schools and college, but everyone involved recognises that the early (semester 1) off-system ways of working were far from ideal for all schools. Since the system launch on the 23rd of February, things are running much better. The service to date has received 26,996 applications and is within the agreed turnaround time with all incoming applications. As we reach the end of teaching and head to the exam diet, the ESC team are preparing for a likely shift in balance between extension and special circumstance application numbers. Learning lessons from last semester, they have agreed an adjusted framework for special circumstance applications and their deadlines and have set up a dedicated deadline page to publish School SC deadlines. They have also established a User Group, the first meeting of which took place recently and was well attended. Director of Student Administration Lisa Dawson has also met with senior colleagues (Barry Neilson, Liz Lovejoy and Dave Robertson) to discuss ESC. It is clear that the majority of issues raised and escalated to these individuals have been addressed or are now in planning in partnership with the user group. As with any new University wide service, this continues to require refinement to ensure it is functioning as expected. Work will

<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>continue to build trust with Schools in the robustness of the validity decisions being made by the central team.* It is clear that some students are submitting applications to ESC without seeking support from their School. This has never been the intention and on the system at each stage students are encouraged to seek local support from their school and University Support Services. ESC have clear protocols in place for escalating causes of concern back into Schools (or relevant professional services), ensuring that both low and medium cases are identified (to ensure they don't become serious) along with serious cases such as threat to life or experience of sexual violence.

*In terms of decision-making, ESC establish and confirm the validity of all extensions requests and SC applications against a) the University's Special Circumstances policy and b) the in-year mitigating changes that have been made as a result of Covid-19 eg for automatic extensions, adjusting evidence requirements and blanket extensions.</td></tr>
<tr><td>**Online Learning Platforms**
Schools reported broad frustration with the various online teaching platforms that the University had in place at the outset of the pandemic, in part reflecting the rapid shift to digital delivery, and reported a desire for a strategic assessment of online learning technology going forward as part of the broader curriculum review and reform.</td><td>**Information Services**</td><td>We appreciate SQAC members' support for review and investment and hope they will add their voices to our requests in the planning round. In the meantime colleagues should continue to report IT issues to the IS Helpline and attend training to ensure that they can expertly use the tools on offer. Learning technologists in ISG are regularly in touch with peers at other institutions, particularly those with similar sets of tools to ensure that we benefit from sector-wide insights. We are strategically reviewing uptake of training by colleagues in order to better identify areas where skills have not been updated. We hope to be able to triangulate who attended training, helpdesk reports and tools used with areas where feedback on teaching has been poor.

Collaborate, Learn and Media Hopper will all be in place for teaching next year, resourcing restrictions ensure that we are not planning any major</td></tr>
</table>

		changes to the core systems available. Colleagues should sign up to service notifications and newsletters for updates on new functionality as it arrives. As noted, we aim during the semester to keep the tools stable without regular changes to interface and behaviour, but over the summer some new features are being added to Collaborate and we are identifying pilot schools for trialling Learn Ultra (the newer version of Learn VLE which offers a new interface). Schools which are part of the Learn Foundations project have been feeding into this through the academic user group. Schools which are not aligned with Learn Foundations will not gain these benefits and may fall further 'out of synch' as we align and focus our service support in these areas. We moved Learn to 'the Cloud' before the pandemic and I hope to move it to the next version (Ultra) soon. This year we had an embarrassing 240 minute outage at the start of term. Learn wasn't actually down, we just couldn't access it, which is basically the same thing for users. Other than that we had 39 minutes down for a whole year, which is much improved on 2017-18 levels. We have seen growth in the use of blogs and computational notebooks as well as e-portfolios and turnitin. We had a huge increase in use of Collaborate on previous years when it was mostly used by fully online courses for distance teaching. For example was saw a 3185% increase in total attendees Dec19 vs Dec20. A 1200% increase in sessions launched, Dec19 vs Dec 2020. The vendor have increased the scalability of the service, we are now in a position where the service can maintain the current level of demand on an ongoing basis. Improvements include: Enhanced reporting of storage used in reports available from Blackboard, text chat improved, participants can now tag others in the session and large sessions can now accommodate up to 1000 participants. Moderator and Presenter role will be able to view 25

videos at a time (students rolled out at later date) You can choose between gallery, speaker or tile view. You can switch between all videos and the shared content in the bottom right corner when sharing content.

Teams, Zoom and Collaborate are all offered so that colleagues have choice of which virtual classroom to use, or when one is overloaded however this is not cost effective in the long-term as they have broadly similar functionality and student feedback indicates that they find it confusing to have different courses using different tools in different ways. The online meetings/teaching tools are changing rapidly. Once we have passed the 'emergency teaching' this year and returned to 'normality' we will review which of the virtual classroom tools to keep. In the last 2 years we have engaged with more than 4,000 students in the biggest co-design exercise the University has ever carried out on its VLE. We have built up a very rich and detailed picture of what students and staff need to do in Learn, and why. Our user surveys of students indicate that student requirements of Learn VLE remain much the same as they were before the pandemic and they hope that courses use it consistently.

Colleagues successfully uploaded 200+k items of media this year. Upload speeds and success have been impacted by home broad band speeds for many as home broadband packages are optimised for downloading media rather than uploading. In many cases colleagues did not follow university guidance to attach automated captions to their pre -recorded video and did not attend training (or watch support videos) to optimise the tools. The volume of media now stored online is very expensive for the university and in an attempt to reduce this cost ISG will be deleting large source files as part of an automated process. Licence costs for the university have significantly increased as a result of much increased usage and ISG will strategically review which services should be cut or closed in order to accommodate this additional spend.

		In response to feedback, ISG have made bids in the planning round for investment in hybrid classroom AV kit, VLE upgrades and e- exams platforms. I'd be happy to attend an SQAC meetings to talk about ongoing VLE consolidation projects and Learn Foundations which prepare the way for a longer term VLE review, or to highlight how attending training in how to use the tools may make it easier for colleagues to improve their teaching.
On-campus Space and Resources Access to the University's on-campus space and resources continues to be a persistent theme across School reports. Concerns were raised in terms of the quality and suitability of teaching and community building space that was under strain before the pandemic and which may be under further strain when students return to campus under social distancing constraints. There are opportunities going forward to consider the role and purpose of both physical and digital learning spaces as part of the wider curriculum review, drawing on the lessons learnt from hybrid teaching.	**Convenor of Space Strategy Group**	I note the concerns - consistently expressed across School reports on estates. While much of this relates to the COVID period, I do know that this is not necessarily the cause of the issues being raised. There is also an interesting juxtaposition between School reports which reflect 'their' estate and the University role in addressing inadequacies. For example, I am aware of Schools who have had significant issues this year in delivery of teaching where allocated space remained unused, and available 'extended' timetabling slots in evening period were also not utilised. Again, while these two examples are reflecting the COVID challenges, they are suggesting that the problem is more nuanced than simple questions of quantity or volume of teaching space. In my view it is also difficult to address this fully with an eye in the rear-view mirror. Clearly teaching is going to be impacted permanently - both in terms of how we deliver it, how we timetable it, and the nature of the estate in terms of both capacity and quality/suitability. The consistency of this item on reports would suggest that we need to consider the issues more formally and prospectively and with perhaps more detail, to get under the issues properly.

		I would suggest that Tina as Chair of SQAC might convene a meeting soon with myself, VP Catherine Martin and Grant Ferguson (Interim Director, Estates) to progress some ideas.
Assessment and Progression Tools (APT) Some Schools (predominantly in CAHSS) reported issues with the functionality and reliability of APT. Concerns were noted that ATP was not adequately flexible to deal with complex course structures and required manual calculations/checking.	**Director of Student Systems and Administration**	Reported calculation errors for semester 1 boards last year were investigated and no calculation problems were identified. However a time lag was identified with a BoE report which has now been fixed. Student Systems will deliver further training for any area experiencing issues setting up structures and/or work with them on the structures they feel aren't providing the expected results. Whilst APT supports around 40 different methods of assessment, if a School adopts assessment structures that APT doesn't support, they will need to be managed outside of the system. The issue with external examiners understanding reports hadn't been raised before now. We no longer have an active APT project but can consider further enhancements through the Partnership Board which governs the Student Systems Partnership (SSP) portfolio.

Internal Periodic Review Themes 2019-20

The following responses were received in relation to issues raised in the Internal Periodic Reviews 2019-20:

Area for Further Development	Remitted Action	Response
Tutors and Demonstrators (recommended in eight reviews). Recommendations covered training (including continuing professional development), allocation of work and remuneration, the creation of roles to provide support, and recruitment processes.	Academic Services to refer recommendation to the review of the Policy for the recruitment, support and development of tutors and demonstrators.	A number of planned or periodic policy reviews which were scheduled to take place in 2020/21 have been postponed due to the impact of Covid-19 upon the ability of stakeholders (e.g. within Schools and Deaneries) to engage in meaningful consultation. Outcomes of an evaluation by HR of the effectiveness of Guaranteed Hours policy and procedures had been key to the review of the T&D policy but this exercise was similarly delayed by Covid-19.
Space (recommended in seven reviews). Recommendations related to the impact that pressures on and challenges with the estate are having on the student and staff experience, including on the ability to build community. The lack of space for tutors and demonstrators to carry out marking and meet with students was also noted.	Academic Services to refer recommendations to Space Strategy Group.	With respect to space, for tutors, demonstrators but more broadly to foster a strong sense of community, our plans for this were completely stymied by the lockdown introduced in December 2020. Plans as signed off in late December were focused on the broad task of bringing the campus back to life, but no sooner had they been signed off on December 18th than the First Minister introduced new controls (not even 24 hours later). Every effort to maximise the potential use of space has been exerted before and since this point, but the burden of the guidance on distancing has been acute.
Community building (recommended in six reviews). Recommendations focused on	Academic Services to refer recommendations to	See response above.

developing and implementing approaches to improve community building. The impact of pressures on and challenges with the estate on efforts to build community was also noted.	Senate Education Committee.	
Curriculum (recommended in six reviews). Recommendations relating to curriculum development and course provision, and embedding and assessing skills and employability within the core curriculum.	Academic Services to refer recommendations to Senate Education Committee.	The Curriculum Transformation Programme has moved into a consultation phase, and one key element relates to skills more broadly, and employability more specifically. Professor Conchur O'Bradaigh is leading a work stream to explore the potential in this area reporting to the Curriculum Transformation Board (itself reporting to the University Executive). This is all early stage consultation and framing, and the opportunity to contribute is open and welcome, but without prejudice to the direction of our wider consultation on the curriculum this element is going to be a core tenet of any lively model(s) which evolve.
Student Support (recommended in six reviews). Recommendations related to the importance of clearly communicating support available to students and also encouraged the preservation of good practice within the current Personal Tutor system in future models of support.	Academic Services to refer recommendations to Personal Tutor and Student Support Team Review.	For 21/22 the existing Personal Tutor system remains in place. While it does not appear feasible to implement the recommendations of the Student Support and Personal Tutor review in full by the start of 22/23, Senior Leadership Team (SLT) have expressed a strong desire to see substantial progress with implementation by the start of 22/23. The Student Support and Personal Tutor review sets out fundamental changes to the current PT system but also identified aspects of current practice which should be retained and incorporated into the evolved model of student support, for example group based meetings between PTs and tutees, which might be incorporated into the work of the Academic Cohort Leaders' work, and involvement of PTs in teaching core courses (e.g. UG first year), which will be reflected in the greater emphasis placed on the

| | | role of our academic staff in building connections and community as part of their teaching workload, given time will have been released from the administrative elements of having been a PT.

Some changes to the Senior Tutor role have already been approved this year in response to the case review into a student suicide. Going forward, the Senior Tutor role will be retained as a fundamental part of the proposed structure, working in partnership with relevant academic and professional services colleagues, with a more clearly defined remit.

Many aspects of existing / emerging good practice, such as proactive check-ins or case management of students requiring enhanced support, will be carried forward into the proposed systems and ways of working introduced as part of the evolved model. |
|---|---|---|

Senate Quality Assurance Committee

20 May 2021

Thematic Review 2018-19:
Black and minority ethnic (BME) students'
experiences of support at the University

Progress Update

Description of paper:
1. A progress update of the implementation of the recommendations of the Thematic Review 2018-19: Black and minority ethnic (BME) students' experiences of support at the University.

Action requested / recommendation:
2. For information.

Background and context:
3. At the September 2020 meeting the Committee agreed to seek regular progress updates in relation to the Thematic Review 2018-19.

Discussion:
4. Committee is asked to note progress.

Resource implications:
5. Resource implications were considered as part of the review.

Risk management:
6. Risks were considered as part of the review.

Equality & diversity:
7. Equality and diversity was an integral part of the review.

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

Author	**Presenter**
Prof Rowena Arshad, Convenor, Race Equality and Anti-Racist Sub-Group	**Brian Connolly,** Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services

Freedom of Information: Open

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

Thematic Review 2017-18:
Black and minority ethnic (BME) students' experiences of support at the University

Update on Recommendations/Remitted Actions

Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC), at the meeting held on Wednesday 18 September 2019, approved the final report of the Thematic Review 2018-19: Black and minority ethnic (BME) students' experiences of support at the University. The recommendations of the review were then remitted to the individuals and areas identified in the report and a taskforce established by Professor Sarah Cunningham-Burley under the new Equality, Diversity & Inclusion Committee, to drive forward the recommendations.

SQAC is required to oversee progress on the implementation of the report recommendations via an initial 14 week report and then subsequent annual reports. In September 2020 SQAC considered year-on responses from the individuals and areas with remitted actions updating the Committee on progress and identifying possible barriers to completion. It was agreed that the Committee would seek regular additional updates until all outstanding actions have been resolved.

The individuals and areas with outstanding actions have been asked to provide a further response to each action, noting expected timescales for completion and highlighting potential barriers to progress. The following responses were received:

Recommendation	Timescale for completion	December 2020 Update	Current Update
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.	June 2021	A meeting took place with Ayanda Ngobeni (EUSA BME Liberation Officer), Adam Bunni (Academic Services) and Caroline Wallace (HR) on 3rd November to look at how report and support can be improved for BME students. It was agreed an	Three Black and minority ethnic counsellors have been appointed. Two full time have already started. Andy Shanks is currently in the procurement process for working with a third-party service and having Black and minority ethnic counsellors and Mandarin speakers is part of the tender.

		intern should be appointed to work with EUSA and also REAR to take this forward. Johanna Holtan is now co-convening REAR with Rowena Arshad and will have responsibility for taking this forward. A concern is that financial issues are holding up the expansion of the Report and Support mechanism to include protected characteristics beyond gender. There is also concern that the 'support' aspects are lagging. The aim is to have an intern in place by Semester 2 who will liaise with EUSA liberation officers, with staff networks and Academic Services so that an improved R &S mechanism will be in place by start of session 2021/22.	
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.	Semester 2, 2020/21	The University Executive has approved the running of the Harvard Measuring Discrimination Survey in Semester 2. This will be run by Dr Gwenetta Curry (MVM) and will capture BME staff experiences. The key focus for improving BME student experiences for this academic year is to:	This was piloted in March/April 2021. Then it should be good to go but timing might be start of session 2021/22 given we are now in a period of exams and assessment. There has been a flurry of activities producing largely online resources which contribute to raising racial literacy. Staff led have been initiated by HR (Caroline Wallace):

| | | (a)   Have in place a BME Counsellor
(b)   Provide racial literacy training for students
(c)   Begin a whole University effort to consider what decolonising the curriculum means. Half of the Schools in the University now have a lead for Decolonising the Curriculum. A meeting will be held of all the School leads in Semester 2 to ensure there is a baseline understanding of what Decolonisation means to enable a degree of consistency in development
(d)   Improve report and support mechanisms. | https://www.ed.ac.uk/equality-diversity/training/self-directed

https://www.ed.ac.uk/equality-diversity/inclusion/race/stand-against-racism

Student led- have involved a lead from the Careers Service Team (Shelagh Green), EUSA, IAD with individual academic staff supporting:

https://www.ed.ac.uk/equality-diversity/students/microaggressions/racial-microaggressions

There is also a need for specific training for key staff e.g. personal tutors, security staff and discussions are progressing on how to take these forward.

Most schools now have a lead on Decolonising the Curriculum. CSE are taking a college led approach. No meeting took place in Semester 2 simply due to workload.

6 podcasts on what decolonising means for 6 different academics including how they have taken this forward will be launched at the 2021 L&T Conference on 15th June. This is an initiative taken forward by REAR and IADF. This will be accompanied with a discussion paper about how this University is taking forward Decolonising the |

			Curriculum. This paper will be given to Colm Harmon leading on the Curriculum Transformation Project to take forward. There is still work to be done on improving overall staff and student racial literacy particularly within areas like societies. Report and Support - EDIC Committee has endorsed launching a report/support platform for racism in January 2022 and Gavin Douglas and Sarah Cunningham Burley are exploring funding avenues. GD will fund a research assistant to consolidate insights and lessons from reporting across the University and amongst other institutions to contribute to development of platform.
The Review Panel **recommends** that University Leadership recognise the need to improve knowledge and upskill in the area of developing racial literacy.	Semester 2 2020/21	Staff resources have been produced to assist this. However what is now needed is to provide race equality and anti-racist training beyond static resources.	This remains action to be taken forward.
The Review Panel **recommends** that the Principal leads a conversation on 'race' in higher education and the implications for the University of Edinburgh.	Dec 2020	Meeting with EDI leads will take place on Dec 3rd 2020. A townhall meeting for all staff will take place in Semester 2.	Townhall meeting has not taken place. REAR has asked the University Executive to give assurance that we will continue to tackle racism at cultural and institutional level – this was in response the Report by the Commission for Racial and Ethnic

			Disparities (Sewell report) which attributes the issue of racism and racial disadvantage to Black and minority ethnic cultures, dispositions, individuals and communities. We await a response. It maybe that a Townhall meeting might be more effective in Semester 1 of the next session where the Principal can acknowledge progress but also raise issues of challenges and work still needing done.
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'.	Completed	An e-book link has been sent to all service and school leads.	
The Review Panel **recommends** that the University reapplies for the Race Equality Charter Mark (RECM).		The University will begin discussions on this at the end of Semester 2 of the 2020/21 session with the intention of an application being made in 2022.	This is being progressed. REAR Co-convenors have met with Sarah Cunningham-Burley and Caroline Wallace with the intention of applying for the Charter Mark in summer of 2022.
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.		This is being taken forward by the Student Experience Action Plan team.	The Student Experience Action Plan Team no longer exists as the plan and its associated budget were cut back at the end of last year in light of the pandemic challenges. So this item remains unactioned at this stage. Gavin Douglas agrees that it is an important action however.
The Review Panel **recommends** that the EDMARC Report receives a high profile		I suspect there is no movement forward on this due to workload	Not progressed but data is available so this is a matter of workload.

communication upon publication and that each College, School, and Professional Service is systematically required to provide a formal response each year.		pressure. I have not chased as my priority has been to take forward the five areas that the Uni Exec have prioritised– see attached document.	
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 BI team in CAHSS has built an EDI dashboard for the College which breaks down data per School. This data will be analysed centrally at College level with a report given to each School who have been asked by the end of the 2020/21 academic session to have identified areas for action to address issues identified for each School e.g. attainment gap, representation. MVM and CSE are also working on analysing data to identify next steps. There is a need to encourage all staff to respond to requests for monitoring as the staff data in particular is less detailed than then data held for students.	CAHSS work was not progressed due to workload and not having a short-term post to assist in this. This remains a priority for the CAHSS EDI Committee. Schools are keen for this data. Work progressing at College level for each at the moment. No progress on this but should be a priority area for 2021/22.
The Review Panel **recommends** that the University requires Colleges, Schools, Deaneries, and Professional Services to		SQAC ongoing.	Schools/Deaneries will be asked to reflect on student progression and outcomes data, and in particular the differences in

SQAC 20/21 5E

respond to BME data as part of annual review processes.			attainment, during this year's cycle of annual quality assurance reporting.
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 will take this forward.	The work being led by Mohini Gray on addressing issues of black and minority ethnic student attainment is progressing. Mohini Gray will identify some action that the University/Schools could take ahead of the final report from the PTAS grant. This report is not due till end of 2021 at the earliest.
The Review Panel **recommends** that the University recognise and celebrate the contributions of BME staff and students.	October 6th	REAR meeting on Oct 6th did not consider this and the next meeting is on February 23rd 2021. An email has been sent to all REAR members to seek ideas by December 15th which will be collated for the meeting in February. Once collated, the information will be shared with SQAC.	REAR did request ideas for this at the Feb 23rd meeting. No concrete ideas came forward. This remains an action recommendation that should be discussed again at the first REAR meeting in 2021/22 with a view to progress or amend.
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.		Delayed due to the Covid19 pandemic but funding has been allocated.	No progress at this point.
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		Will now chase to find out who I am meant to speak to on this. I know this sits within Sarah Smith's portfolio but I am sure the	Dave Gorman is leading on this for Professional Services. Their focus at present is on gender/ethnic pay gaps. However, this is an area that Dave Gorman

professional services areas. The Review Panel encourages the University to use positive action to diversify staffing.		diversifying of the workforce action has been given to someone in her team – but do not know who.	has asked for ideas and assistance on. This is a discussion that REAR will be having with him specifically by June 2021 with a view to progressing action next session.
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 (SRA) has started to revise the material being given out to students. Shelagh Green leading on Adaptation and Renewal Team (ART) work around EDI training for students.	Work is progressing well.
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 will take this forward.	
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.		Conversations are happening with those leading on the Student Support Team review. The work by the team has been paused due to the pandemic.	No further forward.

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Student Counselling Service use positive action to diversify its staffing.	January 2021	A job description has been pulled together to allow an advert to go forward for a BAME Counsellor to be appointed in house. UoE Legal Services have been involved to advise on triggering positive action that might be possible under the Equality Act 2010.	This work is completed – see comments above re counselling.
The Review Panel **recommends** that the Student Counselling Service should ensure that it has a Service Level Agreement is in place with any organisation that it uses to support University of Edinburgh students.	January 2021	Andy Shanks and Ronnie Millar have been working with UoE Procurement and Legal Depts to run a pilot project whereby we work with an external provider to provide us with increased choice in accessing a BAME counsellor for BAME students- this is part of Plan A (the integrated/ blended approach), and can stand alone as Plan B in itself.	This work is completed – see comments about re counselling.
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.		Our priority is to get a Counselling service provision up and running asap that can meet the needs of BAME students. So a Benchmarking exercise should occur but actually we know that that we should get on with the action of improving our service and continue to benchmark alongside.	Our priority was to recruit Black and minority ethnic counsellors and this is now completed. It is likely the Benchmarking exercise is redundant for now.

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.	Dec 2020	There is an action point in the University circular mentioned above that we will be looking for each School to begin discussions about Decolonising the Curriculum in their various subject areas. The Vice Principal Students has also agreed to be a champion for equalities issues (including race equality) as part of the lead person in charge of the Curriculum Review.	See above comments on Decolonising the curriculum which in part relates to this item.
The Review Panel **recommends** that the University address the attainment/awarding gap. The action plan should include targets to reduce the attainment gap.		This work is being taken forward with a PTAS grant by Dr Mohini Gray and will last for 13 months- reporting by Semester 1 2021/22.	See above comments related to this grant and work taken forward by Mohini Gray.
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.		SQAC has established a Data Task Group to progress this action.	The Committee considered an enhanced set of student data papers at the April 2021 meeting and the Data Task Group continues to explore options for an enhanced system for monitoring retention, progression and degree outcome data for different student groups.

20 May 2021

Scotland's Rural College Accreditation Committee
Annual Report 2020/21

Description of paper
1. This paper summaries the key areas of discussion from the Scotland's Rural College (SRUC) Accreditation Committee meeting of Wednesday 21 April 2021.

Action requested / recommendation
2. For information.

Background and context
3. Responsibility for managing the accreditation process has moved from the College of Science and Engineering (CSE) to University level. Henceforth, the Convenor of Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC) will convene the annual accreditation meeting with the Academic Services area of the University responsible for co-ordinating the process.

4. In April 2021 the Accreditation Committee met to review and affirmed continued accreditation of the SRUC programme, 'Environmental Resource Management (BSc)' and the outgoing 'Environmental Resource Management (BSc)'.

Discussion
5. See attached paper.

Resource implications
6. Accrediting SRUC degree programmes has resource implications for Academic Services.

Risk management
7. In order to preserve the University's reputation, it is essential to ensure that degrees accredited by the University of Edinburgh meet the same high standards of academic quality and student experience that we would expect from our own programmes. The annual SRUC Accreditation Committee provides a framework to ensure that the accredited programme continues to meet these expectations.

Equality & diversity
8. As this paper reports on past activity, there are no Equality and Diversity considerations and an EqIA is not necessary at this time.

Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action agreed
9. As the paper is an update to provide information there are no actions.

Author
Brian Connolly,
Academic Services

Presenter
Professor Tina Harrison,
Convener, Scotland's Rural College
(SRUC) Accreditation Committee

Freedom of Information
Open

The University of Edinburgh
Senate Quality Assurance Committee

**Minutes of the meeting of Scotland's Rural College Accreditation Committee
held on Wednesday 21 April 2021 at 11.15am via Microsoft Teams**

Present:

Professor Tina Harrison **(Convener)**	Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance
Professor Andrew Barnes	Head of Rural Economy, Environment and Society Department, SRUC
Dr Kyrsten Black	Registrar, SRUC
Dr Jenn Carfrae	Programme/Team Leader for Environmental Resource Management, SRUC
Karen Gray	Academic Quality Manager, SRUC
Nichola Kett	Head of Quality Assurance and Enhancement Team, Academic Services, University of Edinburgh
Professor Linda Kirstein	Dean of Education Quality Assurance and Culture, College of Science and Engineering, University of Edinburgh
Amy McLuckie	Student Representative, Co-President of SRUC Students' Association
Professor Jamie Newbold	Academic Director, SRUC
Dr Claire Phillips	Dean of Quality Assurance, College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine, University of Edinburgh
Brian Connolly (Secretary)	Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services, University of Edinburgh

1. **Welcome and Apologies**

2. **Membership of the Accreditation Committee 2020-21**

   The Committee noted the membership for 2020-21.

3. **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 20 February 2020**

   The Committee approved the minutes of the previous meeting.

4. **Matters Arising**

The Committee noted that responsibility for managing the accreditation process had now moved from the College of Science and Engineering (CSE) to University level. Henceforth, the Convenor of Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC) will convene the annual accreditation meeting with the Academic Services area of the University responsible for co-ordinating the process. The Committee thanked CSE for co-ordinating and supporting the accreditation process. It was also confirmed that the Principal of SRUC has been included as an Ex-Officio member of the University Senate.

For Information

5. **Memorandum of Agreement**

The Committee noted the new Memorandum of Agreement (MoA).

The Committee noted that the MoA was now with University Legal Services prior to final sign-off. SRUC thanked the University team for the help and support during the drafting of the MoA.

6. **Students' Association Update**

The Committee noted the update on key SRUC Students' Association (SRUCSA) activities since the last meeting.

The Committee noted that one of the key activities for 2020/21 was developing a sense of community in the context of the ongoing pandemic. A key project piloted by SRUCSA this academic year was #SpeakEasy. In short, lecturers were asked to allow 10 minutes at the end of their online lecture for students to be shown a #SpeakEasy slide containing conversation prompts and/or icebreakers. The overall aim is to replicate casual discussion between students which would normally happen during breaks, at the end of lectures and in the corridors of the campus. It was noted that uptake and use had been variable but it was suggested that the initiative may be of interest to the University as it is also seeking to foster a greater sense of belonging, particularly in the context of hybrid learning and teaching.

Action: Academic Services to arrange for SRUCSA to share #SpeakEasy and other community building initiatives with the University.

For Discussion

7. **Annual Report 2019-20**

The Committee considered the Annual Report 2019-20. The Committee noted the excellent quality of the report and accompanying documentation and commended the SRUC team responsible, in particular Dr Kyrsten Black, Dr Jenn Carfrae and Karen Gray.

Overview

The Committee commended SRUC staff and students on the successful switch to blended learning for completion of teaching, learning and assessment for the

2019/20 academic year, incorporating the implementation of the Help not Hinder procedure. The pivot to online blended learning, new platforms for delivery and assessment had been rapidly assessed and successfully implemented. Big Blue Button had been used as a teaching resource and ProctorExam for online proctoring of the Veterinary Nursing exams and provided staff development activities to support colleagues. It was also noted that SRUC Registry and Centre for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching had been established and functioning effectively.

Enhancement Led Institutional Review

The Committee commended SRUC on the positive response to recommendations from the successful 2019 Enhancement Led Institutional Review (ELIR). Of particular note was the multi-strand project to address the ELIR recommendation relating to student feedback. SRUC has focused on ensuring timeliness and turnaround of assessment feedback. A mechanism has been devised to enable exception reporting to be utilised through UNIT-e system to determine compliance with stated feedback times. This will be underpinned by detailed assessment and feedback schedules being produced by Programme teams and being monitored by Heads of Department. Other activities have focused on constructive alignment and purposeful assessment planning, with a specific requirement to produce curriculum maps and assessment blueprints.

Institutional Led Review

The Committee noted that following the update to the Institutional Led Review (ILR) process which took place last year and taking account of the formation of the new Board of Studies groupings, further consideration has been given to the potential to separate the ILR process from revalidation. SRUC has now received approval from the University of Glasgow for this proposal and the revised schedule for both processes will now be implemented.

The rationale for this change is based on the experience of the Engineering, Science and Technology team who felt that the separation of the two events enabled them to use the ILR process more effectively as an opportunity to reflect on the existing programme with feedback from the panel helping to inform the revalidation of the degree offer. It is also based on the experience of Environment and Countryside who felt that they could have focused more attention on the relevant aspects (review and revalidation) had they been separated. Equally this fits effectively with internal restructuring within SRUC which means that the two processed are led by different teams (i.e. ILR by the Centre for Enhancement of Learning and Teaching and Validation/Revalidation by Registry).

Mental Health

The Committee noted that the ELIR had commended SRUC for several areas of good practice covering the approach to mental health awareness and support. It was noted that that SRUC had enhanced provision further during 2019/20 with the implementation of the MySRUC App, a new student portal offering a single click access point for students and education staff to a range of support such as addictions, anxiety and stress and gender-based violence.

It was also noted that Togetherall (previously BigWhiteWall) has been implemented as a major source of information and support for both SRUC staff and students. An

escalation system has been implemented with Togetherall so that senior staff with a responsibility for student safeguarding can be contacted in the case of extreme emergency. Student utilisation of the system is monitored monthly through reporting to the Academic Leadership Team.

Accreditation by Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs)

The Committee noted that the Environment and Countryside team raised the possibility of accreditation with the Chartered Institute of Water and Environmental Management (CIWEM) as part of the revalidation event. This was included as a recommendation and the team have recently achieved CIWEM accreditation for 2020- 2025.

Application for Degree-Awarding Powers

The Committee noted that SRUC remains ambitious to achieve Taught and Research Degree Awarding Powers. Following the outcome of the ELIR a proposal was considered by Academic Board (March 2020), which was subsequently endorsed by the SRUC Board to take a phased approach to the application process. Initially, the primary focus will be on achieving taught degree awarding powers (TDAP), whilst further development is made on the policies and processes which underpin the long and successful history as research degree managers and supervisors. The current timeline is that the application for TDAP is being drafted currently with the intention of submitting August 2021.

8. **External Examiner Report 2019-20**

    The Committee noted the very positive External Examiner Report for the academic year 2019-20.

    For Approval

9. **Accreditation of Environmental Resource Management (BSc)**

    The Committee affirmed continued accreditation of the SRUC programme, 'Environmental Resource Management (BSc)' and the outgoing 'Environmental Resource Management (BSc)'.

10. **Any Other Business**

    There was no other business.

11. **Date of Next Meeting:** TBC

The University of Edinburgh
Senate Quality Assurance Committee

20 May 2021

Draft Annual Report of the Senate Standing Committees

Description of paper

1. This is the draft annual report to Senate form the Senate Standing Committees: Education Committee; Academic Policy and Regulations Committee; and Quality Assurance Committee. It reports on the Committees' achievements and use of delegated powers in 2020-21. It also proposes outline priorities for 2021-22.

Action requested

2. The Committee is invited to comment on the draft report, in particular the major items of committee business from 2020-21 and the proposed plans of the Committee for the next academic year.

Background and Context

3. The Senate Standing Committees provide an annual report setting out progress on activities in the past year and seeking Senate approval for their general strategic direction and priorities for the next academic year.

5. The draft report provides an opportunity for Senate Standing Committee members to feed into the annual review and planning process.

Resource implications

4. The proposed plans for 2021-22 will have some resource implications relating to time spent by members of the Committees and Policy Officers in Academic Services or staff invited to participate in working groups. Some of the resource requirements for wider work of the Committees will be met through existing resources or have agreed funding in place.

Risk Management

5. Each individual strand of proposed activity will be subject to risk assessment as appropriate.

Equality and Diversity

6. Where required, Equality Impact Assessments will be carried out for individual work packages completed next year.

Next steps / implications

7. Comments from the Committee will be fed into the final version of the report. The report will be presented to Senate for noting and approval on 2 June 2021. The approved report will be highlighted in the Senate Committees' Newsletter. The Senate Committees will progress the agreed strategic approach during 2021-22 as set out in the report. This report will also be shared with the University Court for information.

Authors
Professor Colm Harmon, Convenor of Senate Education Committee
Professor Tina Harrison, Convener of Senate Quality Assurance Committee
Professor Alan Murray, Convenor of Academic Policy and Regulations Committee
Sue MacGregor, Director of Academic Services
Brian Connolly, Academic Policy Officer
Kathryn Nicol, Academic Policy Officer

Ailsa Taylor, Academic Policy Officer
Pippa Ward, Academic Policy Officer

5 May 2021

Freedom of Information
Open

Annual Report of the Senate Committees 2020-21

1.	Executive Summary

This report summarises the achievements of the Senate Committees, and their use of the powers delegated to them by Senate, for academic year 2020-21, along with their proposed plans for 2021-22.

2.	Introduction

The three Standing Committees of Senate (hereafter referred to as the Senate Committees) are the Senate Education Committee (SEC), Academic Policy and Regulations Committee (APRC), and Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC).

Senate has delegated to these Committees a range of its powers, and these powers are set out in the Committees' Terms of Reference. Links to the Terms of Reference and memberships of the Senate Standing Committees are below:

- Education Committee
- Academic Policy and Regulations Committee
- Quality Assurance Committee

Sections 3, 4 and 5 below provide information on the Standing Committees' activities in 2020/21.

Section 6 sets out proposals for future work. These proposals have arisen from Committee discussions, and discussion at the Senate Committee Conveners' Forum. The proposals are designed to assist the University in pursuing its Learning and Teaching agenda and wider goals and laid out in the University Strategy 2030:

- Strategy 2030

3.	Key Committee and Task Group Activities in 2020-21*

Name of Committee	No. of meetings
Senate Education Committee	5
Academic Policy & Regulations	4
Senate Quality Assurance Committee	5

Name of Task Group	Task Group of:
Personal Tutor System Oversight Group	SQAC
Student Support Services subcommittee	SQAC
Data Task Group	SQAC
Support for Curriculum Development Group	SEC
Online Remote Examinations and Assessment (OREA)	SEC

*Includes meetings scheduled for the remainder of the session.

The remits and memberships of any task groups are available within the relevant Committee pages at: www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/committees

4.	Senate Committees' Progress in 2020/21

Section 4 provides information on progress against the activities proposed in last year's report to Senate. Section 5 provides information on other committee activity in 2020/21.

4.1	Education Committee

Progress with activities proposed in last year's report:

Activity
1. **Drive the curriculum reform agenda in the evolving context** **November 2020 Meeting** - Presentation on curriculum review by the Vice-Principal Students – the Committee considered a number of key issues, for example the complexity of the University's offer; the way in which prospective applicants view the University; whether the University's curriculum reflects its philosophy; and whether the University currently over-teaches and examines. - 'Space, Place and Pedagogy: 'Beyond Digital' Learning and Teaching' (Paper B) – the Committee gave 'in principle' support for the proposals outlined in the paper, and agreed that they would be taken forward as part of the curriculum transformation agenda. - 'Providing an Excellent Learning Experience for our International Students' (Paper D) – the Committee agreed that there were opportunities to look further at this as part of the curriculum transformation agenda. It was agreed that consultation around curriculum reform / transformation should involve a diverse group of students. **January 2021 Meeting** - 'Lessons from the Mastercard Foundation Scholars Program' (Paper B) – it was recognised that the lessons learned from this Program may help to inform the curriculum transformation agenda. - 'Edinburgh Futures Institute (EFI) PGT Model' (Paper D) – it was recognised that the proposed model may benefit not only EFI's PGT programmes, but the University's PGT (and potentially UG) offering as a whole. **March 2021 Meeting** - The Committee considered, for information, a paper taken to the 23 February 2021 meeting of University Executive providing a brief update on the work of the Curriculum Transformation Programme and the draft Board's membership and Terms of Reference. **May 2021 Meeting** - Paper and presentation by the Vice-Principal Students [to be updated]
2. **Ensure effective responses to ELIR recommendations** This will be taken forward in 2021/22 due to the ELIR being delayed until March 2021.
3. **Oversee the ongoing development of the Doctoral College and monitor its impact upon the experiences of PGR students including discussion and influence of the University approach to PGR scholarships.**

November 2020 Meeting

- The Doctoral College Operational Plan was received by Education Committee
- The Committee noted a change of name from the PGR Steering Group to the Doctoral College Operational Group.

January 2021 Meeting

- The Committee noted that the Doctoral College Operational Group had met for the first time and was prioritizing activities to ensure that it had capacity to deal with issues around COVID mitigation.

Update Provided by Doctoral College May 2021

The Doctoral College now consists of around 225 staff across all Schools, Deaneries, Colleges and key services. The Microsoft Teams pages are very active allowing staff to share ideas and problems quickly and get back solutions available for all from the services. It has allowed us to react quickly to current events (especially around the pandemic) as well as to hugely enhance change management in all aspects of research student support and training.

The new Doctoral College Operational Group is running carrying over the business of the former Steering Group. There is also a Management Group set up under the auspices of Research Policy Group (soon to be Research Strategy Group) and functionality has been divided between them. There is a common core membership.

Over the last year the Operational/Steering Group has overseen the creation of our themed plan with seven key themes each led by one of the Deans: Administration, Wellbeing, Communities, Research Strategy, Recruitment and Finance, and Governance and Planning. These have sub-themes also with a lead. Below these we are developing workstreams to action tasks.

We have set up two substantial working groups looking at Scholarships and Diversity in Recruitment. Both report formally to SRFSG but are overseen by the Doctoral College operational group. The Scholarships group has proposed (and it has been accepted) that Principal's Career Development Scholarship and Edinburgh Global Research Scholarship be stopped and put in place a replacement scheme called the Edinburgh Doctoral College Scholarship. It is also aiming to include a baseline of conditions for such Scholarships which it aims to roll out to all UoE scholarships and beyond. This will include sick pay, family leave and mandatory training in EDI and ethical research. The Recruitment group has just completed its report with recommendation building on good practice in our Doctoral Training Centres and Centres of Doctoral Training across the institution.

4. **Monitor the evolution and implementation of the institutional policy to support the University's Lecture Recording service in the context of Adaptation and Renewal post-Covid-19.**

September 2020 Meeting

- The Committee approved a new Virtual Classroom Policy. The Policy clarifies rights and responsibilities when delivering and recording teaching and learning using the Virtual Classroom Service and other online technologies.

  The Virtual Classroom Service is used in the regular delivery of fully-online programmes, and during the COVID-19 pandemic has permitted online and hybrid delivery of programmes normally delivered on campus. The Policy helps to manage

the potential risks associated with virtual classes. The Policy extends existing principles agreed for lecture recording to this context, amending them or making separate provision where required.

The Policy applies University-wide to staff, students and visiting lecturers involved in running or participating in virtual classroom sessions. The Policy also covers online student pastoral support meetings. The Policy does not cover teaching recorded or live-streamed using the Lecture Recording service, or non-teaching online events, meetings and other activities as these are covered by the Lecture Recording Policy.

5. **Monitor ongoing effectiveness of Student Health & Wellbeing Strategy in the context of overall student learning experience.**

November 2020 Meeting

- An update on the Student Mental Health Strategy was provided by the Director of Student Wellbeing. Members noted excellent work by the University's mental health services both to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic and to continue developing strategically.

6. **Ensure strengthening of the Committee's link to the Space Strategy Group.**

January 2020 Meeting

- Edinburgh Futures Institute (EFI) PGT Model – the Committee discussed the importance to the model of the University having suitable teaching space, and the Space Strategy Group's role in this.

[Additional comment to be requested from Estates]

4.2   Academic Policy and Regulations Committee (APRC)

Progress with activities proposed in last year's report:

Activity
1. **Work with the relevant work streams of the Adaptation and Renewal Programme to oversee the implementation of any significant policy changes associated with the developing programme of work.** No action to date.
2. **Monitor any requirement for longer term regulatory and policy changes as a result of Covid-19 and take appropriate action as required.** APRC agreed a package of measures to mitigate the ongoing impact of Covid-19 in January 2021. Recent efforts have been focused on producing user-friendly guidance to support Schools with the implementation of these measures, which has now been published on SharePoint. The guidance will be accompanied by a series of case studies to demonstrate the application of the various measures. Following the successful operation of virtual meetings of Boards of Examiners in 2019/20, and following Semester 1 in the current session, APRC agreed in January 2021 to amend the Taught Assessment Regulations to allow Boards of Examiners to meet

virtually, wherever this is considered appropriate by the relevant Convener. This not only supports diversity of participation from members, who may not otherwise be able to attend in-person meetings, but also supports the University strategic goals relating to climate impact, by reducing the need for staff to travel to meetings.
3. Input as required into Curriculum Transformation project (led by Education Committee). This will be taken forward in 2021/22.
4. Review of Enhancement-Led Institutional Review outputs and take appropriate action as required. This will be taken forward in 2021/22 due to the ELIR being delayed until March 2021.

4.3 Quality Assurance Committee (QAC)

Progress with activities proposed in last year's report:

Activity
1. Continue to contribute to preparations for the University's next Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) and oversee activities in response to the review. The Committee contributed to the preparations for the Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) and will oversee activities in response to the University's successful outcome. The University was judged to have "effective arrangements for managing academic standards and the student learning experience", a positive judgement and the best possible outcome for an ELIR. The Review Team commended the University for: our commitment to working in close partnership with our students; the work of the Institute for Academic Development (IAD) in supporting staff development and sharing good practice; the development and expansion of Peer Support/Peer-Assisted Learning Schemes; our support for student involvement in Internal Periodic Reviews. The Review Team identified a number of areas for further development, the majority of which we were already working towards. There are two areas in particular where we have been asked to make significant progress over the course of the next academic year: personal tutoring/student support and assessment and feedback. The final report will be published in the middle of July and circulated widely. The University is required to take action on the areas for further development and to report on this to the Quality Assurance Agency Scotland (who run the ELIR process) one year after the publication of the report. The Committee oversee the response to the recommendations, ensuring alignment with existing areas of work, including Curriculum Transformation.
2. Review responses to the coronavirus pandemic gathered via the University's Quality Assurance Framework, gather learning for future developments and share good practice across the institution. The Committee considered the annual School quality reports (25 reports from the Schools and Deaneries), annual College quality reports and the outcomes of annual reports from

the student support services (16 reports). The reporting process this year was streamlined to focused on the impact of and learning from the Covid-19 pandemic while also allowing for optional reflection on other aspects of academic standards, student performance and the student experience. The Committee identified examples of positive practice and issues for further development at institutional level including: staffing and workload pressures; central communications to students and staff; equality, diversity, and inclusion issues arising due to the impact of the pandemic; the implementation of the new Extensions and Special Circumstances (ESC) service; the performance of the various online teaching platforms; access to on-campus space and resources and issues with the Assessment and Progression Tools (APT). The Committee has requested a response to each issue from individuals and areas with relevant responsibilities and a progress report on actions will be considered at the April meeting of SQAC. A report on these issues has also been submitted to the University Executive

3. **Review the approach to gathering student feedback across the University from Course Enhancement Questionnaires (CEQs).**

The Committee continues to monitor the implementation of mid-course feedback through annual monitoring, review and reporting processes. The Committee has reviewed [to be updated following meeting to note whether approval received] a revised Student Voice Policy, taking into account the recommendations of the CEQ Review Project Board (approved by University Executive) to decentralise the management of course evaluation feedback, affording greater flexibility to schools in how they may gather and respond to the student voice. In support of this change, the CEQ Review Board is developing a toolkit to support local collection of end of course feedback (e.g. question banks, different methods of collecting feedback) to be available for the start of AY 2021/22. The Board will look at options for a University wide survey once there is more clarity on the future of the NSS.

4. **Examine data and methodological options for the systematic monitoring of retention, progression, and attainment data.**

A Data Task Group has been established to exploring data options for a new system of monitoring student retention, progression, and attainment. The membership of the Group is as follows: **Dr Paul Norris**, Dean of Quality Assurance and Curriculum Approval (CAHSS); **Paula Webster**, Head of Student Data and Surveys (Student Systems); **Fizzy Abou Jawad**, Vice President (Education), Students' Association; **Brian Connolly**, Academic Services. The Group submitted a progress report to the April meeting of SQAC (the agenda of which focused on QA Data and included the annual Degree Classification Outcomes report). The Committee was presented with a range of analysis on student progression and attainment and noted a number of progression and attainment gaps and asked the Data Task Group to undertake further exploration to help understand possible contributory factors.

5   Other Committee Activity in 2020/21

Other committee activity carried out in 2020/21 is summarised below.

- The attached Annex sets out any new strategies / regulations / policies / codes that the Committees have approved (the more substantive of which are covered in Section 4 above), along with changes to existing documents.

6 Senate Committees' Priorities for 2021/22

6.1 Planning Context

Once again, the year will be planned in the context of Covid-related considerations driven by the institutional response to Scottish Government guidelines. This will influence the mode of operation and interaction between the Committees and their stakeholders.

6.2 Education Committee

Activity
1. Ensure effective responses to ELIR recommendations. (Carried forward from 2020/21).
2. Input into the Curriculum Transformation project [Additional comment to be requested from programme team]

6.3 Academic Policy and Regulations Committee

Activity
1. Input as required into Curriculum Transformation project (led by Education Committee, carried forward from 2019/20).
2. Review of Enhancement-Led Institutional Review outputs and take appropriate action as required. (Carried forward from 2019/20).
3. Monitor any requirement for longer term regulatory and policy changes as a result of Covid-19 and take appropriate action as required. (Continued from 2020/21).

6.4 Quality Assurance Committee

Activity
1. Develop and oversee the implementation of a plan of action in response to the 2021 Enhancement Led Institutional Review (ELIR).
2. Implement the recommendations from the Digital Maturity report and consider how quality processes and the data that they produce can support the Curriculum Transformation programme.
3. Continue to examine data and methodological options for the systematic monitoring of retention, progression, and attainment data.
4. Engage with quality assurance and enhancement-related aspects of the Scottish Funding Council review of coherent provision and sustainability.
5. Implement the recommendations from the review of Course Enhancement Questionnaires (CEQs).

Annex – new regulations/policies/codes, and reviews of and amendments to existing regulations/policies/codes, approved by Senate and its Committees during 2020/21

<mark>[Information on 2020/21 updates to be added below – updating in progress]</mark>

Senate Committee	Name of document	Type of change (New / Revision / Deletion / Technical Update / Reviewed and no changes made)
SEC	Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy	
SEC	Virtual Classroom Policy	New policy approved at SEC in September 2020. See papers at: virtualclassroompolicy.pdf (ed.ac.uk)
SEC	Academic and Pastoral Support Policy	Amendments to the Senior Tutor role description approved by SEC in March 2021. See papers at: 20210303agendapapers.pdf (ed.ac.uk)
APRC	Undergraduate Degree Regulations 2020/21	Reviewed and approved at APRC in March 2021. See papers at: 20210325agendaandpapers.pdf (ed.ac.uk)
APRC	Postgraduate Degree Regulations 2020/21	Reviewed and approved at APRC in March 2021. See papers at: 20210325agendaandpapers.pdf (ed.ac.uk)

The University of Edinburgh
Senate Quality Assurance Committee

20 May 2021

Senate Presentation and Discussion themes for 2020/21 meetings

Description of paper
1. A request to the Committee to suggest themes for the presentation and discussion section of next year's Senate meetings, and a note of recently presented topics.

Action requested / recommendation
2. The Committee is invited to make suggestions for themes for the presentation and discussion sections for Senate 2021/22.

Background and context
3. Senate meetings are divided into two sections: an open presentation and discussion section, and a section for formal business open to Senate members only.

4. All members of staff are invited to attend the presentation and discussion section of the Senate meetings and this is an opportunity to hold open discussions on a key strategic theme.

5. From 2018/19, Senate also began to receive 'year-on updates' on selected topics presented in the previous year. In 2020/21, these updates were incorporated into the main presentation topics.

6. Suggestions for themes are being sought from the Senate Education Committee, the Academic Policy and Regulations Committee, the Senate Quality Assurance Committee, and the Research Policy Group.

Discussion
7. The themes below have been covered in recent years.

2020/21
- Adaptation and Renewal: Students
- Adaptation and Renewal: Research and Innovation
- Adaptation and Renewal: Reshaping and Estates & Digital Infrastructure

2019/20
Main topics:
- Support for Early Career Researchers
- Student Support and Wellbeing: Review of Personal Tutoring and Student Support, and update on the Student Mental Health Strategy
- Enhancement-Led Institutional Review
- Curriculum Reform

Year-on updates:
- Student Experience Action Plan
- Research Excellence Framework

2018/19
Main topics:
- Teaching and Academic Careers
- Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy
- Enhancing the Student Experience – Approach and Action Plan
- Refreshing the University's Strategic Plan
- Research Excellence Framework
- Student Experience Action Plan
- Widening Participation

Year-on update:
- Careers and Employability

Resource implications
8. None relevant

Risk management
9. None relevant

Equality & diversity
10. Committees are encouraged to consider equality and diversity as a factor in their selection of suggestions, and equality and diversity implications will be considered in the final selection of presentation themes.

Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action agreed
11. Committee secretaries will collate suggestions and pass these to the Senate Clerk.

12. Collated themes will be passed to the Principal, who will make the final selection of presentation and discussion themes for 2021/22. Selected themes will be advertised via the [Senate website](#) and in advance of each meeting.

<u>Author</u>
Kathryn Nicol, Academic Policy Officer
5 May 2021

Freedom of Information
Open

20 May 2021

Annual review of effectiveness of Senate Standing Committees

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

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

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

4. In line with the requirements of the Code, during Spring/Summer 2021, Academic Services is conducting an annual review of the three Senate Standing Committees. The outcomes of this review will be reported to Senate in September / October 2021.

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

Discussion
6. In the context of current University priorities and resources, review activities must be proportionate and take into account the ongoing University response to the Covid-19 emergency.

7. The review process is intended to gather information on and evaluate effectiveness in terms of the:
   a. Composition of the committee
   b. Support and facilitation of committee meetings

    c. Engagement of members and knowledge and understanding of their roles and committee remits

    d. Impact and strategic relevance of Senate Committees' work

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

    a. Senate Quality Assurance Committee members are asked to submit written comments to **b.connolly@ed.ac.uk**

    b. Senate Committee members will be invited to respond to an online questionnaire during summer 2021 (managed by Academic Services). Draft questions are appended below.

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

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

Resource implications

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

Risk management

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

Equality & diversity

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

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

13. The report will be presented to Senate and the Senate Standing Committees in September / October 2021. If the review identifies required actions or enhancement opportunities, these will be taken forward by Academic Service (if directly related to the functioning and support of the Senate Committees) or referred to the appropriate body for consideration.

<u>Author</u>
Brian Connolly, Academic Policy Officer
May 2021

Freedom of Information
Open

Appendix 1

Senate Standing Committees: Internal Effectiveness Review 2020-21

Draft questions for Summer 2021 survey

Members of the Senate Committees will be invited to fill in an online questionnaire during Summer 2021 and the draft questions for this exercise are set out below for comment. This is the same question set used in the 2019-20 Senate committee review.

1. **Committee remit**
   1.1. Is the Committee's remit clear? If not, what improvements would you suggest?
   1.2. Is the scope of the remit appropriate?
   1.3. Has the Committee adapted effectively to the challenges or changes in priority?
   1.4. Are you happy with your Committee's use of task groups?
2. **Governance and impact**
   2.1. Do you have a clear understanding of how the Committee fits into the academic governance framework of the University?
   2.2. Do you feel that the Committee makes the desired impact based on its remit and priorities?
   2.3. Are there clear links between Committee business and University strategic priorities?
3. **Composition**
   3.1. Do you think that the current composition of the Committee enables it to fulfil its remit?
   3.2. Is the size of the Committee appropriate in order for it to operate effectively?
4. **Equality and Diversity**
   4.1. Is the composition of the Committee suitably representative of the diverse University population?
   4.2. Are you satisfied that equality and diversity considerations are adequately addressed when discussing Committee business?
5. **Committee members – Role clarity and participation**
   5.1. Are you clear on your role and responsibilities as a Committee member?
   5.2. If this is not clear, do you have any suggestions on how to improve this?
   5.3. If you were a new member in 2019/20, were you satisfied with the induction you were given to the Committee and its business?
   5.4. Is lack of engagement by members ever an impediment to the Committee?
   5.5. Does anything create a barrier to your engagement with the Committee?
6. **Stakeholder Engagement and Communications**
   6.1. Does the Committee engage and communicate effectively with stakeholders? (For example, is the Senate Committees' Newsletter an effective vehicle?)
   6.2. Do you have a clear understanding of your role on the Committee as a representative of your College or Group?
   6.3. Do you have a clear understanding of your role in cascading information from the Committee to your College or Group?
7. **Committee support**
   7.1. Do you feel that the Committee is supported effectively by Academic Services?
   7.2. Does the information provided to the Committee (in format and volume) support effective decision-making by the Committee?
   7.3. Do papers provide you with appropriate levels of detail on the background of issues brought to the Committee, and on how Committee decisions will be implemented?

Appendix 2

Actions identified in the previous annual effectiveness review:

Area Under Review	Recommended Action	Responsible
Remit	1. Committees to discuss the relevance of task groups for areas of business in particular to enable wider participation and representation which could be beneficial to the Committee in its decision making.	Academic Services and Senate Standing Committee Conveners
Composition	2. Committees to consider their membership actively in the course of each year in order to ensure it remains relevant (e.g. co-opted members).	Academic Services
Governance & Impact	3. Paperwork – Committees to consider whether it may be possible to allocate readers for some of the more peripheral items.	Academic Services
	4. Presentation of papers - Committees to invite those who submit papers to present them if they are not a member. This seems to happen in some cases but not in others. This would ensure a more helpful discussion and better understanding for those who are putting the proposal forward for approval and understand the issues raised when a paper is not approved.	Academic Services
EDI	5. More emphasis across all Committees on EDI as an integral consideration to all business and decision making.	Senate Standing Committee Conveners
	6. Committees to request that contributors ensure that cover papers portray more evidence of EDI considerations.	Academic Services
Role	7. Conveners and Secretaries to introduce continually improved inductions for members.	Academic Services and Senate Standing Committee Conveners
	8. Re-set the expectations for the role of members in the cascading of information to constituencies in respect of each Committee's remit and decision making,	

	with specific reference to the requirement for information to be reported to and from relevant College committees.	
Communications	9. Academic Services to work with Committees to build on the success of the Committee Newsletter and to support increase in effective cascading of information to stakeholders.	Academic Services