**Meeting of the Senatus Curriculum and Student Progression Committee (CSPC)
to be held from 2.00p.m. on Thursday 21 January 2016 in the Cuillin Room, Charles
Stewart House**

A G E N D A

1.	**Minutes of Meeting of 19 November 2015**	Enclosed
2.	**Matters Arising**	
	a) **Protection of Children and Protected Adults Policy**	

For Discussion

3.	**Student-Led Individually-Created Courses: Phase 1 pilot evaluation and Phase 2 pilot proposal**	CSPC 15/16 3 A
4.	**Timing of Semester 1 examination diets: December 2016 and December 2017**	CSPC 15/16 3 B
5.	**New Degree Programmes Edinburgh Medical School: Biomedical Sciences**	CSPC 15/16 3 C
6.	**Special Circumstances Task Group: Interim Report**	CSPC 15/16 3 D
7.	**Postgraduate Degree Regulations: Leave of Absence**	CSPC 15/16 3 E
8.	**Approval processes for action where a student has failed to complete all the assessment requirements of a degree programme**	CSPC 15/16 3 F

For Information and Formal Business

9.	**PCIM Post Project Update**	CSPC 15/16 3 G
10.	**Review of the Academic Year**	Verbal Update
11.	**Dignity and Respect Policy**	CSPC 15/16 3 H
12.	**Any Other Business**	

Ailsa Taylor, Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services, 14 January 2016

H/02/27/02
CSPC: 19.11.15

Minutes of the Senatus Curriculum and Student Progression Committee (CSPC) held on Thursday 19 November 2015 at 2.00pm in the Cuillin Room, Charles Stewart House

Present:

Professor Ian Pirie (Convener)	Assistant Principal, Learning and Development
Professor Graeme Reid (Vice-Convener)	Dean of Learning and Teaching (CSCE)
Dr Adam Bunni	Representation and Democracy Manager, EUSA
Professor Helen Cameron	Director, Centre for Medical Education (CMVM)
Ms Joy Candlish	Head of Academic Affairs (CSCE)
Professor Alexis Grohmann	Associate Dean, Academic Progress (CHSS)
Dr Neil Lent	Institute for Academic Development (IAD)
Dr Sheila Lodge	Head of Academic Administration (CMVM)
Mr John Lowrey	Dean of Undergraduate Studies (CHSS)
Dr Antony Maciocia	Dean of Students (CSCE)
Dr Ewen Macpherson	School of Engineering
Professor Alan Murray	Assistant Principal, Academic Support
Mr Barry Neilson	Director of Student Systems
Ms Anne-Marie Scott	IS Learning, Teaching and Web
Ms Imogen Wilson	Vice President, Academic Affairs, EUSA

In attendance:

Mr Kristian Adamson	CHSS Administrator, Governance
Jeremy Bradshaw	Assistant Principal, Researcher Development
Professor Charlie Jeffery	Senior Vice-Principal
Dr Gavin McCabe	Employability Consultant
Professor Susan Rhind	Assistant Principal, Assessment and Feedback
Ms Ailsa Taylor (Secretary)	Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services
Mr Tom Ward	Director, Academic Services

Apologies for absence:

Professor Allan Cumming	Dean of Students (CMVM)
Dr Soledad Garcia - Ferrari	ESALA, Edinburgh College of Art
Dr Theresa McKinven	Head of PG Section (CHSS)

1. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the previous meeting held on Thursday 17 September 2015 were approved as an accurate record, subject to the following amendments:

Item 16 Any Other Business

a) Typo corrected - Professor Graeme Reid

b) Study Abroad Progression Committee - annual meetings had been held in the College of Humanities and Social Science and the College of Science and Engineering (rather than in the College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine as stated).

2. Matters Arising

a) Electronic Business – Children and Protected Adults Policy (matters arising)

The draft Children and Vulnerable Adults Policy that had been brought to the Committee had now been reviewed by the Central Management Group (CMG). Revisions included a change of name, to the Children and Protected Adults Policy. CMG had now approved the policy, subject to final confirmation through the Combined Joint Consultative Negotiative Committee (CSCNC). It was anticipated that this would occur at the end of November 2015, and the outcome of this would be reported back to CSPC.

b) PCIM Follow-Up (item 4)

The Committee noted that Academic Services is in the process of taking forward various follow-up actions from the PCIM project, including:

- working with Colleges to run Board of Studies sessions to discuss progress with the enhanced course descriptor, highlight good practice in writing learning outcomes, discuss team-based approaches to course design, and highlight the implications of the new Consumer and Marketing Authority (CMA) guidance;

- encouraging Schools to remove redundant courses;

- evaluating the impact of the new policy on course and programme handbooks.

c) Proposed Pilot of Examination Arrangements for Online Distance Learning Students (item 5)

Mr Ward updated colleagues on these proposals. It was unlikely that the pilot of examination arrangements would take place as anticipated by the Committee at the last meeting in September 2015, when this item was discussed (as a closed paper). Further details would be made available to the Committee once the position was clarified further.

d) Taught Assessment Regulations 2015/16 (Regulation 15 – Feedback Deadlines)

College representatives were invited to report on any specific opt-outs from the feedback regulation that had been considered by the relevant College committee, in accordance with Taught Assessment Regulation 15.3 (2015/16). This regulation stated….”For other summative assessed work, in exceptional circumstances, where the necessary marking and moderation processes cannot be concluded within 15 working days, Schools may request an opt-out from the relevant College committee”.

The Committee received a tabled paper of the opt-outs from this regulation in 2015/16 from Schools within the College of Science and Engineering. These opt-outs had been approved by the College Learning and Teaching Committee on 20 October 2015.

The Colleges of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine and College of Humanities and Social Science (CHSS) gave verbal updates on the position within their areas. The College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine did not have any opt-outs to report. The College of Humanities and Social Science had received opt-out requests for undergraduate courses from the School of Education. It was understood that there had been some postgraduate opt-outs from CHSS, which would be reported back to CSPC at their next meeting.

The Senior Vice-Principal re-iterated that opt-outs should be seen as the exception and should only be granted where needed to address a specific issue. Every effort should then be made to ensure full compliance with the regulation for the next delivery of the affected course.

> **ACTION: Mr Kristian Adamson to check the position regarding any postgraduate opt-outs from this regulation this year within the College of Humanities and Social Science. Any opt-outs would be reported back to CSPC at the next meeting.**

e) Special Circumstances Task Group Update

The Committee noted that this task group has begun its review of the University's Special Circumstances Policy. At the first meeting the task group had discussed the challenges of taking account of medical documentation (particularly for mental health conditions), alternate approaches to corroborating students' special circumstances (including clarity on the position regarding student self-certification), and varying practices in managing Special Circumstances Committees. The group was also expecting to conduct a review of policy and practice in relation to extensions to coursework deadlines, in the context of special circumstances. An interim report was expected to be presented to CSPC early in 2016.

f) Room bookings (AOB) and pressure on course delivery

At the last CSPC meeting in September, a member had raised a concern about room bookings, in relation to disruption to course delivery at the start of semester 1. Confirmation on the current position had been sought from the relevant service in advance of the meeting and the following had been confirmed:

Concurrent estate development work had caused significant disruption to the teaching estate, delivering a net loss of 30% against the central area total. Business continuity was delivered through a combination of greater use of outlying teaching zones (primarily Holyrood) and the implementation of emergency additional space provided through the College of Science and Engineering, Information Services Group and Schools. Although all teaching was eventually accommodated, it was recognised that an increase in disruption and inconvenience was experienced by students and Schools. The University's Chief Information Officer Gavin McLachlan was currently undertaking a review of recent events, which was due for completion during December 2015. It was likely that key lessons-learned and recommendations would emerge as part of ensuring the elimination of future risk in this area.

Accommodation for core teaching in semester 2 was well advanced, with a small number of outstanding issues to resolve. Arrangements were currently being made to secure some additional space to further alleviate pressure on semester 2 core teaching.

g) Study abroad update

Members were updated on recent reflective discussions on study abroad across Colleges and support services, and plans for future developments, following the College (Humanities and Social Science and Science and Engineering) Study Abroad Progression Board meetings held earlier this year. The Committee agreed to establish a short-life task group to focus this work.

3. Assessment and Progression Tools Project (CSPC 15/16 2 A)

Mr Barry Neilson presented this item.

Colleagues were updated on the latest developments and discussed future plans for this project. All recommendations outlined in the paper presented were firmly endorsed, including:

- a recommendation for open discussions to occur with Schools regarding progression rules and options for any systems development to be able to support these;

- recommendations regarding programme and course administration (e.g. relating to defining compulsory and core modules);

- a recommendation to move to the position whereby ratified semester 1 course marks are all published after semester 1 Boards of Examiner meetings (rather than being ratified by a Board at the end of semester 2). This recommendation was particularly firmly supported by the Committee. Opt-outs would only be approved if there was a firm pedagogical reason for this;

- a recommendation for work to clarify the stages, roles and responsibilities of Boards of Examiners, timelines and publication of outcomes.

Draft proposed key dates for 2016/17 were circulated for consultation.

Members discussed progression rules, and it was noted that approximately 60% of undergraduate programmes had some sort of elevated hurdle into honours study. It was agreed that removal, or harmonisation of the use, of elevated hurdles wherever possible would be extremely desirable. It was further suggested that an analysis of students who fell short of elevated hurdles would help us to further understand the impact of it. Further discussion would be required in some areas on any professional body requirements with regard to elevated hurdles.

The Assessment and Progression Tools project would continue its work with colleagues in Schools and Colleges in developing the tools which would support the assessment and Board of Examiner processes, led by the Steering Group.

4. Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework Third Party Credit Rating Policy (CSPC 15/16 2 B)

The Committee approved this policy, subject to some further minor amendments that had been identified since the policy had been circulated. The policy was to be published on the Academic Services website.

> **ACTION: Pippa Ward in Academic Service to finalise policy and publish on the website at:**
> **http://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/policies-regulations/policies**

5. Student-Led Individually Created Courses (SLICC) Pilot (Verbal Update)

Dr Gavin McCabe gave a verbal update to the Committee on this item.

The Committee discussed how to approach the evaluation of the pilot and agreed in principle that, unless the pilot highlighted any particular issues, a larger SLICCs pilot would run in 2015-16 commencing in semester 2 with students undertaking their SLICCs during the

vacation period as previously. Dr McCabe would bring a paper to CSPC in January 2016 on this. Any more detailed queries from members regarding the evaluation, or aspects that members felt should be covered in the evaluation were to be communicated to Dr McCabe directly over the next few weeks at gavin.mccabe@ed.ac.uk

6. Semester 1, 2015 Examination Timetable (CSPC 15/16 2 C)

The Committee received a briefing paper on semester 1 (2015/16) examination timetable scheduling, for information.

7. Knowledge Strategy Committee Report (CSPC 15/16 2 D)

A report on the latest discussions at the Knowledge Strategy Committee (KSC) was received for information. Members expressed the view that it would be beneficial for Senate to be represented on this Committee by Senate Committee Conveners or Vice-Conveners, given the strategic importance of the Committee.

8. Academic Year Dates 2017/18 and Provisional Academic Year Dates 2018/19 (CSPC 15/16 2 E)

The academic year dates for 2017/18 and provisional academic year dates for 2018/19 were approved as presented.

> **ACTION: Ailsa Taylor to pass approved 2017/18 academic year dates to Communications and Marketing for the semester dates page on the University website: http://www.ed.ac.uk/news/semester-dates**
>
> **ACTION: Ailsa Taylor to ask Student Administration for resit dates for 2017/18 and circulate to colleagues/include on relevant semester dates page.**

9. Student Discipline Officers 2015/16 (CSPC 15/16 2 F)

The Committee approved the revised Student Discipline Officer list for 2015/16. Dr Antony Maciocia had replaced Professor Alan Murray as a Student Discipline Officer. Dr Sarah Henderson (Deputy Director, Postgraduate Taught) was added to the list (College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine), and Professor Sue Rigby was removed.

> **ACTION: Ailsa Taylor to revise Student Discipline Officer 2015/16 list and publish on the website at:**
> **http://www.docs.sasg.ed.ac.uk/AcademicServices/Discipline/StudentDisciplineOfficers.pdf**

10. CSPC Concessions Report 2014/15 (CSPC 15/16 2 CLOSED G)

The Committee noted the contents of the (closed paper) CSPC concessions report.

11. Any Other Business

Professor Graeme Reid extended his thanks to Professor Pirie on behalf of the Committee for all of his support and leadership in his time as Convener of CSPC (since 2011). Professor Pirie was due to retire in December 2015, at which point Professor Alan Murray (Assistant Principal, Academic Support) would become Convener of CSPC.

Dr Antony Maciocia was no longer a co-opted member of the Committee - Dr Maciocia now occupied a position under the Terms of Reference 5.4 (a senior member of staff within the College who has responsibility for maintaining and enhancing the quality of the student experience), by way of his recent appointment as Dean of Students in the College of Science and Engineering.

Ailsa Taylor, Academic Services, 3 December 2015

<u>The University of Edinburgh</u>

Senatus Curriculum and Student Progression Committee (CSPC)

21 January 2016

Student-Led Individually-Created Courses: Phase 1 pilot evaluation and Phase 2 pilot proposal

<u>Executive Summary</u>

At its meeting of 19 November 2015, CPSC received an update on the pilot of Student-Led Individually Created Courses (SLICCs) and discussed how to approach the evaluation and continuation of the pilot. The Committee agreed in principle that, unless the pilot highlighted any particular issues, a larger SLICCs pilot would run in 2015-16 commencing in Semester 2. This paper provides a summary of the main evaluation findings to date and invites CSPC to now formally approve a Phase 2 SLICCs pilot.

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

Excellence in Education; Outstanding Student Experience

<u>Action requested</u>

For note and approval.

<u>How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?</u>

Approval by CSPC will be passed directly to those involved in steering and implementing Phase 2 piloting of SLICCs.

<u>Resource / Risk / Compliance</u>

1. **Resource implications (including staffing)**

   Phase 2 piloting will necessitate staff time from various central services and Schools that choose to be involved. Central services providing the most substantial support have already agreed this in principle; following CSPC approval, the SLICCs Academic Champion and Academic Lead will begin discussions with Schools.

2. **Risk assessment**

   The University's SLICCs pilot has already commanded significant interest elsewhere in the sector. Failure to move ahead with a second phase pilot will likely result in competitors overtaking the University in an area where it has led innovation.

3. **Equality and Diversity**

   The paper does not have any major equality impacts.

4. **Freedom of information**

   The paper is open.

Key words

Student-led; enhancement; independent learning; engagement through partnership; flexibility; interdisciplinary provision

Originators of the paper

Dr Gavin McCabe, Employability Consultancy
Dr Simon Riley, SLICCs Academic Lead
December 2015

STUDENT-LED INDIVIDUALLY-CREATED COURSES
PHASE 1 PILOT EVALUATION AND PHASE 2 PILOT PROPOSAL

Description of paper

1. This paper provides a summary of the main evaluation outcomes from the pilot of Student-Led Individually-Created Courses (SLICCs), and a detailed outline of the follow-up pilot. This is provided to allow CSPC to re-affirm its approval for an expanded pilot commencing in Semester 2 of 2015-16 and agree the pilot's scope.

Action requested

2. CSPC is asked to <u>note</u> the paper, <u>approve</u> the second phase of piloting and <u>advise</u> on the requirements of this piloting to ensure the University can make a decision on the future of SLICCs at the end of this second phase.

Recommendation

3. That CSPC notes the success of the initial SLICCs pilot and formally approves a second phase of piloting to commence in 2015-16.

Background and context

4. CSPC approved the original Phase 1 pilot of Student-Led Individually Created Courses (SLICCs), and approved the generic Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF) Level 8 and Level 10 descriptors used for this pilot. These descriptors were developed in consultation with the Institute for Academic Development and the Employability Consultancy, allowing some flexibility while providing a common framework.

5. At its meeting of 19 November 2015, CPSC received an update on the SLICCs pilot and discussed how to approach the evaluation and continuation of the pilot. The Committee agreed in principle that, unless the pilot highlighted any particular issues, a larger SLICCs pilot would run in 2015-16 commencing in Semester 2. This paper provides a summary of the main evaluation findings to date and invites CSPC to now formally approve a Phase 2 SLICCs pilot.

Student participants

6. Eighteen students submitted proposals for their SLICC that were approved. These students were from seven Schools across all three Colleges: Biological Sciences; Biomedical Sciences; Business; Economics; History, Classics and Archaeology; Social and Political Science; and Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences. Twelve of these successfully completed their SLICC; six students chose not to submit for assessment. Of the twelve students who completed their SLICC, eleven were at SCQF Level 8 for 10 credits, and one was at SCQF Level 10 for 20 credits.

7. Students undertook a diverse range of experiences for their SLICCs, including:

   a. researching Eastern and Western perspectives on longevity and building an educational platform about this topic;

   b. a research expedition in Iceland investigating the global microbial community;

   c. forming a new biannual student-run journal 'Canvas';

   d. work as a Team Leader at a camp teaching Personal Development and Personal Leadership for teenagers in Denmark;

   e. an internship in the Norwegian Armed Forces looking at its HR chain;

> f. a research placement with a neurosurgeon;
>
> g. an internship at ConocoPhillips, looking at changes in the petroleum industry since the oil price drop in 2014 and the impact on employment circumstances.

Evaluation: approach and results

8. The evaluation of the pilot engaged with everyone involved (staff and students) and gathered data through a blend of sources (one-to-one interviews, focus groups, and survey questions). The evaluation explored six themes in particular:

    a. the structure and design of the SLICC framework;

    b. the student support (quantity, quality, medium etc.);

    c. students' motivations and gains;

    d. the process and support for staff;

    e. the staff resourcing required;

    f. gains for staff involved; and

    g. benefits for the institution.

9. Students were particularly enthusiastic about: the focus on adopting a reflective approach to learning; the opportunity for self-designed and owned learning; the skills gained; the deeper and applied learning achieved; the change in their attitude to learning at University and the opportunity to discuss their final achievements, results and feedback with their tutors.

10. Staff valued the focus on student ownership and reflection; the boost to students' assessment literacy; the level of student engagement and ability; the opportunity for cross-disciplinary work with colleagues; and the stimulus to staff members' own learning and teaching practices elsewhere.

11. Overall, staff and student feedback was very positive, valuing the approach of the SLICC framework and the support and guidance given. While each group identified areas for improvements, possible enhancements and strategies to be explored through further piloting, no major issues of concern emerged during the evaluation. Summaries of the findings under each of the evaluation themes are available as an appendix.

12. The External Examiner (Professor Peter McGeorge, Vice Principal for Learning and Teaching at the University of Aberdeen) was particularly impressed by the pedagogic approach, course design, academic rigour, standards achieved and quality of work produced by the students during their SLICCs and the quantity (well beyond 10 credits). The External Examiner commented in his summation at the examination board that an obvious strength of the model was the cross-disciplinary supervisory approach adopted during the pilot and if possible this should be retained and built upon.

Contingencies

13. While the Phase 1 pilot and evaluation did not identify any conceptual barriers to the SLICCs approach or lack of enthusiasm and benefit for those taking part, it did highlight a number of structural limiting factors, in particular associated with cross-University work – for example the difficulties encountered as a consequence of the current course ownership and QA structures (and therefore flow of resources) and the need for each student to seek approval from their Personal Tutor to undertake such a course.

Success criteria for Phase 2 piloting

14. Discussions to date have surfaced a range of success criteria for the Phase 2 piloting:

    a. **academic rigour** by design and that is communicated and perceived;

    b. **scalable and resource efficient** for both academic and non-academic staff;

c. **accessibility** – a generic framework that can be tailored to a wide range of student-driven settings, not limited by discipline;

d. **supports learning and development** – develops students' skills and confidence and increases their learning from their experiences;

e. **acts as a catalyst** for enhancement and co-creation of the curriculum; and

f. **encourages students to integrate learning** between their learning experiences.

CSPC is invited to identify any further success criteria important for the Phase 2 pilot.

Next steps/implications – Phase 2 piloting

Structure

15. Assuming approval for Phase 2 piloting is given by CSPC, it is proposed that this will consist of two elements:

a. 'Pilot – SLICCs for Additional Credit' (follow on from Phase 1 pilot) – proposed for a maximum of 100 students (SCQF Level 8 for 10 credits), selected on a competitive basis, to test both scaling up and ensure that all course enhancements are implemented effectively. During Semester 2, in collaboration with EUSA, students will be recruited to the Phase 2 pilot and will begin their preparations to be ready for their SLICC during summer 2016. The members of the multi-disciplinary SLICCs Pilot 1 Development Group and the Board of Examiners based in the School of Education have agreed to continue to support this. Finished and evaluated by November 2016.

b. 'Pilot – SLICCs for in-programme Credit' – three generic course online (PebblePad) study guides and course templates will be created containing student and staff guidance, reflective learning frameworks, cross-disciplinary Learning Outcomes, and assessment rubrics, at SCQF Levels 8, 10 and 11. Interest has already been expressed in piloting these by several schools (Business, Education, Geosciences, Law, Medicine, PPLS, R(D)SVS; including ODL and on campus MScs at Level 11) as new trial courses within existing programmes, including team-based frameworks and settings. Courses adopting the SLICC framework will use the generic template at the appropriate credit level, which will have some defined flexible space to enable adaptation to their own discipline. These will be assessed through their local Board of Examiners. Finished and evaluated by November 2017.

Enhancements and engaging colleagues

16. Various revisions and enhancements have been identified during the evaluation to date (see above) and will be prioritised and taken forward as appropriate. We will also look at aspects of the SLICCs method and materials that can be repurposed elsewhere within the curriculum, together with supporting the links to the evolving strategy of curriculum enhancement, including research-led learning, community engagement and experiential learning as part of a common core curriculum, being supported by the Assistant Principals team including for Community Engagement and Research-Led Learning.

17. In January the options and enhancements for Phase 2 will be prioritised and the necessary resources and support agreed by the SLICCs Academic Champion (Professor Lesley McAra, Assistant Principal Community Relations), the SLICCs Academic Lead (Dr Simon Riley), budget-holders for the support services most substantively involved (Careers Service / Employability Consultancy, IAD and IS) and staff with experience of supporting the Phase 1 pilot. Following this, Professor Lesley McAra and Dr Simon Riley will engage colleagues to ensure communication with Schools (e.g. Heads of Schools, Directors of Learning and Teaching, Senior Tutors etc) about the SLICC Phase 2 pilots is clear, early and inclusive.

18. There will be two rounds of evaluation. In November 2016 a final evaluation of 'SLICCs for Additional Credit' (so it can be rolled out for summer 2017 (as appropriate) and an interim evaluation of 'SLICCs for in-programme credit' to permit further refinement and allow continuation and rollout for 2017-18, as appropriate. 'SLICCs for in-programme credit' will be finally evaluated in November 2017. Input will be sought from CSPC on the evaluation approach.

19. Built into this evaluation there will be a scoping exercise to consider:

    i. how the SLICC reflective learning framework may be adapted and used in diverse new and existing formats (e.g. short intense, community-based, teamworking, placement experience, year abroad, internships), any governance implications, and exploring its role in potential initiatives and funding to widen student participation in experiential learning activities;

    ii. benchmarking with what other institutions are doing in this area.

For CSPC consideration

20. If CSPC approves a second phase of piloting, CSPC guidance is sought on ensuring this piloting will provide sufficient information for a decision to be made about the future of SLICCs at the University.

21. CSPC is asked to agree that <u>student funding</u> reflects where the student support is undertaken, e.g. to the School hosting the Board of Examiners and teaching load given to those Schools contributing staff time.

22. CSPC is asked to decide:

    a. Should there be a follow up pilot for additional credit at Level 10? (One student completed a SLICC at Level 10 in Phase 1.)

    b. What should happen to a student in good academic standing, who submits a suitable 'SLICC for Additional Credit', but where School support / sign off is not forthcoming? This is considering that this is for additional credit, and currently organised by School of Education.

Consultation

23. This paper has been reviewed and approved by Assistant Principal Professor Ian Pirie, and Assistant Principal Professor Lesley McAra (SLICCs Academic Champion).

Further information
<u>Authors & Presenters</u>
Dr Gavin McCabe, Employability Consultancy
Dr Simon Riley, SLICCs Academic Lead
December 2015

SLICCS: EVALUATION THEMES AND SUMMARY FINDINGS

Structure and design

Students particularly valued the focus on reflection and the extensive preparation required, in particular interpreting the Learning Outcomes for their own setting, and felt these supported the depth and diversity of their learning experiences. Students agreed with the balance between the flexibility of the SLICCs approach and the rigid structures imposed within this (e.g. preparation process, e-portfolio and final report structure), finding both aspects helpful and important. While noting it required significant additional work, students also commented positively on the process of self-grading their submitted report and evidence portfolio.

Staff and the External Examiner commented positively on the academic rigour of the SLICCs, in particular the approach to assessment, feedback and moderation. The approaches to feedback and students self-grading were thought to be particularly strong and saw a high degree of correlation between the students' self-grading and grades awarded by staff.

While double-marking was used for every student in the pilot, going forward this would not be resource appropriate or necessary once confidence in the approach has been evidenced and established; a revised moderation scheme should then be implemented.

Some consideration needs to be given to consider the accessibility of SLICCs. For example, can/should a SLICC be equally accessible to a student working in a supermarket as to a student on a research expedition or structured internship? Are 10 credits appropriate for the amount of student work, and their richness and depth of insight? When using pilot SLICCs as examples for future students, it will be important to also flag other sorts of opportunities on which a SLICC could be based.

Staff also highlighted the possibility of amending the Learning Outcomes so that students own learning from mistakes could be better recognised and appropriately rewarded.

Student support

No significant gaps in the quantity or topics of support were identified. Areas where some increased or revised guidance will be helpful include: specific aspects of PebblePad; guiding framework for reflection; assessment examples and self-grading. By necessity, during the pilot some resources were developed and released as each stage approached – this was picked up in the evaluation and should be avoided/minimised in the future and supplemented by a clearer overview from the outset.

The preparatory workshops, online resources and instructions, and guidance available through email were felt to be particularly helpful, and the clarity of the process and reporting structures were valued. However, some students were not fully certain where to best go for support on particular aspects – greater clarity will be given in the future.

Staff suggested some areas for increased support or instruction to students: how to provide, select and embed evidence; the importance and future benefit of ongoing reflection throughout the process; and pitfalls to avoid. The pilot SLICCs should provide valuable examples to future students, in particular when accompanied by staff commentaries.

Students' motivations and gains

Students' motivations for undertaking a SLICC focussed on the opportunity: to apply learning to 'real life'; to personally design and own their learning experience in an area specific to their interest; to challenge themselves; to be part of innovations in learning practices; and to have recognition of summer activities on their transcript.

Students reported a range of gains, but in particular: development of their skills and ability to reflect; a better understanding of their strengths and weaknesses; seeing the connection between their past and present learning experiences and developing a "mind-set for learning"; and developing deeper and more diverse learning from their experience than would have otherwise been the case.

Process and support for staff

In general staff reported that PebblePad worked well and smoothly. However, where a staff member found PebblePad difficult this could act as a significant barrier and therefore additional work should be undertaken to make the process as easy as possible for staff through additional guidance and simplified language, navigation, and note capturing.

The process for staff was generally well received. Some refinements were suggested, including: requesting reflections from students after their proposal has been approved in response to specific questions; the possibility of a face-to-face or Skype tutorial as part of the approval process; and negotiable deadlines.

Staff valued the training and support that was available. Further work can be done in refining the assessment rubric/grade matrix and adding advice and examples of assessments and feedback to increase staff confidence in dealing with SLICC activities from outside their own area of expertise; possibly also including a mock run-through as part of staff training. The pilot experience will be helpful in developing very clear FAQs and guidance for new staff entering the SLICCs support and assessment process.

Staff resourcing

In the majority of cases, staff commented favourably on the time required as a tutor - typically equating it to 2-3 hours per student spread between initial proposal approval, a mid-point check (if taken up by the student) and the final assessment and feedback. On top of this, students had the option for a tutorial with their tutors following the release of their final marks and feedback – staff and students found this positive where taken. However, for a small number of staff the time commitment proved much more substantial – more work will need to be done to unpick the details of this and to minimise this through additional staff training and support at the outset.

Gains for staff and benefits for the institution

Staff particularly valued the cross-disciplinary working and opportunity to be involved in the co-provision of feedback for students; discussions by staff and the External Examiner at the Examination Board highlighted the quality of feedback this produced.

Staff commented on the insight and valued gained from being part of an innovative and pedagogically sound approach that is stimulating significant interest in the rest of the sector.

Staff saw potential for this as a vehicle for supporting staff CPD in good practice around course and assessment design.

Both students and staff saw the potential to use the SLICCs approach and PebblePad within other existing courses and settings, for example using the SLICCs approach as an architecture for experiential learning (with varying degrees of mentoring) or as a vehicle for co-design of the curriculum. Staff within and beyond the SLICCs pilot have already identified the scope of the SLICCs approach in aligning with and supporting various agendas, in particular community engagement and experiential learning, research-led learning and Graduate Attributes.

Dr Gavin McCabe, Employability Consultancy
Dr Simon Riley, SLICCs Academic Lead
December 2015

<u>The University of Edinburgh</u>

Senatus Curriculum and Student Progression Committee

21 January 2016

Timings of Semester 1 examination diets: December 2016 and December 2017

Executive Summary

Student Administration is recommending the following:

1) *2016 Semester 1 exam diet is extended to include Tuesday 20th and Wednesday 21st December 2016.*
2) *2017 Semester 1 exam diet includes Friday 08 December 2017 (Friday of revision week).*

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

Strategic Theme: Outstanding Student Experience

Action requested

For approval

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Examination diet dates will be communicated via the University's website.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. **Resource implications (including staffing): None**

2. **Risk assessment: None**

3. **Equality and Diversity: No impacts**

4. **Freedom of information: Open Paper**

Key words:

Semester 1 Examination Diet

Originator of the paper

Craig Shearer, Head of Student Administration Services, 11/01/16

Timings of Semester 1 examination diets: December 2016 and December 2017

Timing of 2016 Semester 1 examination diet:

- **Student Administration wishes to recommend that the 2016 exam diet is extended to include Tues 20 Dec 2016 and Wed 21 Dec 2016. This would restore the length of the Semester 1 exam timetable to 12 days as it has been in sessions prior to 2015.**
- CSPC has previously agreed to the following for 2016: diet covering 10 days (08 Dec – 19 Dec 2016) including the use of the Thursday and Friday of Revision Week, [CSPC Jan 2014].
- Exams would finish no later than 21 December as per the agreement with EUSA. The last day of exams in 2015 was 21 December 2015.
- The rationale for recommending a restoration of a 12 day diet is a follows:
  - The compression of the diet from 12 days to 10 days in 2015 produced many challenges to the scheduling of exams which resulted in sub-optimal timetables for students.
  - The compression meant that the timetable could not adequately absorb the impact of the restricted availability of exam venues due to estates work in the Central Area. The reduced availability of exam venues will also be an issue in 2016.
  - More exam slots are required to absorb the increase in the number of students taking exams during the Semester 1 diets.

Timing of 2017 Semester 1 examination diet:

- The diet would be shortened by 1 day due to the Friday of week 2 of the diet falling on 22 December (there is an agreement that exams will not take place later than 21 December). The diet would therefore extend across 11 days.
- **Due to the same rationale as above for 2016 it is recommended that the diet is extended by 1 more day to include Friday 08 December (Friday of revision week) thereby having a 12 day exam diet.**

Summary:

2015		2016		2017	
Mon 21 Sept	Start Teaching	Mon 19 Sept	Start Teaching	Mon 18 Sept	Start Teaching
⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇
Mon 30 Nov	Teaching	Mon 28 Nov	Teaching	Mon 27 Nov	Teaching
Tues 01 Dec	Teaching	Tues 29 Nov	Teaching	Tues 28 Nov	Teaching
Wed 02 Dec	Teaching	Wed 30 Nov	Teaching	Wed 29 Nov	Teaching
Thurs 03Dec	Teaching	Thurs 01Dec	Teaching	Thurs 30 Nov	Teaching
Fri 04 Dec	Teaching	Fri 02 Dec	Teaching	Fri 01 Dec	Teaching
Sat 05 Dec	-	Sat 03 Dec	-	Sat 02 Dec	-
Sun 06 Dec	-	Sun 04 Dec	-	Sun 03 Dec	-
Mon 07 Dec	Revision	Mon 05 Dec	Revision	Mon 04 Dec	Revision
Tues 08 Dec	Revision	Tues 06 Dec	Revision	Tues 05 Dec	Revision
Wed 09 Dec	Revision	Wed 07 Dec	Revision	Wed 06 Dec	Revision
Thurs 10 Dec	Exams	Thurs 08 Dec	Exams	Thurs 07 Dec	Revision
Fri 11 Dec	Exams	Fri 09 Dec	Exams	Fri 08 Dec	Exams (recommendation)
Sat 12 Dec	Exams	Sat 10 Dec	Exams	Sat 09 Dec	
Sun 13 Dec	-	Sun 11 Dec	-	Sun 10 Dec	-
Mon 14 Dec	Exams	Mon 12 Dec	Exams	Mon 11 Dec	
Tues 15 Dec	Exams	Tues 13 Dec	Exams	Tues 12 Dec	
Wed 16 Dec	Exams	Wed 14 Dec	Exams	Wed 13 Dec	
Thurs 17 Dec	Exams	Thurs 15 Dec	Exams	Thurs 14 Dec	
Fri 18 Dec	Exams	Fri 16 Dec	Exams	Fri 15 Dec	
Sat 19 Dec	Exams	Sat 17 Dec	Exams	Sat 16 Dec	
Sun 20 Dec	-	Sun 18 Dec	-	Sun 17 Dec	-
Mon 21 Dec	Exams	Mon 19 Dec	Exams	Mon 18 Dec	
Tues 22 Dec	Vacation	Tues 20 Dec	Exams (recommendation)	Tues 19 Dec	
Wed 23 Dec	Vacation	Wed 21 Dec	Exams (recommendation)	Wed 20 Dec	
Thurs 24 Dec	Vacation	Thurs 22 Dec	Vacation	Thurs 21 Dec	
Fri 25 Dec	Vacation	Fri 23 Dec	Vacation	Fri 22 Dec	Vacation
Sat 26 Dec	Vacation	Sat 24 Dec	Vacation	Sat 23 Dec	Vacation
Sun 27 Dec	Vacation	Sun 25 Dec	Vacation	Sun 24 Dec	Vacation

Craig Shearer (Head of Student Administration Services)   Vers1:07/01/16

<u>The University of Edinburgh</u>

Senatus Curriculum and Student Progression Committee

21 January 2016

New Degree Programmes Edinburgh Medical School: Biomedical Sciences

<u>Executive Summary</u>

A report from Edinburgh Medical School: Biomedical Sciences on two new programmes:

1. BSc (Hons) Integrative Biomedical Sciences (in collaboration with Zhejiang University)
2. BSc (Hons) Biomedical and Laboratory Sciences

The programme proposals in the paper have been approved by the Biomedical Sciences Board of Studies and College UG Studies Committee.

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

The programmes align with the strategic goals of excellence in education and innovation, and strategic themes of global impact, partnerships, and widening participation.

<u>Action requested</u>

CSPC is asked to discuss and comment on the programme proposals. If no substantive issues are identified, CSPC is asked to approve the programme proposals.

<u>How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?</u>

The EMS: Biomedical Science representative will feedback comments from CSPC. If substantive issues are identified, EMS: Biomedical Science will revise the proposal(s), and present the revised proposals to EMS: Biomedical Sciences Board of Studies in February. If approved, the revised proposal(s) will be presented to a future meeting of CSPC for approval.

<u>Resource / Risk / Compliance</u>

1. **Resource implications (including staffing)**
   Resources for the Zhejiang collaboration are managed through an agreed financial business plan.

2. **Risk assessment**
   The paper does not include a risk analysis but a risk register is managed by Edinburgh Zhejiang project steering group.

3. **Equality and Diversity**
   No equality and diversity implications.

4. **Freedom of information**
   This paper can be included in open business.

<u>Key words</u>

Biomedical Sciences, collaboration, HND

<u>Originator of the paper</u>
Professor John Stewart, Director of Teaching, EMS: Biomedical Sciences, January 2016

New Degree Programmes Edinburgh Medical School: Biomedical Sciences

There are two initiatives that Edinburgh Medical School: Biomedical Sciences would like to bring to the attention of the Curriculum and Student Progression Committee for information and comment.

1. BSc (Hons) Integrative Biomedical Sciences
The University of Edinburgh and Zhejiang University signed a Cooperation Agreement establishing the Zhejiang University – University of Edinburgh Institute (ZJU-UoE Institute). (The Cooperation Agreement was approved by UoE Court on 8 December 2014). This institute is being built at the Zhejiang University International Campus at Haining and is one of six institutes being developed by Zhejiang University with different partners from across the world. The ZJU-UoE Institute is a collaboration between the School of Basic Medical Sciences at Zhejiang University and the Deanery of Biomedical Sciences at the University of Edinburgh.

The Cooperation Agreement details the development of an international leading research institution that will offer undergraduate and postgraduate degree programmes dedicated to the production of graduates with leadership skills along with academic excellence, innovative capacity and international vision. Since the official signing ceremony in May 2015 progress has been made in line with the Cooperation Agreement and Articles of Association with the expectation that the ZJU-UoE Institute with be completed before September 2017. Construction at the International Campus will reach a stage where the first cohort of students can be recruited for September 2016. The first degree to be offered by the ZJU-UoE Institute will be a four year BSc (Hons) Integrative Biomedical Sciences degree. This degree will be delivered in English by staff from Zhejiang University, the University of Edinburgh and the ZJU-UoE Institute. All courses will be delivered jointly by the three groups of staff except for a set of first and second year compulsory general courses that are a requirement of the Chinese Ministry of Education.

To date a programme proposal and details of the curriculum for the first two years has been approved through the Biomedical Sciences Board of Studies and College of Medicine & Veterinary Medicine Undergraduate Studies committee. The relevant papers are given in this document and have been presented for discussion and comment. **Guidance is sought as to the level of detail required and if further approval by CSPC is required.**

The Cooperation Agreement and Articles of Association state that the programmes will be subject to the requirements of the University of Edinburgh as an awarding Institute in terms of programme structure and approval of curriculum content, quality assurance arrangements, student progression regulations, assessment and final award. Students will be enrolled in both universities and awarded a degree from each university. The current QAA definitions will classify the award as a "double award". The programme will be subject to appropriate and relevant University of Edinburgh regulations and governance procedures and requirements. Detailed general regulations for the International Campus and ZJU-UoE Institute specific documents are being prepared. **Proposals regarding regulations and policies are being discussed with colleagues at the University of Edinburgh and will be presented to future meetings of CSPC as advised.**

2. BSc (Hons) Biomedical and Laboratory Sciences
A part-time day release programme has been developed to allow individuals in full-time employment who have achieved a HND Biomedical Sciences the chance to study for a degree. The provision of this degree provides employees in the science sector with the opportunity for an academic progression pathway (see Pages 23-24 for further information).

1. **Proposal for a Joint Award Undergraduate Programme with Zhejiang University, China**

   1. **Overview**

Under the terms of a Cooperation Agreement signed by the University of Edinburgh (UoE) and Zhejiang University (ZJU) in December 2014 the two partners have agreed to create an international research- oriented institute within which comprehensive collaborations in teaching, research and service activities in various fields will be established.

As part of this agreement the partners will offer a 4-year joint award (UoE and ZJU) undergraduate BSc Hons degree in **Integrative Biomedical Sciences** starting in September 2016. The programme will be delivered jointly, in equal measure, by staff from both institutions. All components of the programme will be delivered in English. It is intended that the programme will be delivered in its entirety at the new international research institute campus in Haining, China. At this stage there is the possibility that at least in the first year the programme will be delivered at the existing Zhejiang University Zijingang campus in Hangzhou. In the longer term it may be possible that some components e.g. year 4 research projects, may be undertaken in Edinburgh.

   2. **Admission**

The first intake, in September 2016, will be limited to 60 students. This number will increase by 30 in each of the next three years reaching a maximum of 150 students per year in 2019.

Chinese applicants will take the national college entrance examination and achieve the admission conditions as agreed by both Partners including English proficiency to a suitable level as required with all University of Edinburgh programmes. The Institute may also recruit students through the ZJU evaluation track in accordance with standards agreed by both Partners.

At maturity in 2019, 30 places each year will be open to international (non-Chinese) students. In the run up to 2019 the number of places for international students will be the pro-rata equivalent. International students will be selected on the basis of academic ability and other criteria jointly decided by both institutions.

Students will be admitted to this degree programme and will not be able to transfer to other degree programmes except by application through transfer procedures.

   3. **Programme**

Content

The proposed undergraduate degree programme structure is indicated in Table 1. In the first two years compulsory courses make up all 120 credits of the curriculum for all students. In years 3 and 4 students will study the defined core compulsory courses alongside elective choices from the lists indicated.

The aim of the programme is to produce future leaders in the world of Biomedical Sciences. Over the four years, the programme aims to develop knowledge and skills that allow students to,
   - recognise the importance of research to the development of medicine and good health
   - understand how advances in knowledge result from scientific investigation
   - evaluate and discuss contemporary issues in biomedical science
   - understand and apply research methodologies in the biomedical sciences
   - be able to independently research and analyse contemporary questions in biomedical sciences.

It is important to appreciate during design of all aspects of courses that while UoE staff will

participate in face-to-face interactions as "flying faculty" many interactions with UoE staff might also be enacted remotely using electronic "distance learning" means.

At present the course information provided in this document is intended to give an indication of the content and guiding principles being considered during course design. Course names and specific content will be brought to future Board of Studies meetings for approval. It is expected that staff from both institutions will contribute equally to all joint courses.

Years 1 and 2

In the first two years the programme incorporates courses compulsory for all students who undertake an undergraduate degree at University in China (**"ZJU compulsory courses"** in Table 1). These courses have been evaluated and an equivalent SCQF credit load matched to the required student effort. Details of these courses can be found in Appendix A. The majority of these courses will be delivered in English. The few courses delivered in Chinese will be substituted by a course in Basic Chinese language and Culture for non-Chinese speaking international students. In year 1, "ZJU compulsory courses" will be spread over both semester 1 and semester 2 in a 40 credit point, 20 credit point split, respectively. "Integrative Biomedical Sciences 1" will be a whole year course while "Introduction to Molecular and Cellular Biology 1" will be delivered in semester 2. It is anticipated that the delivery of "ZJU compulsory courses" in Chemistry, Maths and Physics can be tailored towards the Biomedical Sciences because they will be delivered to Integrative Biomedical Sciences students on the new international campus.

In year 2, "ZJU compulsory courses" will be delivered entirely in semester 2 and will be worth 20 UoE credit points. "Integrative Biomedical Sciences 2" will be a whole year course. The allocation of "Structure and Functions of the Human Body 2", "Biomedical Genetics 2" and "Microorganisms, Immunity and Development 2" to semesters is yet to be agreed but will meet the requirements of a balanced curriculum across the academic year.

Years 3 [Junior Honours] and 4 [Senior Honours]

In year 3, "Integrative Biomedical Sciences 3" will be a whole year course. "Human Disease: From Clinic to Research 1" will run in semester 1 and "Human Disease: From Clinic to Research 2" in semester 2. The allocation of the four proposed elective courses has yet to be determined though there is a possibility that they may also run for the whole year to allow greater student choice.

In year 4, it is proposed that all courses run for the whole academic year.

The degree classification will be determined from the performance in Junior and Senior Honours at a1:2 weighting.

Table 1. Draft Degree Programme Table B.Sc. Integrative Biomedical Sciences
Degree Type: *Single Honours*

Normal year taken	Course	Schedules	SCQF Level	UoE Credit Total
1.	**Integrative Biomedical Sciences 1**[#]	T	8	40
	Introduction to Molecular and Cellular Biology 1	T	8	20
	ZJU compulsory courses (see appendix A) (University of Edinburgh credit applied after completion)		8	20
	ZJU compulsory courses (see appendix A) (University of Edinburgh credit applied after completion)		8	20
	ZJU compulsory courses (see appendix A) (University of Edinburgh credit applied after completion)		8	20
2.	**Integrative Biomedical Sciences 2**	T	8	40
	Structure and Functions of the Human Body 2	T	8	20
	Microorganisms, Immunity and Development 2	T	8	20
	Biomedical Genetics 2	T	8	20
	ZJU compulsory courses (see appendix A) (University of Edinburgh credit applied after completion)		8	20
3.	**Integrative Biomedical Sciences 3**	T	9	40
	Human Disease: From Clinic to Research 1	T	9	20
	Human Disease: From Clinic to Research 2	T	9	20
	Two of the following:			
	Principles of Neuroscience 3	T	9	20
	Molecular Biology of Health and Disease 3	T	9	20
	Essential Medical Microbiology 3	T	9	20
	Physiology and Pharmacology of Drug Action 3	T	9	20
4.	**Integrative Biomedical Sciences Project**	T	10	40
	Integrative Biomedical Sciences Project Preview Dissertati	T	10	10
	Integrative Biomedical Sciences 4	T	10	20
	Integrative Biomedical Sciences Portfolio	T	10	10
	Two of the following:			
	Cancer Biology	T	10	20
	Inflammatory Diseases	T	10	20
	Stem cells and Regenerative Medicine	T	10	20
	Infectious Disease and Global Health	T	10	20
	Metabolic disorders	T	10	20
	Molecular and Genetic Medicine	T	10	20
	Neuroscience	T	10	20

[#] **Compulsory courses in bold**

General overview of proposals for course content.

Year 1

The first year programme aims to be an exciting exploration of the biomedical sciences, facilitating student development in the key areas of biomedical science including cellular and molecular biology. It is important to note that the general Biological background of Chinese students is lower than that of equivalent students in the UK system. The combination of "Integrative Biomedical Sciences 1" and "Introduction to Molecular and Cellular Biology 1" in Year 1 will provide a solid base for advancing these areas of knowledge alongside developing key learning skills.

"Integrative Biomedical Sciences 1"

1. The course will build foundational core understanding of key concepts in the breadth of biomedical disciplines (physiology, pharmacology, neuroscience, reproductive biology, infectious diseases) and use this knowledge to develop a recognition and understanding of the importance and scope of biomedical sciences. In this respect the "Integrative Biomedical Sciences 1" course will be built around key biomedical themes of global importance delivered through keynote lectures/seminars and supported by extensive small group sessions including facilitated discussions and tutorials led by academic staff. Keynote themes will be developed by, and related to the expertise of, key staff appointed by both institutions to deliver teaching on this programme.

2. The course will embed opportunities to encourage the development of graduate attributes and autonomous learning skills including information gathering, academic writing and reflective practice. Student support in these areas will be focused on the key provision of staged feedback and assessment practice. Tutorials based around developing keynote themes will promote skill development in: how to research a subject; academic writing; making lecture notes; effective reading; understanding expectations in addition to allowing development of an understanding of how skills that promote learning in a group format can facilitate the development as an independent learner.

   There is a need to develop an early dialogue with students about aspirations and expectations of the programme. The dialogue needs to discuss how individual expectations and aspirations might be achieved through a partnership that involves teacher-directed and student self-directed evaluation and reflection.

   It is proposed that an early focus will be on developing a reflective dialogue. This can be based around introductory teaching elements but focussing on defining,
   - the aims and outcomes of the course,
   - the aims and aspirations of students,
   - our emphasis on key study skill development
   - assessment and feedback practices including and evaluation of the balance between formative and summative assessment.

3. It is also important to introduce key concepts of quantification and analysis at this early stage. It is anticipated that investigative practical work will allow an appreciation of the importance of experimental design including use of appropriate methodology, management, analysis (use of appropriate statistics), presentation and interpretation of data and comparison with other work.

4. All students will meet the current University of Edinburgh English language

requirements on commencement of the programme. Nevertheless, the need to foster the development of technical/scientific English language communication skills will be met by embedding this in workshops, facilitated group discussions, tutorials. Focus must be dual – understanding of scientific concepts alongside the understanding and correct use of terminology.

"Introduction to Molecular and Cellular Biology 1"

1. This course, while also integrating with IBMS1 in the delivery of opportunities for skill development, will have a more prominent focus on delivering core material to support the development of a foundational cellular and molecular knowledge.

4. Pre-programme preparation

Issues relating to proficiency in English and difficulties in getting used to a new culture/system when the marks count towards degree classification were raised in previous discussions. One proposal might be to run a 4 week induction course for new students. This course would be an opportunity for the students to revise knowledge in key areas of Biomedical Sciences and consolidates kills that are developed during the first two years of studies in Edinburgh. Such an induction course would have additional resource implications above those of the programme itself.

5. Management

The degree programme will be overseen by joint Programme Directors from each partner institution. The day to day administration of teaching activities on the degree programme will be based at the new International Campus in Hianing, China. All students will be matriculated at the UoE and record management and administration will be overseen by the UoE programme director working with a dedicated a programme administrator within the Biomedical Teaching Organisation (BMTO).

6. Resources

All resources will be provided through an agreed business plan.

7. Relationship

The initial proposal to link the 4-year joint award undergraduate degree in Integrative Biomedical Sciences with the 3+1 BSc/MSc degrees in Biomedical Sciences (Zhejiang) has been removed following recommendations form the Chinese Ministry of Education.

BoS outcome: The programme details were approved in principle in May 2015. The first year courses (Appendix B) were approved November 2015.

CUGSC outcome: The programme and associated courses were approved.

Appendix A

Compulsory General Courses

Year 1 ZJU COMPULSORY COURSES (60 UoE credit points)		
Code	**Course name**	**Period**
021E0010	Chinese Cultivation and Basic Laws	Semester 1
021R0020	Conspectus of Chinese Modern History	Semester 2
371E0010	Chinese social development situation and policies I	Semester 1
03110021	Military Training	Semester 1
031E0020	Physical Education I,II	Semester 1
061B0170	Mathematical Statistics	Semester 1
6112010	Introductory Chemistry for Biologists	Semester 1
061B0422	Chemistry experiment	Semester 1
061R0060	Physics I	Semester 2
061Z0090	Physics Experiment I	Semester 2

Year 2 ZJU COMPULSORY COURSES (20 UoE credit points)		
Code	**Course name**	**Period**
021E0040	Dialectics of nature	Semester 2
031E0031	Basic theory of China's social development	Semester 2
371E0020	Chinese social development situation and policies II	Semester 2
031E0010	Military Theory	Semester 2
031E0040	Physical Education III	Semester 2
031E0050	Physical Education IV	Semester 2
051F0600	English test	Semester 2

Appendix B

Details of year 1 compulsory courses

Introduction

Under the terms of a Cooperation Agreement signed by the University of Edinburgh (UoE) and Zhejiang University (ZJU) in December 2014 the two partners have agreed to create an international research-oriented institute within which comprehensive collaborations in teaching, research and service activities in various fields will be established.

As part of this agreement the partners will offer a 4-year joint award (UoE and ZJU) undergraduate BSc Hons degree in Integrative Biomedical Sciences starting in September 2016. The programme will be delivered jointly, in equal measure, by staff from both institutions and the new international research institute. All components of the programme will be delivered in English. It is intended that the programme will be delivered in its entirety at the new international research institute campus in Haining, China.

A paper that outlined the structure of the four years of the programme was approved by the BMS Board of Studies on 6th May 2015. This paper contains proposals for two core courses in the first year of the degree programme. "Integrative Biomedical Sciences 1" will be a whole year course while "Introduction to Molecular and Cellular Biology 1" will be delivered in semester 2.

Integrative Biomedical Sciences 1

IBMS1 will be a 40-point, whole year, SCQF level 7 course that will begin in academic year 2016/17. The new course will be compulsory for all students on the Joint Uoe-ZJU Integrative Biomedical Sciences degree programme.

Outline for Integrative Biomedical Sciences 1

Course aims

IBMS1 will aim to develop a foundational core biological knowledge in the context of a biomedical background while at the same time managing the unique transitions faced by this cohort of students.

The majority of students entering the programme will come from a background of limited biological knowledge. In the first semester the course aims to provide a broad introduction to all aspects of biology but with an important focus to develop key knowledge in molecular and cellular biology that will prepare students for a more detailed examination of this area in the second semester 20 credit point, SCQF level 7 course, "Introduction to Molecular and Cellular Biology 1". IBMS1 will progressively aim to inspire students by introducing wider biomedically-related themes of global importance delivered through lectures/seminars and supported by extensive small group sessions including facilitated discussions and tutorials led by academic staff.

A major focus will be on the development of the skills students require to support their learning throughout their university career in particular the development of use of

scientificlanguage and communication skills. The course will embed opportunities to encourage the development of graduate attributes and autonomous learning skills including information gathering, academic writing and reflective practice. Student support in these areas will be focused on the key provision of staged formative feedback and assessment practice. Tutorials and small group work based around developing keynote themes will promote skill development in: how to research a subject; academic writing; making lecture notes; effective reading; understanding expectations in addition to allowing development of an understanding of how skills that promote learning in a group format can facilitate the development as an independent learner in a learning community. Place clear emphasis on formative feedback

It is also important to introduce key concepts of quantification and analysis at this early stage. It is anticipated that investigative practical work will allow an appreciation of the importance of experimental design including use of appropriate methodology, management, analysis (use of appropriate statistics), presentation and interpretation of data and comparison with other work.

Nevertheless, the need to foster the development of technical/scientific English language communication skills will be met by embedding this in workshops, facilitated group discussions, tutorials. Focus must be dual – understanding of scientific concepts alongside the understanding and correct use of terminology.

Intended learning outcomes

Students taking this course will acquire:
- A knowledge and understanding of the importance biology and the biomedical sciences.
- A foundational knowledge of molecular and cellular biology that allows further development in late courses.
- An understanding of the techniques of information gathering, academic writing, reviewing and assessing their own work and that of their peers
- An understanding of reflective practice.

Teaching and learning activities

Lectures

Lectures form a key component of delivery of foundational knowledge. While not necessarily being the most desirable method of knowledge exchange it is a style that the majority of students will be used to. As such, balancing lecture style learning with regular small group learning activities allows learning to be developed in a range of formats.

It is anticipated that there will be 2 to 4 lectures (50 mins duration) each week over a 12-14 week semester. The following represents a sequence of learning themes;

Semester 1

- Introduction to Biomedical Sciences: "How we learn". Transition to new learning environment. What is different? What is the same? Aspirations and expectations - biomedical research. This will be tightly linked to small group work that allows students to engage and express their views through discussion of focussed key questions.
- What is life? Evolution. What do we need to know to start answering this question? Growth, reproduction, functional activity. Chemical basis of life (water, carbon). Cellular basis of life - biological molecules - underlying molecular code - nucleic acids. Mechanisms of evolution. The ability to adapt and change across generations - natural selection pressures. Ultimately this theme provides students with an opportunity to discuss key themes that lead to co-development of the structure of course.
- Diversity of Form / Organization – cells, within a cell, between cells, tissue, organs, organism. Plant form and function.
- The Cell – arrangement and function.
  Membranes - structure/fluidity/permeability/passive and active transport;
  Organelles - internal membranes/ cytoskeleton/protein trafficking and metabolic functions.   Comparing and contrasting prokaryotes and eukaryotes (animal, plant, fungi).
- The Nucleus and ER: DNA, RNA, protein: mechanism and regulation of transcription and translation (gene expression). Mutation cause and consequences.
- Mitochondria – energy production - cellular metabolism / aerobic, anaerobic respiration. Plants – chloroplasts - photosynthesis. Ecology – symbiosis.
- Growth – Mitosis (cell-cycle) - phases of cell division and their control
- Genetics – Mendel, Chromosomes, "Human Genome", Meiosis

Semester 2

- Reproduction/development - Reproductive system, sexual and asexual reproduction, reproductive cycles, mechanisms and anatomy, hormonal control systems, fertilization early development. Morphogeneisis, determinants of cell fate during development.
- Cell communication: signal transductions: Principles of cell signalling. Receptors and inter and intra-cellular signalling. Nerve - electrical basis of nerve cell function; chemical basis of synaptic transmission.
- Cell communication: signal transductions: endocrine - long-distance signalling between cells, principle of feedback control.
- Cell communication: signal transductions: immune systems - recognition of infective agents and response -innate and adaptive immunity.
- Homeostasis (using cardiovascular system as an example) - structure and function of cardiovascular system. Delivery of nutrients, oxygen, chemical mediators (hormones) to and waste products, CO_2 etc. away from tissues. Homeostatic control - blood pressure, cardiac output, vascular resistance.
- Sensory and Motor systems (Perceiving and responding to external stimuli). Sensory receptors (example?) and signal transduction, relay to CNS. Muscle contraction, musculoskeletal system, locomotion.
- Microorganisms, immunity, ecology - Viruses, bacteria, protozoa. Protection against infection; recognition of infective agent.

The importance of body systems
- Nervous system
- Digestive system
- Excretory system - kidney, osmoregulation
- Respiratory system

Tutorials and Small Group Consolidation Activities.

One academically chaired session each week. This may be delivered on campus or through online activities linked to flying faculty requirements. Discussions should be supplemented with peer-led group activities.

Aims;
- to consolidate material delivered in lectures thorough facilitated discussion of key issues.
- to develop the ideas introduced in the lectures and consolidate knowledge through guiding effective background reading the gathering of relevant supplementary material.
- to allow individuals to develop the skills that promote learning in a group format
- to encourage communication/engagement and development of appropriate scientific language.
- to develop key skills in how to research a subject; academic writing; making lecture notes; effective reading.

These sessions provide focal opportunities to develop English language skills through for example preparing answers to short answer questions. E.g. What is biomedical sciences? What do biomedical Scientists do? How do they communicate their work? What are the major questions that need to be addressed by biomedical scientists in the next five years?

Both discussion and tutorial sessions will provide formative and summative links to course assessment tasks.

Small Group Facilitated Discussion Topics.

As the course develops and the students' knowledge base expands it is proposed to introduce regular tutor-led discussion topics that address wider biomedically-related themes of global importance. Topics will be linked to material being delivered in lectures. Suggested themes include;

- Targeting the membrane receptors for anti-lung cancer therapy
- Debates over the safety of transgenic crops
- Genetics and disease
- Infertility
- Obesity
- Foetal development and the immune system
- Pain
- Cancer-dysregulation of cell growth.

13

- Regenerative Tissue Repair
- Biodiversity
- What is the Human Genome project? Why is it important? Personalised medicine.
- Antimicrobial resistance / Vaccines / Autoimmune disease / Immune response contributing to disease e.g. Rheumatoid arthritis

Students will be provided with a framework to address a discussion topic and asked to generate short pieces of written work that summarise key discussion points thereby promoting academic writing skill development.

Practical work.

Given the uncertain nature of practical laboratory facilities, at least in the short term, investigative practicals will be based on data acquisition in classroom appropriate exercises, e.g. reflex evaluation, peripheral vision, and the use of online and computer simulations that allow the investigation of appropriate research questions. For example, practical work can be linked to subject material being delivered in lectures e.g. use of different microscopical techniques - demonstrating increasing levels of ultrastructural detail.

A key learning objective here is the development of an understanding of scientific method. "Creating and testing an hypothesis"
- Formulating the research question
- Appropriate experimental design
- Planning the experiment
- Acquiring and recording results
- Analysing results – use of statistics
- Interpreting and discussing results.

The use of case study-style problems is an attractive approach in the absence of laboratory access.

Assessment and feedback strategies

- 30% Exam

While a non-examination assessment strategy is an attractive approach it is felt at this stage that this might be too radical for this cohort of students used to examination type assessments. It is thus proposed to retain a component of examination-based assessment in the form of a MCQ-based exam that addresses material delivered throughout the course.

It is expected that at the end of each teaching block students will be expected to complete a set of MCQs that test their knowledge and understanding of the material. Formative review of these tests in consolidation sessions allows individual students to review and reflect on their progress.

- 70% ICA

The skills and attributes being developed in this course are highly suited to different forms of in-course assessment. It is also key that we assess the development of English language use in the context of scientific writing. Thus, it is proposed that a portfolio approach incorporating

a number of different components of an individual students work will be developed. This willinclude opportunities to develop short-answer writing, essay writing, posting to discussion boards after group discussions, report writing, oral and poster presentations, reflective and re-evaluative writing. Many activities will be based on group work and students will be given the opportunities to develop assessment criteria and through peer evaluation apply these criteria in a summative assessment environment.

Students will be required to pass both exam and ICA but not individual components of ICA as learning outcomes will be extensively over-lapping with the principle aim of fostering key language and communication skills in the context of knowledge acquisition and understanding.

Embedded within all discipline based assessment will be evaluation of reading, writing, listening and speaking English language skills. This evaluation will provide formative guidance that will run in parallel with a ZJU General compulsory course in English language.

Prerequisites for IBMS1

Must be enrolled on one of the UoE-ZJU Integrative Biomedical Sciences degree programme.

Introduction to Cellular and Molecular Biology 1

Outline

"Introduction to Molecular and Cellular Biology 1" will be a SCQF level 8 course worth 20 credit points that runs in semester 2 and will run for the first instance in academic year 2016/17. The new course will be compulsory for all students on the Joint UoE-ZJU Integrative Biomedical Sciences degree programme.

Course aims

This course will focus on delivering core material to support the development of a foundational cellular and molecular knowledge. Cells are the basic units of life and this course introduces and investigates what we know about their structure, function and behaviour and how they form the fundamental basis of life. The course will integrate with "Integrative Biomedical Sciences 1" in the delivery of opportunities for learning and skills development.

Intended learning outcomes

Students taking this course will acquire understanding and knowledge:
- of the relationship between the structures of cellular macromolecules and their biological functions.
- at a molecular level of the basic principles of organisation, structure and activity in pro- and eukaryotic cells.
- of experimental methods used to investigate cellular and molecular biology. How to design and carry out experiments, draw quantitative conclusions from experimental data and present the results in the context of theoretical knowledge.
- of the importance of cellular and molecular biology to the biomedical sciences.
- of the techniques of information gathering, academic writing, reviewing and assessing their own work and that of their peers
- of reflective and re-evaluative practice.

Teaching and learning activities

The course will integrate a range of different learning and teaching formats, balancing lecture style learning with regular small group learning activities and online activities.

<u>Lectures</u>
It is anticipated that there will be 32 hours of lectures over the semester ranging from 2 to 4 (50 mins duration) each week. The following represent three main themes within the course.

Lectures form a key component of delivery of foundational knowledge under three main themes

1. The Biochemistry of Life (3 weeks) – See Appendix B for attached paper "Biochemistry module overview" for example of more detailed content and structure.
   - Introduction to the course and Biochemistry; Catalysis and the use of energy by cells;
   - Cellular macromolecules - Proteins and their structure
   - Proteins and their interactions.

2. The Molecular Basis of Genetics (4 weeks)
   - DNA Replication, Mutation and Repair
   - DNA recombination
   - DNA to protein
   - Control of Gene Expression

3. The Organization of the Cell. (8 weeks)
   - Cell Membrane
   - Vesicular Trafficking and Protein sorting
   - Energy conversion (Mitochondria)
   - Cell communication and Signalling
   - Cytoskeleton
   - Cell cycle
   - Cell death
   - Cell Junctions and Cell adhesion

Tutorials and Small Group Consolidation Activities.

Aims;
- to consolidate material delivered in lectures thorough facilitated discussion of key issues.
- to develop the ideas introduced in the lectures and consolidate knowledge through guiding effective background reading the gathering of relevant supplementary material.
- to provide opportunities to review learning and preview next topics
- to allow individuals to develop the skills that promote learning in a group format
- to encourage communication/engagement and development of appropriate scientific language.
- to develop key skills in how to research a subject; academic writing; making lecture notes; effective reading.

Small Group Facilitated Discussion Topics.

Tutor-led discussion topics that address the experimental evidence behind key concepts introduced in the main lecture series. Students will be provided with a framework to prepare for a discussion topic, including reading sources and key questions to address. They will work in small groups to prepare oral and written summaries of key points.

Practical work.

The techniques used to manipulate DNA, RNA and protein, and the methods by which cells and their sub-cellular components can be visualized form the basis of practical classes. This methodology will be illustrated through the experimental expression of GFP/RFP in living cells. If the limitations of facilities prevent the actual hands-on experience of this practical we will produce a tutor/student video that illustrates the experiment while emphasizing the main facets of the experimental process - design and execution of an experiment, the analysis and interpretation of quantitative data and the development of conclusions in the context of theoretical knowledge.

Practical work will also incorporate the use of simulation software that,

- allows modelling of simple chemical reactions and an examination of their relevance to real-life biological systems;
- allows examination of the structure of cellular macromolecules including conformational changes and interactions between molecules associated with normal function and dysfunction in disease.

Assessment and feedback strategies

• 30% Exam

While a non-examination assessment strategy is an attractive approach it is felt at this stage that this might be too radical for this cohort of students used to examination type assessments. It is thus proposed to retain a component of examination-based assessment in the form of a MCQ-based exam that addresses material delivered throughout the course.

• 70% ICA

This will include opportunities to develop short-answer writing, essay writing, posting to discussion boards after group discussions, report writing, oral and poster presentations, reflective and re-evaluative writing. Many activities will be based on group work and students will be given the opportunities to develop assessment criteria and through peer evaluation apply these criteria in a summative assessment environment.

Students will be required to pass both exam and ICA but not individual components of ICA as learning outcomes will be extensively over-lapping with the principle aim of fostering key language and communication skills in the context of knowledge acquisition and understanding.

For example write-ups of the results of seminars/discussion sessions in the form of a few short paragraphs and one or two figures could be used for formative and summative assessment. Detailed instructions will be provided to guide students' writing. Students will get feedback on their conceptual understanding, ability to synthesise and apply material from the first three lessons, as well as on the quality of their written English.

It is expected that at the end of each week of teaching students will be expected to complete a set of MCQs that test their knowledge and understanding of the material. These may be graded to constitute small amount of final grade to incentivise participation, but encourage risk-taking. Formative review of these tests in consolidation sessions allows individual students to review and reflect on their progress.

Pre-requisites for "Introduction to Cellular and Molecular Biology 1"

Must be enrolled on one of the UoE-ZJU Integrative Biomedical Sciences degree programme.

Appendix 1

Introduction to Cellular and Molecular Biology 1 - Biochemistry Module Overview

Week	Lecture (2 hours)	Seminar
1	Introduction to Biochemistry	Biochemical simulations
2	Proteins: Structure	Looking at structures
3	Proteins: Interactions	Case discussion: hemoglobin

Lecture 1: Introduction to Biochemistry

Learning goals

Think	Name the type of molecules most commonly found in living organisms Give examples of how smaller building blocks combine to form larger structures Explain some of the functions of sugars and fatty acids Explain how DNA encodes information Explain the chemical composition of DNA Compare and contrast DNA and RNA
Do	Read a chemical equation and name its parts Recognise and examine a DNA structure
Feel	Appreciate that complexity can arise from simple building blocks See the importance of knowing about the chemical components of a cell See the beauty of DNA Look forward to the genetics module

Lesson Plan

Segment	Topics	Mode
Introduction	Road map Learning goals Ground rules and expectations	Lecture
Basic Chemistry review	Chemical notation Reaction rates/dissociation constants Charges Chemical bonds Acids and bases Catalysis	Quiz to be completed in small groups Whole class discussion

Segment	Topics	Mode
Molecules of Life	Molecular composition Function within the cell Sugars Fatty acids ATP Ions Water DNA, RNA Proteins	In-class research Mini-presentations
DNA review	Genetic code (3-letter code) Replication DNA as a storage device DNA as a template for making protein Transmission to the next generation Base pairs	Small group discussion
Chemistry of DNA	Single base Base pairings Double helix How do we know? DNA discovery DNA vs RNA	Lecture with turn-and-talks
Genetics preview	Chromosomes Transcription, translation Mutations, polymorphisms Coding/noncoding regions	Lecture
Wrap-up	Review Preview next session Homework assignment	Student-led review

Seminar 1: Biochemical simulations

This is a hands-on workshop introducing students to the simulation software COPASI, which allows the dynamic simulation of systems of chemical reactions. Students will learn how to use COPASI and use it to simulate simple reaction systems and to build intuition about reaction rates, reaction equilibria, catalysts etc. We will also look at a simple model of a real-life biological system.

Lecture 2: Proteins: Structure

Learning goals

Think	Know the names and one- and three-letter codes of the 20 standard amino acids Classify amino acids into groups according to chemical properties Explain how a peptide bond is formed Explain the terms primary, secondary and tertiary structure Give examples of secondary structure motifs Name methods used to determine protein structure
Do	Draw the chemical structure of a polypeptide Recognise alpha-helixes and beta-sheets when looking at a protein structure
Feel	Reinforce the idea of complex structures arising from small building blocks Appreciate the merits of different ways of representing protein structures Appreciate that structure determination is a lively and still-evolving research field Be curious about how protein structure and function are related

Lesson Plan

Segment	Topics	Mode
Introduction	Review from last week Road map Learning goals	Lecture/discussion
Amino acids	Structures of amino acids Properties of amino acids Amino acid classifications Similarities and differences One- and three	Self-paced exercise
The peptide bond	Chemistry of a peptide bond Properties of the peptide bond	Lecture + short exercise
Levels of protein structure	Primary, secondary, tertiary, quaternary	Lecture + short exercise
Secondary structure	Primary to secondary structure Protein folding Looking at protein structures Motifs (alpha-helix, beta-sheet)	Small group discussion Lecture + software demo
Higher-order structure	Tertiary structure Quarternary structure	Lecture
How do we know?	Protein structure determination	Mini-presentations of homework assignments
Wrap-up	Review Homework assignment	Student-led discussion

Seminar 2: Looking at structures

This is another hands-on software workshop. Students will learn to use UCL Chimera to examine protein structures. This includes basic Chimera commands (zoom, rotate, highlight, colour, …), but will also be an opportunity to examine the structure of various proteins to get a feel for the wealth of protein shapes functions. The tutorial will include examining the structure of complexes (protein-protein and protein-DNA), looking at a protein undergoing conformational change and comparing the wildtype form of a protein to a mutated form that affects its structure. Among other proteins, students will look at hemoglobin, which they will revisit in week 3.

Lecture 3: Proteins: Interactions

Learning goals

Think	List ways to modify a protein's activity Compare and contrast different forms of modifying a protein's activity Define the terms positive cooperativity, negative cooperativity, non-cooperativity Explain the terms reaction energy, activation energy, catalysis Explain the concept of allostery Explain allosteric activators and inhibitors List important biological pathways Give examples of pathway motifs and their function
Do	Read and interpret a binding curve Interpret an energy diagram Interpret Km and vmax values
Feel	Appreciate how finely tuned protein regulation is Feel comfortable interpreting graphs and diagrams Appreciate that structure and function interact Revisit once more the concept of modularity

Lesson Plan

Segment	Topics	Mode
Checkin	Review of last week Learning goals Roadmap	Lecture
Modifying a protein's activity	Conformational change Small molecule binding Binding other proteins Post-translational modifications Production/degradation Subcellular localisation Comparing modification types	Small-group discussion

Segment	Topics	Mode
Binding curves	Reading and interpreting binding curves Cooperativity	In-class discussion
Energy of chemical reactions	Activation energy Reaction energy Reading energy diagrams Catalysts	Small group exercise
Enzymes	Enzymatic reactions Energy and enzymes Characterising an enzymatic reaction	Short lecture
Allosteric regulation	Allosteric sites Energy and allostery Allosteric modulators	Lecture with turn-and-talks
Pathways	Important biological pathways and their main functions Metabolic pathways Signalling	Student presentations of homework assignment
Pathway motifs	Function of pathway motifs Amplification Positive feedback Negative feedback Convergence Bistability	Hands-on exercise (COPASI)
Wrap-up	Review	Student-led discussion

Seminar 3: Case discussion: hemoglobin

In this discussion-based tutorial, students review and apply content from the first three lectures in order to understand the function (and some malfunctions) of hemoglobin. They will examine the structure of hemoglobin and interpret it in terms of hemoglobin's biological function. They will also interpret oxygen binding curves under varying conditions and think about how this relates to oxygen uptake and release in the body. Finally, students will revisit the concept of competition when working out what happens in CO poisoning.

Assessment

- Write-up of the results of seminar 3 in the form of a "proto-essay" (a few short paragraphs and one or two figures). Detailed instructions will be provided to guide students' writing. Students will get feedback on their conceptual understanding, ability to synthesise and apply material from the first three lessons, as well as on the quality of their written English. This could be a formative-only assessment or form part of the final grade.
- Student self-assessment quizzes (graded to constitute small amount of final grade to incentivise participation, but encourage risk-taking).

2. Proposal for new Honours Degree Programme: Biomedical and Laboratory Sciences

1. Overview

NHS Lothian and Fife College have developed a Science Training School to allow students to progress from the Modern apprenticeship to the HND Biomedical Sciences. This partnership project is realising the recommendations set out in the Interim Report from the Commission for Developing Scotland's Young Workforce, identifying 10 of the 12 recommendations and is further supporting the College in meeting its Community Plans and College Regional Outcome Agreements.

The next stage was to develop a progression route from HND to third year of an articulated Institute of Biomedical Scientist (IBMS) degree. Currently there are very few Universities in Scotland who have a part-time day release science programme and there are no universities in the Lothian region who have an IBMS accredited degree. The provision of the bespoke degree provides employees in the science sector with the opportunity for an academic progression pathway.

The flexible approach to the curriculum will allow employees of NHS Lothian the opportunity to obtain top up modules for degrees which are not IBMS accredited. Currently this provision is only available either from Glasgow Caledonian University or distance learning from Ulster University. This provision is not always flexible for a full time member of staff.

2. Mode of Study

Students will complete their HND in Biomedical Science and enter directly into Year 3. The programme will build on the students' previous study experience. Students will study on a part-time basis on day release (taking 60 credits per year of study) and complete their studies over 4 years.

Students will be given 240 credits in recognition of prior learning for HND in Biomedical Science which will give students 480 credits required for Honours Degree in Biomedical and Laboratory Sciences.

3. Admission

To be admitted to the programme, students must have achieved A Grade in HND Biomedical Science from Fife College. It is expected that student numbers will be 4 when the course commences in September 2016. It is anticipated that the numbers will increase for the 2017 intake with a proposed maximum of 10 students per year.

4. Programme Content

Students will study 60 credits each year and courses will run in Semester 1, Semester 2 and the Summer Block. All courses will be compulsory except for a choice of Honours Elective courses in semester 1 of year 4.

Junior Honours		
Year 1 (September-August and delivered on a Wednesday)	Biomedical Sciences 3	40 credits at SCQF Level 9
	Infectious Diseases 3 [New]	20 credits at SCQF Level 9
Year 2 (September-August and delivered on a Monday)	Clinical Biochemistry & Endocrinology 3	20 credits at SCQF Level 9
	Clinical Immunology & Haematology 3	20 credits at SCQF Level 9
	Research Strategies in Biomedical and Laboratory Sciences [New]	20 credits at SCQF Level 9
Senior Honours		
Year 3 (September – August and delivered on Wednesday)	Biomedical and Laboratory Sciences Core [New]	40 credits at SCQF Level 10
	Biomedical and Laboratory Sciences Project Preview Dissertation [New]	10 credits at SCQF Level 10
Y3-4	Biomedical and Laboratory Sciences Reflective Portfolio [New]	10 credits at SCQF Level 10
Year 4 (September – August – delivery period variable depending on the students choice of Elective Course)	Honours Elective Course	20 credits at SCQF Level 10
	Biomedical and Laboratory Sciences Project [New]	40 credits at SCQF Level 10

5. Management

The degree programme will be run from Edinburgh Medical School: Biomedical Sciences and will be administered by the Biomedical Teaching Organisation (BMTO).

6. Resources

This proposal has been discussed with University Director of Planning and has SFC funded places. The curriculum will comprise new compulsory courses that will be developed in line with the course proposal forms attached to this paper. In the first instance the elective courses comprise a selection of courses that are already delivered in Biomedical Sciences.

The extra monies required to administrate the programme, run the course and support projects will be covered by College funding to the BMTO teaching budget.

BoS outcome: The programme and associated courses were approved.

CUGSC outcome: The programme and associated courses were approved.

The University of Edinburgh

Senatus Curriculum and Student Progression Committee

21 January 2016

Special Circumstances Task Group: Interim Report

Executive Summary

This is the interim report of CSPC's Special Circumstances Task Group (SCTG). The paper outlines the work of the SCTG in semester 1 and sets out proposals for clarifying the University's practice in handling special circumstances cases, and in dealing with requests for coursework extensions.

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

Excellence in Education; Outstanding Student Experience
Reviewing the University policy on extensions to coursework deadlines, in the context of special circumstances, is the second item in the list of CSPC priorities for 2015/16.

Action requested

CSPC is invited to comment on and **endorse** the proposals, recognising that this work is an early stage and, following College and further TG input, will come back to CSPC for final decision.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Following discussion on 21 January 2016, the TG will produce a final report, with proposals for an updated Special Circumstances Policy and changes to relevant regulations, to be discussed at CSPC in April 2016. The agreed policy etc. will be communicated to staff using Academic Services' annual update on new and revised policies and via College events for Boards of Examiners and Special Circumstances Committees.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. **Resource implications (including staffing)**
   There will be resource implications from the proposals. These will be outlined in the final report.

2. **Risk assessment**
   The TG is undertaking this work on behalf of CSPC to reduce the potential risk of treating students inconsistently due to unnecessary variety of practice. This work forms part of the University's work on standardisation, simplification and increasing consistency.

3. **Equality and Diversity**
   An Equality Impact Assessment will be carried out as part of the work of the task group.

4. **Freedom of information**
   The paper is open.

Key words

special circumstances, boards of examiners, special circumstances task group

Originators of the paper

Sara Welham and Claire Edminson, Academic Services, SCTG, 13 January 2016

Special Circumstances Task Group: Interim Report

Description

1   This is the interim report of CSPC's Special Circumstances Task Group (SCTG). The paper outlines the work of the SCTG in semester 1 and sets out proposals for clarifying the University's practice in handling special circumstances (SC) cases, and in dealing with requests for coursework extensions. The existing SC policy and form are online and the Taught Assessment Regulations contain information about SCs (40) and coursework extensions(25):
www.docs.sasg.ed.ac.uk/AcademicServices/Policies/Special_Circumstances.pdf
www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files//specialcircumstancesform.docx
www.docs.sasg.ed.ac.uk/AcademicServices/Regulations/TaughtAssessmentRegulations.PDF

Action requested

2   **CSPC is invited to comment on and endorse the proposals, recognising that this work is an early stage and, following College and further TG input, will come back to CSPC for final decision.**

Work of the Special Circumstances Task Group

3   The SCTG has held two meetings: on 16.11.15 and 11.12 15. The first meeting focussed on an initial discussion of the issues in the task group's remit, and other issues raised by stakeholders, such as medical evidence and certificates. The group considered the variety of SC guidance and documentation within the University, Colleges, and EUSA. It also had an initial discussion about the data protection implications of special circumstances processes. The mental health aspects of special circumstances formed the main discussion item of the second meeting, with very helpful input from Robby Steel, Consultant Liaison Psychiatrist, and from Martin Judd, Assistant Director of Student Disability Services, which will be used to develop the SC policy. The meeting also discussed initial proposals for revising the Special Circumstances Policy and for handling coursework extensions, which form the basis of the paper below.

4   Future meetings of the TG are scheduled for 26 January and 18 March 2016. They will consider how EUCLID could be used to support business processes for special circumstances; data protection issues; further benchmarking input; and will produce a final report for CSPC for its 14 April 2016 meeting. **In addition to the CSPC discussion, College representatives on the TG and on CSPC are asked to discuss the proposals below in relevant College committees and send comments to the SCTG support via the College representatives on the TG.**

Proposals: Special Circumstances Policy and Business Processes

5   The TG sets out some proposals here for clarifying the role and responsibilities of Special Circumstances Committees and other aspects of the Special Circumstances Policy. If CSPC supports these proposals, they will guide the revision of the Special Circumstances Policy and the relevant sections of the Taught Assessment Regulations and other documentation.

   a.   In general we should aim for greater **consistency** in decision-making for handling student cases – the aim should be for cases to be treated equivalently wherever in the University. A clearer University Policy, combined with exemplars and standardised business processes will help this.

b. **Documentation simplification and consistency:** the TG propose that we rationalise the volume of documentation providing advice on handling special circumstances and avoid overlap between documents. For example:
    o Academic Services has deleted the 'Notification of Special Circumstances: Student Actions' and the 'Notification of Special Circumstances: Staff Actions' documents – relevant information is included in other documents, like the SC Policy and form.
    o The Special Circumstances Policy should set out requirements for all relevant aspects of the process, and the level of detail in the Taught Assessment Regulations should therefore be reduced. These changes will come into effect from academic year 2016/17.
    o Relevant information in the Academic Services guidance on Medical Certificates will be incorporated into the revised Special Circumstances Policy.
    o Colleges and Schools will no longer have their own supplementary guidance.
    o EUSA will maintain its own guidance, which will be consistent with the policy.

c. **How to submit cases:** Academic Services' webpages on the special circumstances process will provide information to students regarding how the process works and how to submit special circumstances, with links to the revised SC policy and form. It will also try to give students realistic expectations regarding the possible outcomes of the process. These changes could be made following CSPC's agreement of the policy and regulations in April 2016.

d. **Special Circumstances Committees (SCCs) and the Board of Examiners (BoEs)**: The SCC will continue to be responsible for determining:
    - whether there were special circumstances;
    - when they happened;
    - and what impact they had on the assessment process.
    SCCs' decisions on these matters are binding on Boards of Examiners (and other bodies, such as College Committees with responsibility for making decisions under Taught Assessment Regulation 63) – under no circumstances are they entitled to come to a different conclusion.

    Although the TG recognises that the SCC will not always have the full information available to the BoE, they are firmly of the view that the SCC should continue to make *SCC recommendations* to the BoE regarding the *appropriate assessment decision action* to take, in the light of the established special circumstances. These recommendations would not be binding on the BoE, but would only be set aside if there was relevant information of which the SCC was not aware. The SCC could suggest a range of options to the BoE, who would therefore have an active role in determining the appropriate action to take for students at programme level for award and progression decisions.

e. **Relationship between SCC and Learning Profiles:**
    o Special circumstances should be a mechanism for intermittent or one-off problems, and defined as circumstances exceptional to the individual student in comparison to how they would normally function.
    o The Policy should clarify the situation for students who put in multiple SC cases, as this may suggest a repeated pattern that should be investigated. It is important to differentiate between special circumstances and learning profile adjustments. If students have chronic physical or mental health conditions that affect their performance on an ongoing basis, this should be addressed by Student Disability Services – they need a learning profile – rather than by repeated cases for special circumstances. They could also be referred to the Support for Study panel for further

exploration of the situation and how they might better be supported. We will consider a metric on the degree of repetition but it will not be a simple limit on numbers.

o That is not to say students with chronic conditions are not also eligible for SC if their circumstances change; they could suffer from another unrelated health matter, or have an acute episode, and require SC.

f. Responsibility for SC decisions / recommendations:

o The Policy should clarify which school is responsible for the SCC decision or recommendation (i.e. owning programme, or owning course?). This needs considering in the light of SCC recommendations for action.

o The Policy should clarify the relationship between the programme BoE and the course BoE, e.g. when does an SC remain 'open' for an honours student for consideration by the programme board? If an item of assessment is disregarded for the course mark, presumably it wouldn't get passed to the programme board. But if a borderline was awarded a pass, would the programme board consider dropping the course from the classification calculation?

o Under no circumstances should External Examiners be asked to advise SCCs on individual cases.

o The Policy should specify the decisions available to the SCC. It could also clarify which decisions can be made by schools, and which decisions require college approval, e.g. Schools can award null-sits for pre-honours students, but the same decision for an honours student would require a College concession.

g. Arrangements for submitting and handling SCs:

o The TG agreed that students are expected to take responsibility for their SCC forms and guidance would help the forms to be filled in appropriately, providing relevant information for the SCC.

o A range of opinions have been expressed to the TG on how to handle SC cases, and who the relevant School contact should be: Personal Tutors or Student Support Teams (which could be Student Support Officers, Student Experience Officers, etc.). Practice varies on this across the university, and to date the TG has not been keen to prescribe a single approach to this.

h. Timing Issues:

o What should the Policy say on timescales for notification of SCs by the student? Currently the policy states: "It is the responsibility of students to raise their request for consideration of Special Circumstances with the Special Circumstances Committee, within the time limits specified in the relevant regulations." The form states: "Notification should be no later than two working days after the student's last assessment". Some schools might ask for them to be submitted before the relevant exam board but should there be a case for a policy of 'notify as soon as SCs are known'. An online solution could enable this by allowing the form to be submitted in a 'notification' state, without substantial detail.

o The TG will consider the timing of when SCCs should be scheduled. The SCC meets at different times depending on programs and courses. Sometimes they meet once for the main diets in the academic year and then also for a resit diet. In other parts of the University the SCC meets more frequently. There may not always be a time to get all the information required to support the application and therefore the decision can only be made pending submission of relevant information. This means the committee can either turn down the application, uphold it or, thirdly, request further information. In considering the timing of scheduling of SCCs, the TG will liaise closely with the Assessment and Progression Tools task group, which will be considering the key dates associated with Boards of Examiner activities.

4

- Some conditions are characterised by extreme avoidance, students become withdrawn and may not think to tell anyone about their problems until after the exam period is over; **can we grant retrospective SC**? If so, the bar would need to be set very high, with certain conditions; we need to be clear on what information we seek from medical and other health professionals.

i. **Notification of outcome:**
The Policy should clarify when students will be notified when their SC cases have been considered, by whom, SCC or BoE, and what decision or recommendation was reached. It should also state who else is kept informed of the recommendation, i.e. the student's PT. This decision or recommendation may be subject to further approval, for example for concessions. At present, some students submit Academic Appeals in the mistaken belief that their special circumstances applications have not been update. A consistent and effective approach to informing students of the outcome of their SC applications should address this issue.

j. **Documentary evidence:**
The TG discussed the value of different types of documentary evidence. **CSPC members are invited to comment on and endorse the following issues, which will be clarified in the revised policy.**
- Improved guidance will be developed with specific questions and clear criteria on what is expected – which will be asked of people providing evidence as part of a student's SC case. For example, are the circumstances exceptional for this individual student? Do they impact the student's ability to function? This will provide the SCC with relevant information on which to base their decisions.
- In general, where a student is citing medical circumstances (either his / her own, or those of a person with whom the student has a close relationship), he / she should support the case with supporting documentation from a medical professional (or other forms of corroboration).
- Mental health conditions should be considered in the same way as chronic physical conditions, with relevant input from specialists sought when needed.
- When a student cites medical circumstances, the SCC can accept supporting statements from University staff where they have directly witnessed the student showing symptoms of the medical condition during the relevant period. For example, Personal Tutors, Student Support Officers, and Wardens are particularly likely to be in a position to provide evidence. CSPC is invited to consider whether we would also accept corroborating statements from someone in whom the student has confided but who has not directly witnessed the student's symptoms.
- However, there are also cases where self-certification is relevant for medical circumstances.
    1. The SCC can accept cases based solely on self-certification for medical circumstances that have affected students for seven calendar days or less, where the circumstances have had a modest impact on summative assessment ('modest impact' would need to be defined).
    2. However, when medical circumstances have had a significant impact on summative assessment then the student should provide medical documentation or provide alternate forms of corroboration as part of a special circumstances case.
    3. CSPC is invited to consider whether the University might adopt different approaches to accepting uncorroborated self-certification for extensions and for SCC cases. So, for example, an illness of a few days might have a significant impact on a coursework assignment deadline and mean that we look to the extension route, but if this is not possible then the student needs to submit SCs and needs to

get evidence. This could be drawn to the student's attention at the time so the evidence is contemporaneous with the circumstances.

k. Sources of evidence:
It may be that a doctor is not in the best position to provide a testimonial about the student's health, as they may not have seen the student during or before their illness – possibly only afterwards. Where the student is citing bereavement of a person with whom the student has a close relationship, he / she should either provide a death certificate, order of service, or newspaper death announcement (or equivalent), or a corroborating statement from someone with a close personal relationship with the student. CSPC is invited to consider what evidence we will accept for illness; testimonial from flatmates etc. may be more valid. We could possibly accept letters from parents/relatives. Students need to know that we will trust them and give them the benefit of the doubt, but also that abuse of the system will not be tolerated.

l. Timeliness of evidence: Supporting documentation should refer specifically to the time of the circumstances, and should ideally have been obtained at or immediately after the time of the circumstances.

Proposals: Coursework extensions

6   Internal benchmarking shows that there is a significant variety of practice across the University. Taught Assessment Regulation 25 provides Schools with considerable flexibility regarding arrangements for considering accepting late submissions without applying a late penalty where students have provided good reason. The benchmarking highlights considerable variation between (and sometimes within) Schools regarding:
   o Whether to be willing to consider accepting late submissions where there is 'good reason';
   o Whether there is a maximum period for which late submission can be considered, and, if so, what it is;
   o The category of staff making the decision (Personal Tutor, Student Support Officer, Course Organiser, Head of Subject Area);
   o The practical arrangements for submitting the application (for example, whether to submit a standard form or email).
There is also likely to be variation regarding what constitutes 'good reason', although the benchmarking did not provide information on this.

7   The TG proposes a set of arrangements which will provide a more consistent approach to handling requests for coursework extensions where students have provided 'good reason'. If CSPC supports these proposals, they will guide the revision and development of relevant documentation, e.g. the Taught Assessment Regulations and Special Circumstances Policy. Cross references will be made to other relevant documents, e.g. the Performance Sport Policy, and to the use of extensions within Learning Profiles. **CSPC is invited to agree that we should have a unified, consistent, policy and approach to handling coursework extensions which draws on the following proposals and to comment on the proposals below.**

   a.   We should introduce a standard University form for applying for a Coursework Extension.

   b.   Schools would consider applications for late submissions for all coursework assessments for all taught courses, unless the specific assessment and feedback arrangements for the relevant component of assessment make it impossible to grant an extension without providing the student with an unfair advantage over other students (for example, where the assessment is 'problem-based' and the School provides rapid feedback including model answers, it would be not be possible to allow an extension beyond the point at which

feedback has been provided to other students). If Schools are not able to consider requests for coursework extensions for particular components of assessment, they should publicise this to the students on the relevant course. If a student cannot be granted an extension, they may be asked to submit a SC case. CSPC is invited to consider whether the student could be advised at that point that their circumstances do not warrant any SC submission; and if it is reasonable to consider applications for coursework extensions for group-based assessments.

c.   The Course Organiser or PGT Programme Director would have responsibility for considering requests (to date the task group has expressed mixed views on the idea of prescribing which School staff would have responsibility for discussions on extensions).

d.   Course Organisers or PGT Programme Directors could grant extensions of up to 7 calendar days. Where a student's circumstances make them unable to complete an assessment within seven calendar days of the deadline, their case should be handled via the Special Circumstances process.

e.   'Good reasons' for coursework extensions are unexpected short-term circumstances beyond a student's control which could reasonably be expected to have an adverse impact on the student's ability to complete the assessment on time. The TG proposes that the categories in the Academic Registrars' Council (ARC) April 2011 reference document "Academic Appeals and Extenuating Circumstances for University Practitioners" are used to provide standard "good reasons". The following are examples of 'good reasons':
   o   Physical illness or injury (excluding those for which reasonable adjustment has already been made)
   o   Mental ill-health or similar illness (excluding those for which reasonable adjustment has already been made)
   o   The recent bereavement or serious illness of a person with whom the student has a close relationship
   o   The recent breakdown in a long-term relationship breakdown, such as a marriage
   o   Emergencies involving dependents
   o   Job or internship interview that require significant time, e.g. due to travel. The invitation letter could provide evidence.
The TG propose that the good reasons for extensions explicitly note that these good reasons include the ones from the SC policy and also have additional reasons, which are specific for extensions only. As far as possible the exact wording of these 'good reasons' would align with the equivalent wording for special circumstances.

f.   Again, the TG propose to use the ARC paper to compile a list of examples of reasons that would not be considered, e.g.:
   o   Commitments to paid or voluntary employment
   o   Pressure of academic work (unless this contributes to mental ill-health or similar illness)
   o   Proximity to other assessments
   o   Failure, loss or theft of data, a computer or other equipment (students have the responsibility to back up their work and data)
   o   Death of a pet.

g.   **Documentary evidence:** In general, the requirement for documentary evidence would be proportionate to the weight of the assessment. For example, for a component of assessment worth 50% of the overall course, it would be reasonable to expect the student to provide some form of documentary evidence to support their case, whereas for a component worth 5% this may not be necessary.

h.   **Self-certification** is acceptable for illnesses of seven days or less. Should self-certification be accompanied by some form of corroboration when dealing with high-stakes assessments?

i.   The Policy should be clear that extensions are **discretionary** – and are not an automatic right.

Communication and implementation

8   Following discussion on 21 January 2016, the TG will produce a final report, with proposals for an updated Special Circumstances Policy, other relevant documentation and changes to relevant regulations, to be discussed at CSPC in April 2016. The agreed policy etc. will be communicated to staff using Academic Services' annual update on new and revised policies and via College events for Boards of Examiners and Special Circumstances Committees.
www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/academic-services/policies-regulations/new-policies

Evaluating the impact

9   The final report will include proposals for evaluating the impact of the implementation of the proposals.

Resource implications

10   There will be resource implications from the proposals. These will be outlined in the final report.

Equality and diversity

11   An Equality Impact Assessment will be carried out as part of the work of the task group.

Sara Welham and Claire Edminson, Academic Services, on behalf of the Special Circumstances Task Group, 13 January 2016

Special Circumstances Task Group

Remit

To review the University's Special Circumstances Policy and associated guidance and form, with a view to where possible delivering a consistent approach to handling students' cases across the University, giving particular attention to the following issues:

- The requirement for students to provide documentary evidence to support their cases, including:
    - The eligibility of particular types of medical / professional documentation;
    - The potential for students to self-certify in limited circumstances.

- Appropriate business processes for managing the Special Circumstances Policy and for recording special circumstances applications and / or Special Circumstances decisions in EUCLID.

- The University's policy on extensions to coursework deadlines, in the context of special circumstances.

If the University decides to pursue the introduction of GPA, the task group will also advise regarding any implications this would have for the University's Special Circumstances Policy.

Membership

- Convener: Prof Fanney Kristmundsdottir, MVM
- One Dean / Associate Dean from each College
    - CHSS – Dr Gale Macleod, Dean of PG Studies (Taught)
    - CMVM – Prof Allan Cumming, Dean of Students
    - CSE – Prof Graeme Reid, Dean of Learning and Teaching (where Graeme is unable to attend it will be Gordon McDougall, Dean QA)
- Two other representatives from each College (ensuring a mixture of academic and administrative staff with experience of handling special circumstances cases at School level, including staff with experience at both undergraduate and postgraduate level)
    - CHSS - Alan Brown (Business School)
    - CHSS - Alex Laidlaw (CHSS Head of Academic Administration)
    - MVM – Dr Anna Meredith (Royal Dick Veterinary School)
    - MVM - Nicola Crowley (MVM UG Manager)
    - CSE – Dr Julian Bradfield (Senior Tutor, School of Informatics)
    - Rosie Edwards (Academic Administrator, School of Physics and Astronomy)
- Two EUSA representatives:
    - Imogen Wilson (VP Academic Affairs)
    - Ed Auckland (Academic Advisor, Advice Place)
- One representative of the Student Counselling Service – Jenny Leeder (Deputy Director of the Student Counselling Service)
- SA representative with clinical expertise on mental health issues - Robby Steel, Consultant Liaison Psychiatrist, and Martin Judd, Assistant Director of Student Disability Services
- One representative of Student Systems – Chris Giles (Senior Business Analyst)
- Academic Policy Manager, Academic Services – Sara Welham
- Task Group administrator from Academic Services – Claire Edminson

<u>The University of Edinburgh</u>

Senatus Curriculum and Student Progression Committee

21 January 2016

Postgraduate Degree Regulations: Leave of Absence

Executive Summary

Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) and UK Visa and Immigration (UKVI) reporting requires that the University records when a student is continuing with their studies and is not located in Edinburgh. The paper contains a proposed change to the Postgraduate Degree Regulations on Leave of Absence to take account of concerns raised by Colleges regarding the current regulation and to take account of statutory requirements (for example HESA and UKVI).

Colleges provided examples of Leave of Absence requests following the last committee meeting. Examples, summarised in Appendix I, show that Leave of Absence is granted for students who are actively engaged with their study in the majority of cases.

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

The paper aligns with the University's Strategic Goal of Excellence in Education. Recording of leave of absence is a requirement for statutory reporting.

Action requested

This paper was submitted to the Researcher Experience Committee earlier in January 2016 and REC has now approved the paper, endorsing the proposed regulation change for submission to the annual regulations review. CSPC is also being invited to comment on the proposals prior to submission as part of the annual regulations review process.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

This will be communicated as part of the annual regulations review process.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. **Resource implications (including staffing)**
   Implementation of the regulation is likely to require Schools and Colleges to approve and record on EUCLID more instances of leave of absence than is currently the case. This will have resource implications for staff in Schools and Colleges, and in Student Systems.

2. **Risk assessment**
   There is a risk to the University if the student record does not accurately reflect the status and location of students (see page 3)

3. **Equality and Diversity**
   Equality impact assessment will be carried out on the regulations as part of the annual review.

4. **Freedom of information**
   The paper is **open.**

Key words

Leave, study location

Originator of the paper

Susan Hunter, Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services, 14 January 2016

Postgraduate Degree Regulations: Leave of Absence

Proposed change to the Postgraduate Degree Regulations 2016/17

"Leave of Absence

Students not on a recognised online distance learning programme will study in Edinburgh. Leave of absence is required for compulsory and optional activities related to the programme of study that are not undertaken on campus in Edinburgh. Students must seek formal approval from the College for any leave of absence to study away from Edinburgh that is 60 calendar days' duration or longer. Permission may be sought at admission or during the period of study. All approved leaves of absence must be recorded in the student record. Study location changes of less than 60 days must be agreed with the Supervisor or Personal Tutor, but do not need formal approval from the College and need not be recorded in the student record."

To simplify processes the Committee may wish to consider whether approval for leave of absence of 60 days or more should be delegated to Schools.

It should be noted that this proposal is likely to mean recording for taught students who work on their dissertations away from Edinburgh, as well as for students on collaborative programmes when studying at the partner institution.

Rationale for proposed change

The current regulation is causing confusion and inconsistent recording practices for leave of absence, since it is not clear whether leave of absence relates to location of study or the nature of the study. To be compliant with requirements for UKVI and HESA reporting, the University needs to know where students are studying. The proposed regulation is intended to strengthen processes by making it clear that leave of absence relates to study location. The 60 day period is the maximum period after which any interruption or non-engagement would become reportable for students on a Tier 4 visa.

Regulatory requirements

HESA and UKVI reporting requires the University to record when a student is continuing with their studies and is not located in Edinburgh. Online distance learning students are recorded separately, but all other students, including those on collaborative programmes,

must have their location of study recorded in the student record. Location of study must be recorded whether it is a compulsory element of their programme of study or activity that the student undertakes while engaged with their studies.

Benchmarking

Desk-based research on 24 Russell Group institutions showed that, in general, leave of absence is granted when the student is away from the home institution for activity directly relevant to the programme of study. Therefore, the proposed change to the regulation would be consistent with sector practice. See Paper B submitted to the 29 September 2015 REC meeting.

Practical implications

Processes are in place for Schools to report any changes of study location to Student Systems, through the Programme Change Request Form. Recording all study location changes of 60 days or more through this process reduces the potential compliance risks to the University.

Risk analysis

Inaccuracies in the student record represent a risk to the University's HESA returns and potentially, through audit by UKVI, to the University's trusted status as a sponsor of Tier 4 students.

In addition to recording location of study, the International Office has also suggested that, at some stage, the University may need to consider introducing regulations regarding student residency. For example, a requirement of on campus student to be resident in Edinburgh or its locality.

Susan Hunter
Academic Services
14 January 2016

Leave of Absence: summary of examples received from Colleges

Summary

Examples show that Leave of Absence (LoA) is granted for students who are actively engaged with their study in the majority of cases. HESA and UKBA reporting requires that the University records if a student is continuing with their studies and is not located in Edinburgh.

At its September 2015 meeting, the Senatus Researcher Experience Committee (REC) requested further information from Colleges on the types of LoA requests they were receiving from and granting to postgraduate research students.

Evidence gathered from the three Colleges shows:

- Students on LoA were actively engaged with their programme of study or writing up their thesis. There were a mixture of personal, family and academic reasons for requests. Among academic reasons were that part of the programme of study required activity away from Edinburgh, or that the supervisor was located away from Edinburgh.
- The maximum single period of leave granted was 15 months, although some examples contained requests for extensions to leave already granted.
- There was one instance of LoA granted for volunteering which was not directly part of the programme, where the student was participating in a recognised University of Edinburgh funded activity. However, the student then continued the majority of their leave period carrying out research related to their programme of study.

College comments

The current regulation wording is confusing as in most cases students are continuing to participate in their studies. Students may also need to be away for reasons that do not enhance their programme of study, for example family or personal circumstances, but are continuing their studies.

Colleges suggested that LoA is for students continuing with their studies and interruption is for students who are not. Leave of absence is not appropriate for annual leave requests as students are not continuing their studies.

If students are away from Edinburgh for activity that is not a necessary part of the programme, they may still be considered to be engaging with their study, depending on the type of activity. Colleges would welcome guidance on the types of activity that are covered by LoA and interruptions.

College examples

MVM   Relocation to Canada for personal, family reasons during 3rd year of PhD and working on thesis. 6 months duration

Principal's Go Abroad programme – volunteering in Chile for two weeks. Thereafter remain in Chile for PhD related fieldwork, which is part of the programme of study. Four months duration.

Data collection for PhD research in Kenya as part of the programme of study. Six months duration – extension.

With PhD second supervisor to develop primary research in Ethiopia as part of the programme of study. Eight months duration.

Leave in New Zealand for personal/family reasons while working on thesis. Two and a half months – extension.

Writing up in Kenya for personal (health) reasons. Three months duration.

SCE   Placement related to programme of study.

Spending significant period of study at CERN as supervisor is based there.

HSS   Mostly for fieldwork or if students need to return home for personal or family reasons but are still engaged with their studies.

Very occasionally for an internship.

Susan Hunter, Academic Services, 14 January 2016

<u>The University of Edinburgh</u>

Senatus Curriculum and Student Progression Committee

21 January 2016

Approval processes for action where a student has failed to complete all the assessment requirements of a degree programme

<u>Brief description of the paper, including a statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities</u>

This paper invites the Committee to discuss proposals for changes to the levels of delegation for action under Taught Assessment Regulation (TAR) 63 when a student has failed to complete all the assessment requirements of a degree programme, where the Board of Examiners is given satisfactory evidence that the performance of a student has been affected for reasons of illness, accident or other circumstances beyond the student's control they decide which option to pursue.

These proposals are based on the Convener's discussion with College academic and administrative staff, and take account of the annual report into concessions considered by CSPC in November 2015.

<u>Action requested</u>

The Committee is invited to consider whether it supports the proposals. If the Committee is content with the proposals, Academic Services will take account of them in the annual review of the Taught Assessment Regulations and / or will ask the task group on the review of the Special Circumstances Policy to take account of them.

<u>Communication and Implementation</u>

Academic Services would communicate any changes to TAR 63 as part of its annual communication on changes to policies and regulations for 2016-17. It would also highlight the changes as part of its contribution to College briefing sessions for Conveners of Boards of Examiners in 2016-17. Colleges would also be responsible for using their communication channels to ensure that Conveners of Boards of Examiners, and other relevant School staff, are aware of any changes.

Colleges would be responsible for maintaining records of their decision-making under TAR 63. As part of its annual report into concessions, CSPC would monitor patterns and trends in concessions approved by Colleges, on the basis of data submitted annually by Colleges.

<u>Resource implications</u>

Does the paper have resource implications?

Yes, these proposals would contribute to the Senior Vice-Principal's commitment to simplification by streamlining decision-making processes regarding concessions.

Risk Assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? The paper identifies and assesses the main risk associated with the proposals, to consistency of treatment of students' cases.

Equality and Diversity

Has due consideration been given to the equality impact of this paper?

The changes are unlikely to have any equality implications. However, if the Committee supports the proposals, an Equality Impact Assessment would be undertaken as part of the annual regulations review and the review of the Special Circumstances Policy.

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Originator of the paper

Tom Ward, Director of Academic Services
9 January 2016

Any other relevant information, including keywords

Progression, reassessment, concessions

Approval processes for action where a student has failed to complete all the assessment requirements of a degree programme

1   This paper invites the Committee to discuss proposals for changes to the levels of delegation for action when a student has failed to complete all the assessment requirements of a degree programme, where the Board of Examiners is given satisfactory evidence that the performance of a student has been affected for reasons of illness, accident or other circumstances beyond the student's control they decide which option to pursue.

Background

2   At its November 2015 meeting, the Committee received an annual report into concessions considered by CSPC in 2014-15. The report indicated that CSPC approved 85 concession requests in 2014-15. Of these concessions c. 30 related to actions taken under Taught Assessment Regulation (TAR) 63: Failure to complete all the assessment requirements of a degree programme. In addition to these concessions, Colleges will have approved substantial additional concessions in relation to TAR 63. The report indicated that the volume of concessions approved by CSPC had increased 29% on the previous session. The Colleges of Humanities and Social Science and Science and Engineering also reported significant increases in the volume of concessions, including those that they had considered under TAR 63.

3   TAR 63 is attached as an Annex.

Simplification

4   Under TAR 63, certain types of action require approval at three levels – Board of Examiner, College, and CSPC. In practice, concessions submitted to CSPC are almost always approved, although in some cases it is necessary for Academic Services to first seek further information from Colleges or Schools regarding the rationale for cases and the detail of the proposed action. It therefore appears that the CSPC level of approval may not be necessary or adding value proportionate to the work involved.

5   Given the Senior-Vice Principal's commitment to simplification of learning and teaching practices, in December 2015 representatives from the Colleges met with the Convener of CSPC, AP Prof Alan Murray, to explore whether there is scope to streamline decision-making by delegating some responsibilities regarding TAR 63 from CSPC to Colleges and / or from Colleges to Schools. The proposals set out below reflect those discussions.

Proposals for devolving powers under Taught Assessment Regulation 63

6   The Committee is invited to discuss the following proposed changes to decision-making where a student has failed to complete all the assessment requirements of a degree programme.

School Board of Examiners	Change to level of approval?
Non-honours undergraduate assessment: If the Board does not have sufficient evidence of the student's academic performance to award a mark or grade then the Board applies the resit assessment provisions of Taught Assessment Regulation 24. The Board may recommend that the student's resit assessment be recorded as a first attempt on the transcript.	No change (currently School)
Honours level assessment: If the student has satisfied requirements the Board may award credit on aggregate for relevant elements of that year of the degree (Taught Assessment Regulation 49) When the degree is classified the Board may exclude the affected assessment from the classification calculation.	No change (currently School) Change to School (currently some ambiguity in the regulations and Special Circumstances Policy whether BoEs have authority to approve this)
Postgraduate Taught Students: If the student has satisfied the specific requirements the Board may award credit on aggregate for relevant elements and award the degree.	No change (currently School)
College Committee (on recommendation from the School Board of Examiners)	**Change to level of approval?**
Honours level assessment (not the final year of the degree programme): Requiring the student to be examined at a subsequent diet either after repeating some or all of the coursework or without repeating the coursework;	No change (currently College)
Requiring the student to repeat the course, including some or all assessment;	No change (currently College)

4

Deeming the affected assessment a "null sit" which can be taken again as a first attempt.	No change (currently College)
In cases involving exceptional hardship, permitting the student to take specially prepared alternative assessments, including oral assessment.	No change (currently College)
Final Year Honours Assessment:	
Requiring the student to be examined at a subsequent diet either after repeating some or all of the coursework or without repeating the coursework;	Change to College (currently CSPC)
Requiring the student to repeat the course, including some or all assessment;	Change to College (currently CSPC)
Deeming the affected assessment a "null sit" which can be taken again as a first attempt.	Change to College (currently CSPC)
In cases involving exceptional hardship, permitting the student to take specially prepared alternative assessments, including oral assessment.	Change to College (currently CSPC)
Postgraduate Taught Students:	
Requiring the student to be examined at a subsequent diet either after repeating some or all of the coursework or without repeating the coursework;	Change to College (currently CSPC)
Requiring the student to repeat the course, including some or all assessment;	Change to College (currently CSPC)
Deeming the affected assessment a "null sit" which can be taken again as a first attempt.	Change to College(currently CSPC)
In cases involving exceptional hardship, permitting the student to take specially prepared alternative assessments, including oral assessment.	Change to College (currently CSPC)
Senate Curriculum and Student Progression Committee	**Change to level of approval?**
Honours Assessment:	
To monitor patterns and trends in concessions approved by Colleges, on the basis of data submitted annually by Colleges, and provide general advice regarding the interpretation of the regulations.	N/A
To advise where necessary on potential concessions	N/A

involving factors that are particularly unusual or complex.	
Exceptionally, to allow a student to graduate without the required number and level of credits for the degree.	No Change (currently CSPC)
Exceptionally, that the Senatus award an unclassed aegrotat degree.	No change (currently CSPC)
Exceptionally, that the Senatus award a posthumous degree, undergraduate diploma or certificate	No change (currently CSPC)
Postgraduate Taught Students: To monitor patterns and trends in concessions approved by Colleges, on the basis of data submitted annually by Colleges, and provide general advice regarding the interpretation of the regulations.	N/A
To advise where necessary on potential concessions involving factors that are particularly unusual or complex.	N/A
Exceptionally, to allow a student to graduate without the required number and level of credits for the degree.	No change (currently CSPC)
Exceptionally, that the Senatus award an aegrotat degree.	No change (currently CSPC)
Exceptionally, that the Senatus award a posthumous degree, undergraduate diploma or certificate.	No change (currently CSPC)

Consistency of treatment

7   It is important that there is consistent treatment of students who have failed to complete all the assessment requirements of a degree programme. While it can be argued that the best way to ensure consistent treatment is for a single body (CSPC) to make decisions on all students' cases, in practice this is unrealistic and inefficient in a large institution. In the University the vast majority of decisions regarding students' studies are taken by individual Schools, with a minority at College level. Indeed, it is anomalous that CSPC currently has specific powers under TAR 63, when decisions on other types of actions with far-reaching consequences for students (for example, permission to interrupt studies, to extend PGR study, or to repeat a non-Honours year of study) are devolved from CSPC. By leaving the more significant decisions under TAR 63 at College level (rather than devolving them to individual Boards of Examiners), and leaving CSPC with responsibility for the most significant decisions (eg to allow a student to graduate without the required number and level of credits for the degree), these proposals are proportionate, compatible with consistent treatment of students' cases, and aligned with broader decision-making.

Scope for further devolution of powers regarding assessment and progression arrangements

8   It is possible that there is scope for the Committee to consider more radical devolution of powers under Taught Assessment Regulation 63, for example MVM has suggested that decisions regarding reassessment arrangements for Honours students should be devolved wholly to Schools (whereas at present some decisions require not only College but CSPC approval). In addition, it is possible that there are opportunities for appropriate devolution of powers in relation to other types of decisions-making regarding assessment and progression arrangements.

9   Given the importance of ensuring that the devolution of decision-making is compatible with consistent treatment of students' cases, it may be desirable to undertake devolution on an incremental basis to allow CSPC opportunities to monitor the impact. Therefore, this paper proposes that at this stage the Committee limits itself to considering the changes set out above, which have already been subject to careful discussion between the Convener and Colleges. The Simplification working group established by the Learning and Teaching Policy Group could then consider the merits of broader devolution in the longer term.

Taught Assessment Regulation 63: Failure to complete all the assessment requirements of a degree programme

When a student fails to complete all the assessment requirements of a degree programme the Board of Examiners or Undergraduate Progression Board will investigate the case. If there is no satisfactory reason then taught assessment regulation 61 on unsatisfactory progress applies. If the Board of Examiners of Undergraduate Progression Board is given satisfactory evidence that the performance of a student has been affected for reasons of illness, accident or other circumstances beyond the student's control they decide which option to pursue.

Non-honours undergraduate assessment:

If the Board does not have sufficient evidence of the student's academic performance to award a mark or grade then the Board applies the resit assessment provisions of taught assessment regulation 24. The Board may recommend that the student's resit assessment be recorded as a first attempt on the transcript.

Honours assessment which is not in the final year:

If the student has satisfied requirements the Board may award credit on aggregate for relevant elements of that year of the degree (taught assessment regulation 49). If the Board considers that this would be to the student's detriment or it has insufficient evidence to make an award, the Board will recommend a concession to the relevant College committee that the student:

(a) repeat the course to which the assessment relates; or
(b) take any assessment elements the College deems appropriate.

Final Year Honours Assessment:

If the student has satisfied the specific requirements the Board may award credit on aggregate for relevant elements of that year of the degree and classify the degree (taught assessment regulation 48). If the Board considers that this would be to the student's detriment or it has insufficient evidence to make an award, the Board will recommend that the relevant College committee request a concession from the Curriculum and Student Progression Committee that the student:

(a) repeat the course to which the assessment relates; or
(b) take any assessment elements CSPC deems appropriate; or
(c) exceptionally, that the Senatus award an unclassed aegrotat degree.

Postgraduate Students:

If the student has satisfied the specific requirements the Board may award credit on aggregate for relevant elements and award the degree. If the Board considers that this would be to the student's detriment or it has insufficient evidence to make an award, the Board will recommend that the relevant College committee request a concession from the Curriculum and Student Progression Committee that the student:

8

(a) repeat the course to which the assessment relates; or
(b) take any assessment elements CSPC deems appropriate; or
(c) exceptionally, that the Senatus award an aegrotat degree.

Application of the regulation

63.1 The report to the relevant College committee and the Curriculum and Student Progression Committee needs to include:

(a) special circumstances evidence provided by the student to support the case;
(b) the views of the student and their Personal Tutor or Programme Director, where possible; and
(c) a recommendation from the Board of Examiners or Undergraduate Progression Board.

The case needs to state what assessment will have to be repeated or submitted and relevant assessment dates, e.g. which examination diet is expected to apply.

63.2 Concessions include:

(a) deeming the affected assessment a "null sit" which can be taken again as a first attempt;
(b) recommending that when the degree is classified the affected assessment is excluded from the classification calculation;
(c) requiring the student to be examined at a subsequent diet either after repeating some or all of the coursework or without repeating the coursework;
(d) requiring the student to repeat the course, including some or all assessment;
(e) in cases involving exceptional hardship, and where the Heads of the Schools recommend, permitting the student to take specially prepared alternative assessments, including oral assessment.

The University of Edinburgh

Senatus Curriculum and Student Progression Committee

21 January 2016

PCIM Post Project Update

Brief description of the paper, including a statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities

This paper presents an update on the post project activity of the Programme and Course Information Management (PCIM) project. The paper relates to the University's Strategic Goal of 'Excellence in Education' and the Strategic Theme of 'Outstanding Student Experience'

Action requested

The Committee is asked to **note** the paper.

Communication and Implementation

Communication and implementation of project deliverables is complete. Communication and implementation of post project activities will be considered throughout 2015/16. The post project review report is available on the project wiki.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? No.

Risk Assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? No. A risk register was maintained as part of the project management and is available on the project wiki (as part of the Project Board papers) at: http://edin.ac/1j4ZA6y

Equality and Diversity

Has due consideration been given to the equality impact of this paper? Yes. Equality impact assessments have been carried out as appropriate.

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Originator of the paper

Nichola Kett, Academic Services, 13 January 2016

Any other relevant information, including keywords

Programme, course, project

1. **Generate and distribute reports to Schools and Colleges (gaps and courses with no enrolments) – with Student Systems**

- Exemplar course descriptors identified and posted on the wiki.

- Text added to the Annual Degree Programme Table and Course Delivery Roll Forward email sent by Student Systems (11 December 2015):

    COURSE DESCRIPTOR
    Please ensure that all your course descriptor information is up to date and complete. To assist you with this task reports on idle courses and gaps in key information on each course descriptor will be disseminated to Colleges and Schools during the week beginning 11th January 2016. Exemplars of these key information sections are also available at the following link: https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/display/PCIM/Home

- Working with Student Surveys Unit to ask the student panel three short questions about the enhanced course descriptor.

Aims: reduction in gaps; closure of idle courses; student satisfaction with enhanced course descriptor; increase in academic staff engaging with course proposal and editing systems.

2. **Further guidance and training sessions – with the Institute for Academic Development and Student Systems**

- No additional requirements have been identified.

3. **Develop exemplars**

- As above.

4. **Post-project communication**

- Regular reporting to the Senatus Curriculum and Student Progression Committee.
- Presented at a Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice session on Course Organisation and Management (7 January 2016).
- Working with Student Systems to ensure consistent messaging re the importance of complete, accurate and consistent programme and course information.

5. **Work with Boards of Studies Convenors and Secretaries**

- Contributed to a briefing session with the College of Humanities and Social Science on 8 December 2015 (presentation).
- Hoping to run similar sessions with the other Colleges.

6. **Explore with Schools where they are having to re-use course information (Student Systems)**

- No update at this time.

7. **Other activities**

Staff Survey – Programme and Course Handbook Policy Implementation
- 18 participants indicated that they had either 'fully' (12) or 'somewhat' (6) implemented the policy.

- 7 participants indicated that the policy had 'somewhat' reduced the time taken to produce handbooks. 11 participants indicated that the policy had not reduced the time taken to produce handbooks either because they were fairly complaint already or because it took some time to implement the policy and, as this is a one off exercise, a reduction in time was anticipated in future years.
- 16 participants were able to implement the 'golden copy' principle (directly linking to existing information where it is owned and maintained by another area, rather than copying and pasting) which aims to to reduce the risk of misinforming students and also to reduce the time taken by staff to produce handbooks. One partipant was 'somewhat' able to implement the principle and one reported that they could not implement the principle. Of these two, one participant was confident that this would be implemented more fully in future years with improvements to CCAM and thematic websites. Another participant commented that some of the links on the University webpages were unavailable at the time of the handbooks being processed, and that providing a summary to accompany some of the key links was useful.
- Programme and course handbooks are provided in a wide range of formats.
- The timing of the publication of the final version of the policy brought challenges for implementation.
- The full summary of the results can be found on the wiki.

Staff Feedback – Programme and Course Design, Development, Approval, Changes and Closure Policy
One of the aims of the Policy was to "… allow College guidance to focus on local practice (including timescales, specific roles and responsibilities, templates, etc.) which should mean that efficiencies are made as Colleges do not have to update University level matters in their guidance." Key College Office contacts have been asked for their feedback on whether they feel this aim was achieved, or may be in future years given the timing of the publication of the Policy. Responses are being gathered.

Light review of relevant documentation in response to feedback received:
- Programme and Course Design, Development, Approval, Changes and Closure Policy
- Programme and Course Handbook Policy[1]
- Board of Studies Terms of Reference and Guidance
- Enhanced Course Descriptor Guidance

---

[1] Enabled the discontinuation of the Code of Practice for Taught Postgraduate Programmes

The University of Edinburgh

Senatus Curriculum and Student Progression Committee

21 January 2016

Dignity and Respect Policy

Brief description of the paper, including a statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities

The University has revised its Dignity and Respect Policy. Central Management Group and Court will be invited to approve it at their meetings in January / February 2016. The main changes to the revised Policy affect staff, and it is substantively unchanged for students.

Action requested

The Committee is asked to **note** the paper.

Communication and Implementation

The amended policy will be accessible via the University's equality and diversity webpages:

http://www.ed.ac.uk/equality-diversity/innovation-development/dignity-respect

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? No.

Risk Assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? HR will be responsible for conducting a risk assessment on the revised policy.

Equality and Diversity

Has due consideration been given to the equality impact of this paper? The policy is designed to promote equality and diversity. HR will be responsible for conducting a formal equality impact assessment on the revised policy.

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Originator of the paper

Tom Ward, Director of Academic Services
1 January 2016

Any other relevant information, including keywords

Dignity and Respect Policy

1. Policy Statement

The University has a strong and long-standing commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion and to promoting a positive culture which celebrates difference, challenges prejudice and ensures fairness. Our staff and students are our greatest assets and all members of the University community should expect to be able to excel, and to be respected and valued for their unique perspectives and contributions.

Integrity, collegiality and inclusivity are central to the University's values. In accordance with these values the University is committed to providing an environment in which all members of the University community treat each other with dignity and respect, and where bullying, harassment and discrimination are known to be unacceptable. This Policy sets out the expectations placed on all members of the University.

The University regards any incident of bullying, harassment or discrimination as a serious matter and will respond promptly and sensitively to formal complaints, and where appropriate take disciplinary action.

2. Scope and Purpose

This policy applies to all staff and students of the University in relation to both individual and collective activities and dealings with others in the University.

The purpose of the policy is to:

- Foster a positive culture for working and studying which supports freedom of thought and expression within the law, and within a framework of respect for the rights of other people.
- Promote an enabling and inclusive environment where all individuals are treated with dignity and respect, free from bullying, harassment and discrimination.
- Ensure that occurrences of bullying, harassment and discrimination are taken seriously, and dealt with promptly and with due sensitivity.
- Set out the framework for raising, addressing and resolving concerns about individual and/or organisational behaviour.

3. Responsibilities

3.1   Individuals

As members of the University community we have a responsibility to:

- Demonstrate respect and integrity in our interactions with individuals and groups.
- Work and study collaboratively, collegially and effectively in teams within and across organisational units.
- Identify and challenge unacceptable behaviour when it occurs, even if it is not directed at ourselves.
- Address and resolve matters ourselves, where reasonably possible, in a positive and constructive way.
- Raise more serious concerns with relevant University staff and participate positively in approaches to resolve them.
- Modify our behaviour should we become aware that we have behaved unacceptably in relation to this policy, even if no complaint has been made.

3.2   Managers

In addition, managers of staff and others with responsibility for areas of work or study have:

- A responsibility to lead in promoting a culture of dignity and respect, and
- A duty to take timely, relevant action to resolve concerns.

3.3   University

Expectations of the University as an employer and provider of education will be to ensure that:

- It fosters a positive culture for working and studying which permits freedom of thought and expression within a framework of mutual respect.
- It treats staff and students with openness, respect and dignity at all times.
- Complaints of harassment, bullying or discrimination are treated seriously and with discretion.
- Staff and students feel safe and are listened to when raising concerns about behaviour.
- Malicious or vexatious allegations are dealt with in line with University disciplinary procedures.

4. Unacceptable behaviour

The University expects all its members to treat others with dignity and respect in line and regards bullying, harassment or discrimination as unacceptable behaviour. The University will respond promptly and sensitively to formal complaints, and where appropriate take disciplinary action.

For students, examples of unacceptable behaviour/misconduct are set out in the Code of Student Conduct: http://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/staff/discipline/code-discipline

For staff, examples of unacceptable behaviours in the workplace can include, but are not limited to:

- Unwelcome physical contact ranging from unnecessary touching to serious assault
- Intimidating or threatening behaviour, or language
- Unwelcome attention or advances of a sexual nature
- Disparaging, ridiculing or insulting behaviour, language or gestures
- Inappropriate communication or visual display of offensive material
- Isolation, non-cooperation, or deliberate exclusion of an individual from a work situation (including work-related social events)
- Undermining of an individual through unfair work allocation or persistent unjustified criticism

5. Resolution

Staff and students are encouraged, where possible, to resolve concerns informally.

Staff may wish to seek advice and support from a manager, HR advisor or Trade Union representative. Students may wish to seek advice and support from The Advice Place, or an independent member of staff such as Personal Tutor, Lecturer, or Warden.

The University has a network of trained **Dignity and Respect Advisors (DRAs)** who can provide advice and appropriate support to employees and students when they believe they have identified behaviour contrary to this policy. Their contact details can be found at: http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/equality-diversity/help-advice/advisors

5.1   Options for Employees

Where an employee identifies a potential breach of this policy, there are a number of ways they may wish to approach the matter in an attempt to resolve it, as set out below.

5.1.1 Individual Action

Where an employee believes they are being subjected to treatment which is in breach of this policy, they should seek to address this at the earliest possible stage.

Where they feel able to, the employee should make clear to the person causing the offence that such behaviour is unacceptable to them. In many instances, this can be sufficient to bring an end to that behaviour.

5.1.2 Seeking Informal Assistance

If the employee does not feel able to resolve the matter themselves at an early stage, they may wish to seek advice and support from a manager, HR advisor or Trade Union representative.

They may also approach any of the University's DRAs dedicated to working with staff, who can provide support and advice on how the particular problem could be handled.

The DRA will outline the different ways of dealing with the matter, which for staff, will include:

- Employing self-help and general strategies for dealing with the problem (this may be used in addition to another method).
- Dealing with the situation through informal discussion or formal mediation.
- Raising the matter with their manager, a more senior manager or a member of their College/Support Group HR Team.
- Accessing staff support services e.g. counselling.

Whilst the DRA can provide impartial advice, the employee concerned will be expected to make the decision about which route to follow and take responsibility for progressing with their desired actions.

5.1.3 Raising a Formal Complaint

If the problem has not been resolved by informal means, or the employee feels it cannot be resolved through informal means, then they may submit a formal complaint.

If the complaint relates to the conduct of a student then this will be taken forward by the University through the Code of Student Conduct. Guidance on reporting allegations of student misconduct can be found at: http://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/staff/discipline/code-discipline

If the complaint relates to another member of staff then this should be submitted as a grievance in line with the University's Grievance Policy and procedure, which can be found at: http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/human-resources/policies-guidance/discipline-grievance

5.1.4 Reporting concerns to Police

Where an employee identifies a breach of this policy which constitutes a criminal offence or an immediate threat to safety, they should report the matter to the Police in addition to raising concerns through the appropriate internal route set out in this policy.

5.2 Options for Students

Where a student identifies behaviour contrary to this policy, the ways in which they may wish to approach the matter in an attempt to resolve it are set out below.

5.2.1 Individual Action

Where a student believes they are being subjected to treatment which is contrary to this policy, they should seek to address this at the earliest possible stage.

Where they feel able to, the student should make clear to the person causing the offence that such behaviour is unacceptable to them, regardless of whether the person is a student or a member of staff.

5.2.2 Seeking Informal Assistance

If the student does not feel able to resolve the matter themselves at an early stage, they may wish to seek advice and support from The Advice Place or an independent member of staff.

Students may also approach one of the DRAs dedicated to working with students.

The DRA will outline the different ways of dealing with the matter, which for students, will include:

- Employing self-help and general strategies for dealing with the problem (this may be used in addition to another method).
- Dealing with the situation through informal discussion.
- Raising the matter with an appropriate member of staff, e.g. a Personal Tutor, Lecturer, or Warden
- Accessing student support services e.g. counselling.
- Submitting a complaint through the Student Complaint Procedure, which can be found at: www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/student-academic-services/student-complaint-procedure

Whilst the DRA can provide impartial advice, the student concerned will make the decision about which route to follow and take responsibility for progressing with their desired actions.

5.2.3 Raising a Complaint through the Complaint Handling Procedure

If the problem has not been resolved by informal means, or the student feels it cannot be resolved through informal means, then they may submit a complaint through the Complaint Handling Procedure, which can be found at: http://www.ed.ac.uk/university-secretary-group/complaint-handling-procedure.

DRAs and/or The Advice Place can advise students on submitting a complaint.

5.2.4 Reporting concerns to Police

Where a student identifies behaviour which constitutes a criminal offence or an immediate threat to safety, they should report the matter to the Police in addition to raising concerns through the appropriate internal route set out in this policy.

6. Monitoring

The University will monitor and review its performance on promoting dignity and respect, and the effectiveness of this policy and associated procedures on an ongoing basis. Formal reports will be provided at regular intervals to People Committee and other relevant committees.

7. Policy History and Review

This policy was approved by CMG on 20 January 2010 and Court on 15 February 2010 and takes effect from 15 February 2010. It was reviewed in 2012, and subsequently incorporated the previous Harassment Codes of Practice for Staff and Students, which ceased to exist from January 2013. A further substantial review was conducted in December 2015.

No.	Approval date:	Amendment made:	Approved by:
1.	December 2011	**Minor** amendments to language have been made throughout to bring the Policy in line with the Equality Act 2010 and with the University Strategic Plan but mainly to include Section 6 clarifying procedures for breaches of this Policy.	HR Policy Development Group on behalf of CJCNC.
2.	August 2012	**Addition** of Section 5 on Breaches and **minor** amendments to the wording of the Policy Statement and Scope and Purpose sections.	CMG, Court
3	January 2013	This policy now supersedes the Harassment Codes of Practice for Staff and Students. At the same time the Harassment Contact Officer's role title changed to Dignity and Respect Advisor. Additionally, the detailed description of this role was added.	E & D Committee

| | December 2015 | **Rephrasing** of the Policy statement to bring it in line with other equality-related documents; **simplification** of the Scope and Purpose; **removal** of Guiding Principles section; **expansion** of the Responsibilities section; **inclusion** of specific examples of unacceptable behaviour; **Addition** of Sections 5.1.4 and 5.2.4 | CJCNC; CMG; Senate Curriculum and Student Progression Committee; Court |

This policy will be reviewed by February 2018.

8. Alternative Formats

If you require this document in an alternative format please contact UHRS@ed.ac.uk or telephone 0131 650 8127.

Appendix: Definitions

This Appendix provides definitions of the terms 'bullying', 'harassment', and 'discrimination'

Discrimination

Discrimination means treating an individual unfairly because the individual has, or is perceived to have a protected characteristic, or because of their association with someone who has a protected characteristic. The protected characteristics are:

- Age
- Disability
- Gender reassignment
- Race
- Religion or belief
- Sex
- Sexual orientation
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Marriage and civil partnership

Discrimination can be direct or indirect. Indirect discrimination can occur when the University has a policy or practice that applies to everyone but particularly disadvantages people who share a protected characteristic.

Harassment

Harassment is defined by the Equality Act 2010 as:

"Unwanted conduct related to a relevant protected characteristic, which has the purpose or effect of violating an individual's dignity or creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment for that individual."

The relevant protected characteristics are:

- Age
- Disability
- Gender reassignment
- Race
- Religion or belief
- Sex
- Sexual orientation

Staff and students need not possess the relevant characteristic themselves but may be subjected to unacceptable behaviour because they are wrongly perceived to have a protected characteristic, or because of their association with a person who has a protected characteristic. In addition, Staff

and students have the right to complain of behaviour that they find offensive even if it is not directed at them.

Victimisation is a type of harassment. This occurs when an individual is treated less favourably because he/she has, in good faith, made an allegation of harassment, or has assisted another person in bringing forward such an allegation, or participated in an investigation of a complaint or disciplinary hearing.

Bullying

Bullying is not defined in law but for the purposes of this policy is defined as:

"Offensive, intimidating, malicious or insulting behaviour which intentionally or unintentionally undermines, humiliates, denigrates or injures the recipient."

Bullying is normally characterised by a pattern of behaviour but a single incident could be considered as bullying behaviour.

Bullying is to be distinguished from the legitimate exercise of managerial responsibilities where these responsibilities are carried out in a respectful, reasonable and appropriate manner.