

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

**Meeting to be held on Thursday 21 May 2020 at 2pm
via Microsoft Teams**

A G E N D A

1. **Welcome and Apologies**
2. **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 24 April 2020** SQAC 19/20 5A
3. **Matters Arising**
4. **Convenor's Communication:**
 - Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) – Update SQAC 19/20 5B

For Discussion
5. Annual Monitoring, Review and Reporting: Changes due to Covid-19 Pandemic SQAC 19/20 5C
6. Student Voice:
 - Student Voice Policy - Changes SQAC 19/20 5D
 - Work related to the Covid-19 Pandemic - Update Verbal
7. Student Support Service Annual Review – Minor Change SQAC 19/20 5E
8. Thematic Review Guidance – Minor Change SQAC 19/20 5F
9. Scotland's Rural College (SRUC) Accreditation SQAC 19/20 5G
To Follow
10. Operation of Senate Standing Committees:
 - Annual Report of the Senate Standing Committees SQAC 19/20 5H
 - Themes for 2020/21 Senate Meetings SQAC 19/20 5I
 - Annual Review of Effectiveness of Senate Standing Committees SQAC 19/20 5J

For Information and Formal Business

11. Internal Periodic Review – Reports and Responses SQAC 19/20 5K
12. Knowledge Strategy Committee - Update SQAC 19/20 5L
13. Provisional Meeting Dates 2021-22 (all meetings take place between 2-5pm, venues TBC):
 - Thursday 17 September 2020
 - Thursday 3 December 2020
 - Thursday 25 February 2021
 - Thursday 22 April 2021
 - Thursday 20 May 2021

The University of Edinburgh
Senate Quality Assurance Committee

**Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 23 April 2020 at 2pm
via Microsoft Teams**

Present:

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

Apologies:

Stuart Lamot	Edinburgh University Students' Association Representative
Katie Scott	Head of Student Opportunities, Students' Association

1. Welcome and Apologies

The Convenor welcomed members to the first Teams meeting due to the coronavirus (Covid-19) pandemic.

2. Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 27 February 2020

The Committee approved the minutes of the previous meeting.

3. Matters Arising

The Committee noted in relation to minute 4.2 that the Head of Student Analytics, Insights and Modelling (Student Systems Partnership) and the Dean of Quality Assurance and Curriculum Approval (CAHSS) would meet to examine data set and methodological options for monitoring retention, progression, and attainment and report back to the Committee.

The Committee also noted that due to the coronavirus pandemic the lifespan of the Course Enhancement Questionnaires Review had been extended with the aim of implementing proposals for the start of the 2021-22 academic year.

Action: Head of Student Analytics, Insights and Modelling to circulate a Course Enhancement Questionnaires Review update to the Committee.

4. Convenor's Communications

The Convenor updated the Committee on a number of changes to quality assurance processes in response to the coronavirus pandemic:

- **Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR)** – it was noted that, at the request of Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) Scotland, the University's next ELIR had now been postponed due to the coronavirus pandemic. Key contacts across the University have been informed and new dates for the review would be communicated to colleagues once confirmed. Members suggested that the University could use the contextualisation themes in the Reflective Analysis to frame a reflection on its response to the current pandemic.
- **Internal Periodic Review (IPR)** – it was noted that the postponement of ELIR would have a knock-on effect on the IPRs schedule for 2020-21. Again, the outcome of discussions regarding new dates would be communicated to colleagues in due course.
- **Student Support Services Annual Review (SSSR)** – it was noted that the SSSR for the 2019-20 academic year would be a light touch, streamlined process focused on sharing good practice in response to the coronavirus pandemic.
- **Board of Examiners** – it was noted that updated Board of Examiner guidance had been developed by the Academic Contingency Group and made available on the University's Covid-19 SharePoint site (<https://uoe.sharepoint.com/sites/Covid19>) with a communication sent to staff. It was also noted that the University's Resilience Team, with input from the Head of Academic Policy and Regulation (Academic Services), was working on exam board decision trees and would welcome input from staff before publication. Members agreed that it would be helpful if each College could sense check the decision trees before publication. Members suggested that the decision trees include clarity on exactly what amount of information would be required for Boards to make decisions and whether different students on the same course should be treated differently (i.e. those for which the course is a core requirement vs

those taking it as an option)? The Committee was in agreement that all students should be treated equally.

Action: Committee Secretary to forward the Committee's comments to the Head of Academic Policy and Regulation.

- **Survey of Student Experiences of Remote Learning** – it was noted that the Convenor and the Vice-Principal Students were considering a survey of students to understand their experiences of the remote learning in the light of changes in response to the coronavirus pandemic. In the first instance the survey would focus on Pre-Honours students as they would not be undertaking examinations for the remainder of this academic year. Members noted the importance of ensuring that no more surveys than necessary were conducted during this busy period of upheaval and, in particular, of ensuring that a centrally organised survey did not clash with any local surveys that Schools may be planning.

Action: College Deans of Quality to check with their Schools to determine if local student surveys had been conducted or were planned in response to the coronavirus pandemic.

The Convenor also updated the Committee on changes to the Scotland's Rural College (SRUC) Accreditation process. It was noted that the report from this year's accreditation process would be submitted to the Committee meeting in May and Academic Services would oversee the process from 2020-21.

For Discussion

5. Annual Monitoring

The Committee discussed changes to annual monitoring, review and reporting processes in response to the coronavirus pandemic and the proposal for an interim process to review and reflect on 2019-20.

The Committee agreed that the interim process should be light touch and compliment academic contingency work already underway. The interim process should reflect on the impact of and learning in response to the pandemic. Timescales should be amended to provide the space for this reflection to be meaningful and to recognise the additional workload colleagues in Schools would face in the short-term and at the start of the 2020-21 academic session. Reflection on available data sets using Power BI should also be light touch with clear guidance setting out what is required. The Committee also agreed that the process should allow for the option of updating on actions identified from last year's reporting cycle and a reflection on other aspects of academic standards, student performance and the student learning experience (including industrial action).

Action: The Convenor and Academic Services to develop and submit a set of proposals to the May meeting of the Committee.

6. Senate Committee Planning - SQAC Priorities 2020-21

The Committee discussed priorities for the 2020-21 academic session.

The Committee agreed that it would:

- Continue to contribute to preparations for the University's next Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) and oversee activities in response to the review.
- Review responses to the coronavirus pandemic gathered via the University's Quality Assurance Framework, gather learning for future developments and share good practice across the institution.
- Review the approach to gathering student feedback across the University from Course Enhancement Questionnaires (CEQs).
- Examine data and methodological options for the systematic monitoring of retention, progression, and attainment data.

7. Undergraduate Degree Classification

– Undergraduate Degree Classification Analysis

The Committee received the annual report on degree classification outcomes of successfully exiting undergraduates.

The Committee noted that the proportion of first class and upper-second class degrees awarded by the University remained in line with Russell Group comparators. It was also noted that most subject areas across the University were broadly in line with Russell Group comparators for their discipline and/or with the University average.

– Strategic Discussion of Trends in Undergraduate Degree Classification Outcomes **CLOSED PAPER**

The Committee discussed a report identifying the following five subject areas where patterns in degree classification outcomes diverged substantially from either the institution average or disciplinary comparators:

- **Law** - the proportion of firsts awarded is significantly **above** the Russell Group average when averaged over 4 years.
- **Maths** - the proportion of firsts awarded is significantly **above** the Russell Group average when averaged over 4 years (and also for 2018-19 graduates in isolation).
- **Computer Science** - the proportion of firsts awarded is significantly **above** the Russell Group average when averaged over 4 years (and also for 2018-19 graduates in isolation).
- **Education** - the proportion of firsts awarded is significantly **below** the Russell Group average when averaged over 4 years (and also for 2018-19 in isolation).
- **Engineering and Technology** - the proportion of firsts awarded is significantly **below** the Russell Group average when averaged over 4 years (and also for 2018-19 in isolation).

The Committee noted that Schools with outlier subject areas would normally be invited to specifically reflect on their degree classification outcome data in the annual report. However, given the proposed interim changes to the reporting process and the additional workload faced by Schools, it was agreed that the Committee's oversight of this process for this year should be light touch. Therefore it would be at the discretion of each College to determine the appropriate oversight 'conversation' with each outlier School. The outcome of these oversight conversations would be

reported back to the Committee in due course via the proposed interim reporting process (see agenda item 5).

Action: College Deans of Quality to ensure that the outcomes of the Committee's discussions in regard to Undergraduate Degree Classification are made available to and considered by the relevant College committee(s).

8. UK Quality Code for Higher Education - Advice and Guidance Mapping

The Committee **approved** the mapping the University's policies and practices to the advice and guidance that underpins the UK Quality Code for Higher Education.

9. Work-based and Placement Learning Policy – Minor Changes

The Committee **approved** the minor changes to the Policy. The Committee agreed that the growing numbers of postgraduate research (PGR) placements should be considered in any future review or processes.

For Information and Formal Business

10. Internal Periodic Review – Responses

The Committee **confirmed** that it was content with progress.

11. Guidance:

The Committee noted the following guidance:

- QAA Covid-19 Support and Guidance <https://www.qaa.ac.uk/news-events/support-and-guidance-covid-19>
- spaqrs (Student Partnerships in Quality Scotland) Information Hub <https://www.spaqrs.ac.uk/page.php?page=886>
- QAA Scotland Focus On 2019-20 Technology Enhanced Learning resource hub <https://www.qaa.ac.uk/scotland/en/focus-on/technology-enhanced-learning>

12. Any other business

Board of Studies Guidance

Members suggested that guidance was needed on making changes to courses to adapt to the hybrid mode. It was suggested that a communication be disseminated to remind colleagues of what they can do and what changes could be made after the publication of the Degree Programme Tables (DPTs). It was agreed that there was a need to empower staff to make changes to courses where they feel they need to in order to adapt to a hybrid delivery.

Action: Academic Services Committee Secretary to forward comments to Academic Policy and Regulations Committee (APRC).

13. Date of Next Meeting: Thursday 21 May 2020 at 2pm via Teams.

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

21 May 2020

Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) 2020 – Update

Description of paper

1. Informs the Committee of the postponement of ELIR 2020.

Action requested / recommendation

2. For information.

Background and context

3. ELIR is the method by which the Quality Assurance Agency (Scotland) (QAAS) reviews universities and other higher education institutions in Scotland. The University's next ELIR was scheduled to take place in semester 1 2020/21.

Discussion

4. Due to the impact of the Covid-19 outbreak, QAAS are making changes to their schedule of ELIRs, and have asked that our review is postponed. Discussions are at an early stage, but the review visits are most likely to be moved to semester 2 2020/21, with the Reflective Analysis (RA) and supporting Advanced Information Set (AIS) submitted towards the end of November 2020. It is hoped to keep the original review team, however, this will depend on availability.
5. Thanks to the valuable contributions from students and staff and the work of internal and external reviewers, the RA is near complete. The majority of the RA will remain the same, however, student data and the status of key activities and projects will be updated, and a reflection on our response to the Covid-19 outbreak will be provided.
6. Discussions are underway with QAAS to identify new dates for the review visits and, once these are agreed, an update will be provided.
7. Additionally, the internal periodic review schedule is being considered. Three reviews from 2019/20 were postponed and eight reviews for 2020/21 were scheduled for semester 2, when the ELIR will now likely take place.

Resource implications

4. Additional updating and editing of the Reflective Analysis will be required.

Risk management

5. A successful ELIR is of vital importance to the University.

Equality & diversity

6. No issues are associated with this paper.

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

7. Updates will be provided by email and through the Teaching Matters Spotlight On ELIR series.

Author

Nichola Kett, Academic Services

15 May 2020

Freedom of Information

Open

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

21 May 2020

**Annual Monitoring, Review and Reporting:
Changes due to Covid-19 Outbreak**

Description of paper

1. Seeks approval of the suspension of normal annual monitoring, review and reporting processes due to the Covid-19 outbreak and implementation of an interim process to review and reflect on 2019/20.

Action requested / recommendation

2. To approve the report templates and timescale which form the interim process.

Background and context

3. Virtual discussions between the Assistant Principal (Academic Standards and Quality Assurance), the Vice Principal (Students), the Deputy Secretary (Student Experience), the College Deans of Quality and College quality contacts and Academic Services resulted in the following agreement which has been communicated to key colleagues by Colleges:

We will amend the process, including the timescales, to reflect on the impact of and learning from the Covid-19 outbreak. We aim to create a light touch process which works alongside other academic contingency activity. Reflection on available data sets using Power BI will also be light touch and further guidance will be provided in due course. Changes to the process will be discussed and approved by the Senate Quality Assurance Committee.

Discussion

4. Following discussion of the interim process at the Committee meeting in April, the Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance, the College Deans of Quality and College quality contacts and Academic Services have worked together to develop the report templates and timescale.
5. **Main points:**
 - In response to feedback, the scope of the process has been widened to allow optional updates on actions identified from last year's reporting cycle and a reflection on other aspects of academic standards, student performance and the student learning experience (including industrial action).
 - There is no requirement to include Massive Open Online Courses in the interim process.

- The proposed timescale is:

Reporting level	Deadline
Programme/programme cluster	Friday 30 October 2020
School/Deanery	Friday 20 November 2020
College	Friday 27 November 2020

SQAC Sub Group to meet in early December and a SQAC meeting to approve the final report to be held in mid-December.

6. At the conclusion of the interim process, the Committee will take a decision on when and how to return to normal annual monitoring, review and reporting processes, including on any changes to the normal process.

Resource implications

7. The changes proposed are intended to introduce an interim light touch process which complements existing academic contingency work.

Risk management

8. There are risks associated with ineffective monitoring, review and reporting.

Equality & diversity

9. An Equality Impact Assessment was carried out on the normal process. The interim process will likely lead to less consideration of demographic data than the normal process as it is less directive on the range of data which should be considered as part of annual monitoring. However, the programme template encourages reflection on progression and outcomes, focussing on the difference in attainment of groups of students in 2019/20, and demographic data is available in these reports in PowerBI. The Committee should consider if there are any additional equality and diversity implications during their discussions.

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

10. Academic Services will work with College Deans of Quality and College quality contacts to communicate with colleagues in key roles at an appropriate time. Discussions will also be held with colleagues in the Student Analytics and Insights Team.

Author

Nichola Kett, Academic Services
15 May 2020

Freedom of Information

Open

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH - ANNUAL MONITORING 2019/20
Programme/Programme Cluster Report

Guidance:

- An interim process to reflect on the impact of and learning from the Covid-19 outbreak. May also be used to reflect on other aspects of academic standards, student performance and the student learning experience, including the impact of industrial action. Designed to be light touch and work alongside other academic contingency activity.
- Covers all types of credit-bearing provision: undergraduate, postgraduate taught, and postgraduate research, including collaborations.
- The report should be **brief** (suggested length of no more than three pages). Use bullet points where possible.
- Schools/Deaneries decide on the optimum clustering of programmes to enable effective reflection whilst avoiding duplication of effort.
- **Deadline:** Friday 30 October 2020.

Programme(s):	
Report written by (include contributors):	
Date of report:	

1. Provide a high-level overview of changes made in response to the Covid-19 outbreak.
Please reference and/or use the information gathered via your School/Deanery's Boards of Examiners/Boards of Studies in response to Covid-19.

2. Provide a reflection on the impact of changes made in response to the Covid-19 outbreak.
Which may include but are not limited to (as appropriate):

- A consideration of student **progression** and **outcomes** (focussing on the difference in attainment of groups of students in 2019/20, rather than comparing against other years)
- Student engagement in and feedback on the changes.
- Other types of engagement in and feedback on the changes (e.g. from External Examiners, Professional Statutory and Regulatory Bodies, industry, etc.)
- Activity taking place for students whose progression was impacted.

3. OPTIONAL. Update on actions planned from previous year's annual programme monitoring.
Please note: actions planned from annual programme monitoring on 18/19 should continue to be progressed and monitored as an update will be sought in a future reporting cycle.

4. OPTIONAL. Provide a reflection on other aspects of academic standards, student performance and the student learning experience. This may include a reflection on whether

the disruption caused by the 2019/20 industrial action has led to any impact on the quality of learning, teaching and assessment and, if so, how this has been mitigated.

5. What has worked well and what would you like to retain?

This could include: changes to courses, including content, assessment and delivery methods; and changes to processes.

6. What could have worked better/requires further development?

Please identify any actions or areas for improvement.

Actions identified:

1)

2)

May 2020

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH - ANNUAL MONITORING 2019/20
School/Deanery Report

Guidance:

- An interim process to reflect on the impact of and learning from the Covid-19 outbreak. May also be used to reflect on other aspects of academic standards, student performance and the student learning experience, including the impact of industrial action. Designed to be light touch and work alongside other academic contingency activity.
- Covers all types of credit-bearing provision: undergraduate, postgraduate taught, and postgraduate research, including collaborations. The report may be split by type of provision.
- The report should be **brief** (suggested length of no more than three pages). Use bullet points where possible.
- The report will require discussion and input from across the School/Deanery.
- **Deadline:** Friday 20 November 2020.

School/Deanery:	
Report written by (include contributors):	
Date of report:	

1. OPTIONAL. Progress with (see Aide Memoir from Academic Services):

- actions planned in last year's report;
- and any recommendations from last year's Senate Quality Assurance Committee sub group meeting

Please note: actions from annual monitoring on 18/19 should continue to be progressed and monitored as an update will be sought in a future reporting cycle.

2. Summary of what has worked well.

Including good practice for sharing across the College and University.

Good practice for sharing across the College and University:

1)

2)

3. Summary of what could have worked better/requires further development.

Please identify any actions or areas for improvement.

Actions identified for the School/Deanery:

1)

2)

Actions requested of the College:

1)

2)

Actions requested of the University:

1)

2)

May 2020

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH - ANNUAL MONITORING 2019/20 College Report

Guidance:

- An interim process to reflect on the impact of and learning from the Covid-19 outbreak. May also be used to reflect on other aspects of academic standards, student performance and the student learning experience, including the impact of industrial action. Designed to be light touch and work alongside other academic contingency activity.
- Covers all types of credit-bearing provision: undergraduate, postgraduate taught, and postgraduate research, including collaborations. The report may be split by type of provision.
- The report should be **brief** (suggested length of no more than three pages). Use bullet points where possible.
- **Deadline:** Friday 27 November 2020 (completion of the report delegated to College Dean of Quality or equivalent).

1. Reflection on School/Deanery reports

2. Actions
Actions identified for the College:
1)
2)
Actions request of the University (key themes identified from School/Deanery reports and any additional actions identified by the College):
1)
2)

May 2020

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

21 May 2020

Student Voice Policy

Description of paper

1. The paper outlines changes to the Student Voice Policy.

Action requested / recommendation

2. To approve the changes to the Policy.

Background and context

3. At its meeting in December 2019, the Committee approved revisions to the Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Principles and Operational Guidance. The Committee also noted that the principles of the Guidance would receive a 'soft' launch with optional adoption during the current academic session to allow for any issues to be identified and addressed before they became mandatory from 2020/21.
4. Following extensive evaluation and consultation activity, it was agreed to extend the requirement for mid-course feedback to include postgraduate taught courses that run for 10 weeks or longer from academic session 2020/21.

Discussion

5. SSLC principles have been included in the Student Voice Policy to mandate particular approaches. The principles will be mandated for the operation of SSLC meetings from 2020/21.
6. The requirement for mid-course feedback to include postgraduate taught courses that run for 10 weeks or longer from academic session 2020/21 has been added to the Student Voice Policy.

Resource implications

7. SSLC principles: full student engagement is essential to the enhancement of the student experience. Resource implications for SSLC principles vary according to the School context but clearly do exist (although not quantified) and a significant number of Schools/Deaneries are either already implementing the principles or are planning to do. Additionally, there has been a long period of notice that the Policy change is being made. It is anticipated that the positive benefits for students justify the resource.
8. Resource implications for mid-course feedback vary according to the School context and methods chosen but clearly do exist (although not quantified). There are resource implications in extending mid-course feedback to postgraduate taught courses, although a significant number of Schools/Deaneries are either already doing this or are planning to do. Additionally, there has been a long

period of notice that the Policy change is being made. Feedback suggests that the positive benefits of mid-course feedback justify the resource.

Risk management

9. There are risks associated with ineffectively gathering and responding to student feedback.

Equality & diversity

10. No additional equality and diversity implications have been identified as a result of the proposed changes. The relevant Equality Impact Assessments have been updated:

- http://www.docs.csg.ed.ac.uk/EqualityDiversity/EIA/Academic_Services-Student_Voice_Policy.pdf
- http://www.docs.csg.ed.ac.uk/EqualityDiversity/EIA/Academic_Services-Student_Staff_Liaison_Committee_2020.pdf

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

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

Author

*Gillian Mackintosh
14 May 2020*

Presenter

Academic Services

Freedom of Information

12. Open



Student Voice Policy

Purpose of Policy

To outline the University's approach to gathering, learning from and responding to the student voice (the individual and collective views of the student body).

Overview

The Policy establishes key principles for gathering students' opinions on their University experience and for learning from and responding to the student voice.

For the purposes of these principles to reflect the undergraduate, postgraduate taught and research student bodies, 'Programme Representatives' and elected 'School Representatives' will be referred to as 'Student Representatives'.

Scope: Mandatory Policy

The Policy applies to all students and to staff with responsibility for gathering student opinion and for taking action in response.

Contact Officer

Gillian Mackintosh

Academic Policy Officer

Gillian.Mackintosh@ed.ac.uk

Document control

Dates	Approved:	Starts:	Equality impact assessment:	Amendments:	Next Review:
	30.11.17	30.11.17	14.05.20	21/05/2020	2021/2022
Approving authority	Senate Quality Assurance Committee (QAC)				
Consultation undertaken	Edinburgh University Students' Association, Student Systems				
Section responsible for policy maintenance & review	Academic Services				
Related policies, procedures, guidelines & regulations					
UK Quality Code	UK Quality Code for Higher Education Advice and Guidance : Student Engagement				
Policies superseded by this policy	Principles and operational notes for Student Staff Liaison Committees Learning from and Responding to the Student Voice Policy Learning from and Responding to the Student Voice Code of Practice				
Alternative format	If you require this document in an alternative format please email Academic.Services@ed.ac.uk or telephone 0131 651 4490.				
Keywords	Student voice, Student Staff Liaison Committee, SSLC, Edinburgh University Students' Association, student representation, surveys, feedback, engagement, internal periodic review				



Student Voice Policy

Introduction

The University has a clear commitment to excellence in learning and teaching and enhancing the student experience. To ensure that the University maintains a high quality student experience it is essential that all students have an opportunity throughout their study to reflect on and evaluate their experience of academic life and the wider service offering. To this end the University engages with its students through a variety of mechanisms with a view to learning from and responding to the student voice from students individually, collectively or through their representatives.

Our commitment to working in partnership with students is articulated at the highest level in the University's Strategic Plan and the University Learning and Teaching Strategy. Staff at the University of Edinburgh currently work in partnership with Edinburgh University Students' Association to:

- ensure that students are central to governance and decision making,
- ensure that students are central to quality assurance and enhancement,
- provide opportunities for students to become active participants,
- foster collaboration between students and staff.

The student experience is used throughout this Policy to encompass the learning, teaching and assessment experience and the wider student experience including experience of student support services. This Policy recognises that student views about their experience of the University are an essential part of the University's quality assurance and enhancement framework.

Key Principles for Learning from and Responding to the Student Voice

The primary purpose of gathering student opinion is to assure the quality of learning and teaching and student services, and to enhance the student experience.

The methods used to survey the student opinion should not disadvantage any student from participating. The methods used should provide equal opportunity for all students to feedback on their experience.

Student surveying must be conducted within strict ethical guidelines¹. Data integrity must be maintained through systematic approaches to collection and management. Confidentiality and anonymity of respondents must be ensured. Students must be informed of the purpose of the survey and the uses that may be made of the data. Careful consideration should be given to the timing of surveys.

The benefits of surveying student opinion must outweigh the costs².

Students should ensure that their feedback does not breach the University's Dignity and Respect Policy³.

The unit responsible for gathering feedback from students must communicate actions taken in response on a timescale appropriate to student needs

¹ Student Surveys Ethics Committee <http://edin.ac/2gyAUHf>

² Contact the Student Surveys Unit for an example cost/benefit analysis

³ Dignity and Respect Policy <http://edin.ac/1Cq0VZY>



Student Voice Policy

Multiple sources of information will be used to draw insights. Sources of information include: surveys; the student representative structure; and Staff Student Liaison Committees. Where relevant, the analysis of data should allow for benchmarking.

Communicating Action taken in Response to Feedback

It is extremely important that student feedback is acted upon and that the action taken in response to feedback is clearly and effectively communicated to students. This will ensure that students feel their feedback is valued, shared, reflected upon and used for enhancement and they are clear on the action taken by the University in response to their feedback.

Mechanisms for Listening and Responding to the Student Voice

The following mechanisms underpin the University's approach to listening and responding to the student voice (Schools may supplement these with local arrangements):

- Student Representation
- Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC)
- Student Surveys and Course Enhancement Questionnaires
- Mid-course feedback from Students
- Student participation in Internal Periodic Reviews and Student Support Service/Thematic Reviews
- Student Partnership Agreement
- Student Panel

Student Representation

The University's student representation system provides multiple opportunities for the student voice to be heard. The Students' Association facilitates the student voice through Programme Representatives, School Representatives, Activities Representatives, Section Group Representatives, Liberation Officers and Sabbatical Officers. The student representation system functions through various structures and systems, including Student Council, campaigns, student-led projects, and referenda.

The Senate Learning and Teaching Committee⁴ agreed that from 2019/20, all Schools are expected to implement a programme-level representation system for taught provision rather than following a tutorial or class representative model. Exceptions to this will be considered by Academic Services and the Students' Association, overseen by Senate Quality Assurance Committee (QAC)⁵.

The number of programme representatives ('student reps') for taught provision in each School should be broadly proportionate to the number of students on programmes in the School. While Schools have flexibility, in liaison with the Students' Association, to determine how they organize their programme reps, a ratio of 1:40 is a useful guide.

⁴ Senate Learning and Teaching Committee 23 May 2018

⁵ Academic Engagement Coordinator and VP Education, Edinburgh University Students' Association, Academic Policy Officer, Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance



Student Voice Policy

The Students' Association provide targeted in-person training for student representatives ('student reps')⁶ which focuses on the programme level. Online training will also be available for students on online programmes and students on placement.

In addition to operating Programme Rep arrangements for taught programmes, Schools will work with the Students' Association to operate appropriate student representational systems for postgraduate research programmes.

Further information:

Student Representation <http://edin.ac/2qz69C2>

Edinburgh University Students' Association <https://edin.ac/2wnxO1d>

Student Staff Liaison Committees (SSLC)

Student-Staff Liaison Committees are held in every School and are the main forum for staff and Student Representatives to discuss matters relating to degree programmes and the student experience.

SSLCs provide a formal mechanism for communication and discussion between academic and administrative staff and representatives of the student body, relating to all matters connected with improving the degree programmes (at all levels of study including Undergraduate (UG), Postgraduate Taught (PGT) and Postgraduate Research (PGR)) and the student experience. In addition it provides a mechanism to escalate issues that are out with the remit of the SSLC to resolve, to School, College, University or Support Service for further action.

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

At least one formal meeting should be held in each semester, which should be agreed upon in consultation with School staff and Student Representatives.

Schools must publish the date, time, and location of the meeting, inviting any additional items to be added to the agenda. It is suggested that this happens at least two weeks in advance of the meeting.

The agenda must be made available in advance of the meeting. Schools must publish minutes and inform students and staff where these are located.

Meetings should be attended by:

- Programme Representatives for the programmes being discussed
- Staff responsible for the leadership and organisation of the programme
- Professional services staff as appropriate and relevant to school structure.

[Online Learner Student Representatives and Students](#) should have the opportunity to participate virtually during the meeting or input via other electronic means beforehand.

Staff and Student Representatives are responsible for ensuring that students are made aware of how their feedback is acted upon after the SSLC meeting.

⁶ Online training will continue for online learners, students on placement and in other exceptional cases.



Student Voice Policy

Operational Guidance: <http://edin.ac/2AiKgSo>

Student Surveys and Course Enhancement Questionnaires

Student surveys are a key element in seeking feedback from students and obtaining information to improve services and the student experience. Results are analysed and recommendations for change made based on the findings. Some of the findings may prompt further research to gain more of an understanding of how students feel about particular issues. Important student surveys include: the National Student Survey; the Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey; the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey; and Course Enhancement Questionnaires.

Further information: <http://edin.ac/2i1banf>

The main purpose of **Course Enhancement Questionnaires** (CEQs) is to enhance student learning, to provide School staff with information that they can use to guide and evaluate changes in course content and teaching, and to enhance support for learning across programmes and the broader University. All taught, credit bearing courses (UG and PG) that have students enrolled on them and are delivered by the University of Edinburgh, including the taught portion of research courses, should be surveyed using the University's standard survey tool and question sets.

Further information: staff <http://edin.ac/2w1vj1o> and students <http://edin.ac/2gAJEfQ>

Mid-course feedback from Students

Mid-course feedback aims to provide students with an opportunity to provide feedback to staff *whilst courses are running* on what is going well and to identify any problems with the course. Students will receive a response to their feedback, again whilst the course is still running. This allows students to identify issues which staff can adjust during the course so that the current cohort of students can benefit from changes made; and to highlight aspects that are working well. It also allows staff to respond to items raised which cannot be adjusted during the course and to provide reason(s) for this.

Schools must ensure that mid-course feedback is collected and responded to for all undergraduate postgraduate taught courses which run for 10 weeks or more. Schools are responsible for determining how mid-course feedback is carried out, for ensuring that it operates in an appropriate way and encourages constructive feedback. If Schools think that a particular approach to gathering mid-course feedback might raise equality and diversity issues then they should take steps to mitigate the risks.

Further information:

- Examples for students <http://edin.ac/2i1J0Z5>
- Guidance for staff <http://edin.ac/2dOmswH>
- Equality and Diversity guidance <https://edin.ac/2wIXeMI>

Student participation in Internal Periodic Reviews and Student Support Service/Thematic Reviews

Student views are gathered as part of the University's internal periodic review and student support service/thematic reviews. For internal periodic review, mechanisms for engaging with students prior to the review are detailed in the [guidance](#) issued by Academic Services and for Student Support Service/Thematic Reviews, a reflection on feedback from students forms part of process.

Further information: <http://edin.ac/2gz59hg>



Student Voice Policy

Student Partnership Agreement

The Student Partnership Agreement states how students and the University are working in partnership. It is reviewed annually and, over time, will document activity.

The University of Edinburgh and Edinburgh University Students' Association enjoy a long and productive partnership. This agreement builds on the strength of that partnership. It highlights how the wider University, including all students and staff, can effectively work together to enhance the student experience. It sets out our values, our approach to partnership and the priorities we have agreed to work on together.

Further information: <http://edin.ac/2i1pIDg>

Student Panel

The Student Panel is intended to provide staff with easy access to a broadly demographically representative sample of the student population for research purposes, whilst insulating the wider student population from ad-hoc insight activity in an effort to prevent survey fatigue.

By signing up for the Student Panel, a student is agreeing to be contacted by the Student Data and Surveys team on a regular basis and asked to complete a variety of tasks. These tasks can range from filling out a short survey to attending a focus group. In return for their time, any student that participates in a task is awarded panel points which they can exchange for vouchers.

Contact: Student Surveys Unit student.surveys@ed.ac.uk

May 2020-23-May-2019

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

21 May 2020

**Student Support Services Annual Review:
2019/20 Reporting Process**

Description of paper

1. Proposal to streamline the Student Support Services Annual Review (SSSAR) process and revise the reporting template for 2019/20 reporting. Outlines the suspension of normal annual reporting processes due to the Covid-19 outbreak and proposes implementing an interim process to review and reflect on 2019/20.

Action requested / recommendation

2. For approval.

Background and context

3. Student Support Service review assures the quality of the student experience with regard to services. It is part of the University's annual quality monitoring processes.

Discussion

4. The Covid-19 outbreak and resulting Government restrictions have meant that this year is significantly different to the previous year. It has also had significant impacts on the University's Student Support Services' operations.
5. Quality Assurance Agency Scotland's expectation is that the sector will still carry out its annual quality monitoring process but recognises that these may be different.
6. Academic Services proposes that SSSAR reporting for 2019/20 should be streamlined to focus on impacts of industrial action and Covid-19. This will reduce the reporting burden on services and also fulfil expectations for compliance.

7. Reporting template

A revised reporting template is attached as Appendix 1. Academic Services proposes that this is circulated to services before the end of May with a reporting deadline in mid-November. Services will be invited to submit their reports from the end of August to a new SharePoint site, which will facilitate sharing of experience and practice with other services. As reports will focus on the extraordinary impacts of Covid-19 they will be shortened to a five page maximum.,

Reviewing reports

Academic Services proposes that there is no formal reader reporting for this year. Instead, Academic Services will review all reports and the SSSAR sub-committee

external member and the Students' Association Vice-President Education will also be invited to review the reports to highlight areas of good practice for sharing. This will ensure expectations on externality and student voice set out in the UK Quality Code are met.

Meetings

It is also proposed to hold an event, to celebrate the effort of Student Support Services during the pandemic and share good practice, after the reporting process is complete. Therefore, there will be no formal SSSAR sub-committee meetings for this reporting cycle.

Resource implications

8. Resource involved in setting up a new SharePoint site will be met from within existing Academic Services resources. The streamlined reporting process will mean less work for service heads and also for sub-committee members.

Risk management

9. Academic Services has not identified any risks in the proposed changes.

Equality & diversity

10. The proposed changes will mean that services are not specifically asked to consider impacts of changes to their services on different groups of students as part of the reporting process this year. The Committee should consider equality and diversity during their discussions

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

11. Academic Services will communicate with Student Support Services and implement agreed changes to reporting for this cycle. Academic Services will evaluate the impact of changes for this year to inform any future review of the SSSAR process.

Author

*Susan Hunter, Academic Services
13 May 2020*

Presenter

Nichola Kett

Freedom of Information

The paper is open.

Student Support Services Annual Review



THE UNIVERSITY
of EDINBURGH

Service Value Assessment: Academic Year 2019/20

Completing the report

- The report should be the output of a reflective process, focusing on
 - activities **over the past academic year**,
 - the student experience and
 - activities that relate to student use of the service.
- The report should be brief, **no longer than 5 pages** and should reflect on specific changes implemented in response to disruption during industrial action and Covid-19. Focus on what worked well, what worked less well and what you might continue going forward.

Text in *italics* is for guidance; please replace it with your own content.

The [Student Support Services Review Policy](#) contains an overview of the process.

Service:	
Submitted by:	
Date:	

Reflection on 2019/20

Summarise the impacts of industrial action and Covid-19 on how the Service operated in 2019/20.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>A brief outline of and reflection on any new developments in response to industrial action/Covid-19 and their impact on service delivery (doing new things).</i> 2. <i>A brief outline of and reflection on changes made to activities, processes, practices or policies, in response to industrial action/Covid-19 (doing the same things in a new way).</i> 3. <i>What has worked well (include any partnership working activity):</i> 4. <i>What worked less well:</i> 5. <i>What changes might you continue going forward:</i>

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

21 May 2020

Thematic Review Guidance

Description of paper

1. The paper outlines changes to the Thematic Review Guidance.

Action requested / recommendation

2. To approve the changes to the Guidance.

Background and context

3. At the meeting held on Thursday 27 February 2020, the Committee agreed that the current approach to Thematic Review should be maintained but that it should be reserved for significant issues requiring in-depth exploration.

Discussion

4. The Committee is asked to approve the minor change to the Guidance.

Resource implications

5. A key challenge of Thematic Reviews is that they are relatively resource intensive. The agile and responsive approach of the Thematic Review process requires more co-ordination and administrative resource than the traditional approach to internal reviews. Organising a range of interviews, focus groups, surveys, and additional meetings requires additional work on the part of the review co-ordinator and can require additional time of each member of the review panel. Moving to an irregular review schedule will have a positive impact on the resources Academic Services has available for future reviews as well as other activities across the University.

Risk management

6. There are no risks associated with the change.

Equality & diversity

7. No additional equality and diversity implications have been identified as irregular but in-depth Thematic Reviews would signal the importance of the issues under consideration.

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

8. The Guidance will be made available on the Academic Services webpages.

Author

Brian Connolly
May 2020

Presenter

Brian Connolly

Freedom of Information

Open



Thematic Review Guidance

Purpose of Guidance

This guidance is for support service and academic areas included in a Thematic Review at the University of Edinburgh.

Scope: Guidance is not Mandatory

Staff involved in Thematic Review

Contact Officer Brian Connolly Academic Policy Officer b.connolly@ed.ac.uk

Document control

Dates	Approved: 25.05.2017	Starts: 2017-18	Equality impact assessment: May 2017	Amendments: 21.05.2020	Next Review: 2024-25
Approving authority	Quality Assurance Committee				
Consultation undertaken	Academic Services				
Section responsible for guidance maintenance & review	Academic Services				
Related policies, procedures, guidelines & regulations	Student Support Service Annual Quality Assurance Report Template				
UK Quality Code					
Guidance superseded by this guidance	n/a				
Alternative format	If you require this document in an alternative format please email Academic.Services@ed.ac.uk or telephone 0131 650 514481.				
Keywords	Thematic Review, quality, student support				



Thematic Review Guidance

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Thematic Review is the process by which the quality of the student experience is reviewed in relation to a particular theme or aspect of student support, rather than an individual service or academic area.
- 1.2 The role of student support is of crucial importance in determining the overall quality of the student learning experience.

As part of the University's Quality Assurance Framework, a review of the strategic and operational role of support services in relation to their impact on the student experience is conducted annually by a sub-group of the Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC). This annual review process allows the University to reflect on the contribution of support services to the 'quality culture' within the institution, the ways in which the services engage with students to monitor and improve the quality of services, and the ways in which the services promote high quality learning and continuous quality enhancement.

- 1.3 A key element of the annual review process is the identification of key issues and common themes which emerged across the University during the previous year. These are then considered by SQAC and inform the choice of topic for future Thematic Reviews. **The Thematic Review process is reserved for issues of significance to the University requiring in-depth exploration, as determined by SQAC, and therefore reviews may take place on an irregular basis.**

Commented [CB1]: SQAC agreed, at the meeting held on Thursday 27 February 2020, that the current approach to Thematic Review should be maintained but that it should be reserved for significant issues requiring in-depth exploration. It was agreed that using Thematic Review as an irregular but in-depth mechanism would signal the importance of the issues under consideration.

2. Aims, Scope and Objectives

- 2.1 The aim of Thematic Review is to identify and analyse areas of good practice and areas for enhancement across student support in relation to a select category of student experience or 'theme'. The approach aims to take an overview of strategy, services and user experiences pursuant to a particular theme that cuts across many areas of the University, in relation to both support services and academic areas.

It is intended that the process should be positive and constructive, supporting the service and academic areas in the enhancement of provision and the student experience.

- 2.2 The scope of Thematic Review can be broad or narrow depending on the nature of particular theme.

For example, a broad scope encompassing student support across the University and examining a wide range of issues may be appropriate for a particular theme relevant to the student body as a whole. Alternatively, a narrower, more limited scope may be more appropriate when examining issues which impact on a discrete section of the student population.

The scope of a Thematic Review is determined by SQAC with due consideration given to the findings of the annual review of student support services, relevant statistical data and the University's strategic priorities.

- 2.3 The objectives of Thematic Review are to:



Thematic Review Guidance

- facilitate discussion between schools, colleges and support services;
- evaluate the extent to which provision meets and supports the needs of students and relevant stakeholders, including staff;
- evaluate the ways in which support engage with stakeholders to monitor and improve the quality of provision;
- share and disseminate examples of good practice;
- identify opportunities for enhancement and monitor action taken in response;
- evaluate the extent to which the activities are aligned with relevant institutional strategic objectives, as well as external requirements;
- determine action or support required at institutional level.

3. Process

3.1 The Thematic Review process consists of the following key stages:

- Planning
- Consultation
- Report
- Implementation

3.2 Planning Stage

A review panel will be selected by the by the Convenor of SQAC, including a Review Convenor, in consultation with the Deputy Secretary Student Experience and Academic Services. The panel will include a school academic representative, a school administrative representative, a student representative, an external member, and a Review Administrator (Academic Services). The Review Administrator will act as liaison between the review panel and the support areas.

The review panel will hold an initial meeting to discuss the scope of the review and agree a remit. At this meeting the panel will agree upon timelines for the review, which support services will be included and what documentary evidence will be required. The panel will also determine the most appropriate methodological approach to the consultation stage. For example, this may entail a day of scheduled meetings, a survey, or a set of focus groups or interviews with key stakeholders.

The support services and academic areas included in the review will produce a brief report providing a reflective and self-critical evaluation of the provision in relation to the theme of the review. The support service and academic area may be asked to provide further supporting documentation in advance of the review, however no material in addition to the reflective report should have to be created especially for the review.

In turn, the review panel will hold a meeting to consider the reflective reports (and other documentary evidence), identify initial findings and where further information may be required. Final arrangements for the consultation stage will be agreed at this point, including arrangements for meetings with key stakeholders.

3.3 Consultation Stage



Thematic Review Guidance

The review panel will conduct consultations with key stakeholders (i.e. student and staff service users, support service staff, and University management) in line with the chosen methodological approach.

The review panel will hold a meeting at the conclusion of the consultation stage to discuss findings and agree initial commendations and recommendations which will form the basis of the review report.

3.4 Report Stage

The review report is drafted by the Review Administrator.

The report will identify and analyse areas of good practice and areas of enhancement across the student support services in relation to the theme. The report will include the following sections:

- Executive Summary - highlighting the key findings, commendations and recommendations;
- Introduction – noting the rationale for the theme and the chosen methodology;
- Analysis – in-depth consideration of the key findings, commendations and recommendations;
- Appendix – including a list of documentation considered by the review panel and a prioritized list of commendations and recommendations.

The Review Convenor agrees the draft before it is circulated to the review panel for comment and approval. The draft report is then sent to the relevant support or academic area for correction of factual errors. The review report is then submitted to SQAC for consideration and approval of the commendations and recommendations.

Following approval, the final report is circulated by Academic Services to the heads of support services and academic areas included in the review, Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance, Deputy Secretary Student Experience, review panel, and copied to all areas responsible for action. The report is published on the Academic Services website.

3.5 Implementation Stage

Following receipt of the final report, the support services and academic areas are responsible for taking forward action on the recommendations made by the review. The reviewed areas are responsible for informing student service users of the review outcome and actions taken to address recommendations.

Approximately 14 weeks after receiving the final report, the areas with remitted actions submit an initial progress report to SQAC for comment, approval and feedback.

A year after receiving the final report, areas with remitted actions submit a further progress report to SQAC for comment, approval and feedback. At this point, where recommendations are still outstanding, SQAC will agree an appropriate approach to ongoing monitoring of recommendations.

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

21 May 2020

Annual Report of the Senate Standing Committees

Description of paper

1. This is the annual report of the Senate Standing Committees: Education Committee; Academic Policy and Regulations Committee; and Quality Assurance Committee. It reports on the Committees' achievements and use of delegated powers in 2019-20. It also proposes outline plans for 2020-21.

Action requested

2. For information.

Background and Context

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

Resource implications

4. The proposed plans for 2020-21 will have some resource implications relating to time spent by members of the Committees and Policy Officers in Academic Services or staff invited to participate in working groups. Some of the resource requirements for wider work of the Committees will be met through existing resources or have agreed funding in place.

Risk Management

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

Equality and Diversity

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

Next steps / implications

7. The approved report will be highlighted in the Senate Committees' Newsletter. The Senate Committees will progress the agreed strategic approach during 2020-21 as set out in the report. This report will also be shared with the University Court for information.

Author

Sue MacGregor, Director of Academic Services
May 2020

Freedom of Information

Open

Annual Report of the Senate Committees 2019-20

1. Executive Summary

This report summarises the achievements of the Senate Committees, and their use of the powers delegated to them by Senate, for academic year 2019-20, along with their proposed plans for 2020-21.

2. Introduction

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

- [Education Committee](#)
- [Academic Policy and Regulations Committee](#)
- [Quality Assurance Committee](#)

Proposals for future work have arisen from Committee discussions, and discussion at the Senate Committee Conveners' Forum. The proposals are designed to assist the University in pursuing its Learning and Teaching Strategy and meeting the goals of the University Strategy 2030, see:

- [Learning and Teaching Strategy](#)
- [Strategy 2030](#)

Please note that Committee discussions over the latter part of 2019/20 have been heavily affected by Covid-19 preparations which has meant that, in some cases, Committee priorities for 2020/21 are still under review and will require full sign-off by the relevant Committee at the start of 2020/21 session.

3. Key Committee and Task Group Activities in 2019-20*

Name of Committee	No. of meetings
Senate Education Committee	4
Academic Policy & Regulations	6
Senate Quality Assurance Committee	5

Name of Task Group	Task Group of:
Personal Tutor System Oversight Group	SQAC
Support for Curriculum Development Group	SEC
Learning Analytics Review Group	SEC
HEAR Recommendation Panel	SEC

*Includes meetings scheduled for the remainder of the session.

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

4. Senate Committees' Achievements 2019-20

4.1 Activities involving wider contribution or cutting across all Committees

A number of activities proposed in last year's report involved all three Committees. In addition, the Coronavirus Covid-19 pandemic has necessarily involved each of the Committees in response and mitigation activity, some of which is noted below:

Previously agreed Activity
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Continue to work with Students' Association to promote and implement the Student Partnership Agreement At its meeting in October 2019, Senate Education Committee approved a refreshed version of the Student Partnership Agreement for 2019-2020. The revised themes relate to ongoing work in the Student Experience Action Plan and have been discussed with the Students' Association, the Deputy Secretary Student Experience and the Vice Principal (Students). The themes include Community, Student Voice and Social Justice.• Funds were allocated through the Sense of Belonging Task Group for students and staff to submit bids for projects to take forward the priorities within the partnership agreement during 2019-2020. A total of thirteen applications were received and twelve projects secured funding, covering areas including a ceilidh, a student-staff sustainability think-tank to develop meaningful and embedded sustainability conversations throughout the BVM&S curriculum, and the purchase of garden tools to facilitate the development of the Kings Building's Permaculture Garden.• This activity has been coordinated by a member of the Academic Services Quality Team. For further information see: www.ed.ac.uk/students/academic-life/student-voice/partnership-agreement
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Implement any agreed changes to the operation of Senate and to its Committee structures following the externally-facilitated review of Senate, and the review of the structure of the Senate committees. Each Committee received new Terms of Reference (ToR) and memberships and successfully launched their meetings under those arrangements at the beginning of the academic session. These ToR reflected the new approach suggested in the external review. The terms of reference for SQAC remained similar to those of the preceding year. However, the creation of the Education Committee following the disbanding of the Learning and Teaching Committee and Research Experience Committee involved additional considerations on how we might effectively combine Postgraduate Research matters alongside other Learning and Teaching strategy, policy and oversight. The PGR representatives from the three Colleges have maintained an input to agenda setting this year in order that this balance can be set.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Continue to take steps towards aligning with the new UK Quality Code, with a view to full alignment prior the University's next Enhancement-Led Institutional Review (ELIR). The Committee has maintained its oversight of alignment with the UK Quality Code and has coordinated the detailed activities and wider consultation on the draft Reflective Analysis document.
Covid-19 Response / Industrial Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• APRC has been consulted a number of times as emergency academic guidance was produced in response to both industrial action and most urgently the Covid-19 pandemic. A number of temporary concessions to regulations were agreed by APRC during the session.

- SQAC agreed proposals at its May meeting for the suspension of normal annual monitoring, review and reporting process due to the Covid-19 outbreak. Proposals for an interim process to review and reflect on 2019/20 were agreed.
- Education Committee held discussions at its May meeting on the shape and approach to delivering teaching and learning in Semester 1.

4.2 Education Committee

Progress with activities proposed in last year's report:

Activity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oversee continued implementation of University Learning and Teaching Strategy – it was agreed at the October 2019 meeting of Education Committee that 2019/20 would be the final year of the operation of the Learning and Teaching Strategy. The University will transition to a new strategy in due course, the main focus of which will be plans for curriculum reform. The new strategy will also incorporate the key principles from the Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy to ensure that the curriculum is inclusive by design.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In partnership with the Service Excellence Programme's Student Administration and Support board, oversee and guide the review of student support - Education Committee received an update on the Student Support and Personal Tutor Project at its October 2019 meeting and approved the proposed support model at its December 2019 meeting.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oversee the implementation of recommendations from the 2018-19 task group on inclusion, equality and diversity in the curriculum – it has been agreed that a taskforce will be established by Professor Sarah Cunningham-Burley under the new Equality, Diversity & Inclusion Committee to drive forward the recommendations of this task group and the Thematic Review of black and minority ethnic (BME) students' experiences of support at the University.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor the implementation of the new institutional policy to support the University's Lecture Recording service – the Lecture Recording Policy is currently being reviewed to take account of learning from use of the service during the COVID-19 pandemic.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure continued progress to enhance support for Careers, Employability and the development of graduate attributes – members received a copy of a briefing paper in February 2020 summarising research undertaken by the Careers Service into the future of work and what this means for Edinburgh's students. Graduate attribute development and a curriculum that supports this will be a key focus of the planned curriculum reform.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to monitor implementation of the Student Mental Health Strategy – an update from the Director of Student Wellbeing will be brought to the September 2020 meeting of Education Committee.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to strengthen the University's understanding of retention and continuation rates for different undergraduate student groups, and to focus on enabling students from all groups to succeed – this is now being taken forward by Senate Quality Assurance Committee.

The priorities agreed for Researcher Experience Committee (now being taken forward by SEC) and progress made to date are as follows:

- **Excellence in Doctoral Training and Career Development programme - evaluate the effectiveness of School / College briefings for supervisors, assess the impact of changes to requirements of supervisor training and support planned for 2019-20, and explore the development of online training to supplement School / College**

<p>briefings for supervisors – Education Committee received an update at its October 2019 meeting on work being undertaken under the ‘Supervisor Support and Training’ work stream of the programme. It also endorsed a proposal to develop an online course for doctoral supervisors to complement mandatory supervisor briefings at its December 2019 meeting.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the University’s approach to overseeing, coordinating, and managing postgraduate research student (PGR) support and development activities at an institutional level (subject to clarifying the relationship with the planned Service Excellence Programme strand of work on the PGR student lifecycle) – the Committee received an update on proposals to establish a ‘Doctoral College’ at its October 2019 meeting, and considered more detailed proposals later in the academic year. In the meantime, Education Committee approved (at its December 2019 meeting) temporary governance arrangements to ensure that the business formerly undertaken by REC continues to be well managed. The Doctoral College Management Group met in April 2020 to shape the next steps towards an intended launch of the Doctoral College in the Autumn.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate the implementation of the revised Code of Practice for Researchers and Supervisors – at the meeting in March 2020, SEC noted an evaluation of the effectiveness of communication of the Code of Practice for Supervisors and Research Students (Code of Practice) and revised content published in 2018.

4.3 Academic Policy and Regulations Committee (APRC)

Progress with activities proposed in last year’s report:

Activity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with the Service Excellence Programme to oversee the implementation of any significant policy changes associated with the current programme of work (e.g. Special Circumstances and Coursework Extensions, Programme and Course Information Management) The Committee has been working closely with colleagues in the Service Excellence Programme, providing feedback on proposed changes to policy and regulations relating to extensions and special circumstances. The Committee will consider for approval final proposals at its May 2020 meeting, in order to support the introduction of the Extensions and Special Circumstances Team ahead of 2020/21.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guide the University’s response to any policy issues raised by the UK Standing Committee for Quality Assessment’s report on degree classification outcomes Developments in this area are being monitored by the Committee. There has been no specific need to consider any policy changes at this time. However, we have made significant progress on the issue of borderlines for classification, covered below.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oversee the implementation of changes in policy regarding resubmission of PGT dissertations and associated dissertation supervision support, and PGT assessment/progression arrangements Academic Services is not aware of any issues arising from the implementation of the new regulations relating to resubmission of PGT dissertations. However, we will be keen to seek feedback from Schools and Colleges. In light of the demands upon Schools and Colleges imposed by Covid-19 contingency, we will delay seeking this feedback until 2020/21.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oversee the implementation of changes to the Code of Student Conduct following the review in 2018-19, and conduct a light-touch review of the impact of the amendments In light of the impact of Covid-19 on relevant stakeholders, we will delay seeking feedback on the amendments to the Code of Student Conduct until 2020/21. Staff in Academic

Services are in frequent contact with staff at the Advice Place, who support students through the conduct process.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oversee the implementation of any agreed changes to the Support for Study Policy following the review in 2018-19 The policy was agreed and the website updated and the revised policy will kept under review.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop an institution-wide approach to borderlines for Honours degree classification Academic Services and Colleges are currently assessing whether to delay the introduction of any new approach beyond 2020/21 in order to prevent unreasonable impact upon Schools dealing with Covid-19 contingency planning.

4.4 Quality Assurance Committee (QAC)

Progress with activities proposed in last year's report:

Activity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to evaluate the impact of the new programme-based approach to the Class Representation System SQAC has overseen the move to the new programme-based representative system from the start of the 2019-20 academic session. Academic Services and the Students' Association produced a graphical guide for students giving feedback (including feedback on the new student representation system) which was published online and hard copy versions shared across the University.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oversee institutional activities in response to the University's 2015 Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) and contribute to preparations for the 2020 ELIR, including continuing to work on assessment and feedback SQAC has overseen preparations for the 2020 Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR). The Convenor and Academic Services drafted the institutional Reflective Analysis report and coordinated contributions from colleagues across the University. However, at the request of Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) Scotland, the ELIR has now been postponed due to the coronavirus. SQAC will communicate the outcome of the discussion about new dates for the review to colleagues once it has been confirmation.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oversee implementation of mid-course feedback to taught postgraduate courses (subject to the outcome of the review during 2018-19) SQAC continues to monitor the implementation of mid-course feedback through annual monitoring, review and reporting processes. The Committee approved the Mid-Course Feedback Guidance for the start of the 2019-20 academic session (as requested by Learning and Teaching Committee in May 2019 in response to the follow-up evaluation of mid-course feedback). The guidance encourages the use of mid-course feedback for taught postgraduate courses with a view to making it Policy for 2020/21.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to monitor the effectiveness of the operation of the Personal Tutor system SQAC has continued to monitor the effectiveness of the Personal Tutoring (PT) system via the PT Oversight Group. Since the last Senate report, the Group met to approve the School Personal Tutoring Statements for 2019-20. While the Group was broadly content with the Tutoring Statements, it asked some Schools to make some amendments to their Statements before publishing them. The Group is due to meet twice during the remainder of the 2019-20 academic session: to approve the School Personal Tutoring Statements for 2020-21; and to reflect on the student survey results. This Group will continue to oversee the PT system until the implementation of the evolved model of Student Support.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to support Schools to reflect on their patterns of degree classification outcomes

SQAC continues to monitor subject areas for patterns in degree classification outcomes which diverge substantially from either the institution average or disciplinary comparators. This year six subject areas were identified as statistically significant outliers. While acknowledging that there may be good reasons for these areas to have these patterns of degree outcomes, SQAC invited them to clarify their position by including a detailed reflection on the degree classification outcome data in their School's annual quality report. Each School provided an explanation of trends and actions taken to address any inappropriate patterns and SQAC will continue to annually monitor degree classification outcomes across the University.

5 Exercising of delegated powers in 2019-20

Senate has delegated to the Committees a range of its powers. These powers are set out in the Committees' terms of reference (see Section 2, above). The main powers that the Committees have exercised during 2019-20 (in addition to the project-based activities set out in Section 4, above) can be summarised as:

- Strategies / regulations / policies / codes
 - Approval of curriculum changes
 - Quality Assurance
 - Student concessions
- The attached Annex sets out any new strategies / regulations / policies / codes that the Committees have approved (the more substantive of which are covered in Section 4 above), along with changes to existing documents.
 - APRC was asked in November 2019 to approve a suite temporary concessions to regulations and policies in response to planned industrial action in Semester 1 and subsequently to cover Semester 2. The aim of this was to mitigate the academic impact on students of the industrial action which had been announced by The University & College Union (UCU) while maintaining academic standards and the value of the University's award.
 - In addition, at its meeting in March 2020 and on the recommendation of the Academic Contingency Group, APRC approved the extending of these temporary concessions in response to the Covid-19 pandemic.
 - Preparation for the Enhancement-Led Institutional Review (ELIR) has been overseen by SQAC throughout the period. It should be noted that the impact of the Covid-19 outbreak has led the Quality Assurance Agency Scotland (QAAS) to consider changes to their schedule for ELIR visits and have asked that our review is postponed until Semester 2 in 2020/21.
 - SQAC agreed proposals at its May meeting for the suspension of normal annual monitoring, review and reporting process due to the Covid-19 outbreak. Proposals for an interim process to review and reflect on 2019/20 were agreed.

6 Senate Committees' Priorities for 2020-21

6.1 Planning Context

As noted above, the year 2019/20 has been influenced both by periods of industrial action and intense response and mitigation of the Covid-19 pandemic. In addition, it is noted that

the Committee priorities for 2020/21 will need to be revisited and that the Committees aim to focus on these at the start of the new academic year.

It is recognised that the University's Academic Governance arrangements and new plans for the management and direction of our Adaptation and Renewal Programme will need to work in harmony, with all Committees playing a major part.

Key areas of activity which will affect the cycles of business of all three Senate Committees will include the evolving approach to Curriculum Reform; response to the ELIR outcomes now expected in Semester 2 and the quality of academic experience for students and learners at all levels.

6.2 Education Committee

Activity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drive the curriculum reform agenda in the evolving context
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure effective responses to ELIR recommendations (NB: ELIR now running in Semester 2)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oversee the ongoing development of the Doctoral College and monitor its impact upon the experiences of PGR students including discussion and influence of the University approach to PGR scholarships.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor the evolution and implementation of the institutional policy to support the University's Lecture Recording service in the context of Adaptation and Renewal post-Covid-19.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor ongoing effectiveness of Student Health & Wellbeing Strategy in the context of overall student learning experience.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure strengthening of the Committee's link to the Space Strategy Group.

6.3 Academic Policy and Regulations Committee

Note: the following list provides a sense of APRC priorities which were under discussion at the time of writing this report. The main focus at the May 2020 meeting of APRC will be the firming up of its priorities for the coming year:

Activity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with the relevant work streams of the Adaptation and Renewal Programme to oversee the implementation of any significant policy changes associated with the developing programme of work.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor any requirement for longer term regulatory and policy changes as a result of Covid-19 and take appropriate action as required.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Input as required into curriculum reform (led by Education Committee).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of Enhancement-Led Institutional Review outputs and take appropriate action as required.

6.4 Quality Assurance Committee

Activity
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Continue to contribute to preparations for the University's next Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) and oversee activities in response to the review.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review responses to the coronavirus pandemic gathered via the University's Quality Assurance Framework, gather learning for future developments and share good practice across the institution.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review the approach to gathering student feedback across the University from Course Enhancement Questionnaires (CEQs).
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Examine data and methodological options for the systematic monitoring of retention, progression, and attainment data.

Annex – new regulations/policies/codes, and reviews of and amendments to existing regulations/policies/codes, approved by Senate and its Committees during 2019-20

Senate Committee	Name of document	Type of change (New / Revision / Deletion / Technical Update / Reviewed and no changes made)
Education Committee	Student Partnership Agreement	Revision : update of themes for 2019/20
Education Committee	Academic and Pastoral Support Policy	Minor updates to links.
Quality Assurance Committee	Associated Institutions Policy	Minor updates and transfer of approving authority to SQAC
Quality Assurance Committee	Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework Third Party Credit Rating Policy	Minor updates and transfer of approving authority to SQAC
Quality Assurance Committee	Student Voice Policy	Revision: SSLC principles mandatory from 2020-21 Mid-course feedback will become a requirement for all taught postgraduate courses that run for 10 weeks or longer from academic session 2020/21.
Quality Assurance Committee	Work-based and Placement Learning Policy	Technical Updates
Quality Assurance Committee	Thematic Review Guidance	Minor change to clarify the timing of reviews following a review of the process
Quality Assurance Committee		Interim processes agreed for Annual Monitoring, Review and Reporting and Student Support Services Annual Review for reporting on 2019/20 due to the Covid-19 outbreak

APRC	Postgraduate Assessment Regulations for Research Degrees 2020/21	To be reviewed and approved at APRC on 28 May 2020
APRC	Undergraduate Degree Regulations 2020/21	Reviewed and approved at APRC in March 2020. See papers at: www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/20200319agendaandpapers.pdf
APRC	Postgraduate Degree Regulations 2020/21	Reviewed and approved at APRC in March 2020. See papers at: www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/20200319agendaandpapers.pdf
APRC	Authorised Interruption of Study Policy	Minor addition with a link to the relevant Privacy Notice at www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/specialcircumstancesaisconcessionsloprivacynotice.pdf
APRC	UG Progression Board policy	Removal of link which no longer exists and updated dates for next review
APRC	University use of e-mail as a method of contacting students	Updated a link which was no longer valid and updated dates for next review
APRC	Programme and Course Handbook Policy	Minor changes (updating of standard text and links)

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

21 May 2020

Senate themes for 2020/21 meetings

Description of paper

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

Action requested / recommendation

2. The Committee is invited to make suggestions for themes for the presentation and discussion sections for Senate 2020/21.

Background and context

3. Senate meetings are divided into two sections: an open presentation and discussion section, and a section for formal business open to Senate members only.
4. All members of staff are invited to attend the presentation and discussion section of the Senate meetings and this is an opportunity to hold open discussions on a key strategic theme.
5. From 2018/19, Senate also began to receive 'year-on updates' on selected topics presented in the previous year.
6. Suggestions for themes are being sought from the Senate Education Committee, the Academic Policy and Regulations Committee, the Senate Quality Assurance Committee, and the Research Policy Group.

Discussion

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

2019/20

Main topics:

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

Year-on updates:

- Student Experience Action Plan
- Research Excellence Framework

2018/19

Main topics:

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

Year-on update:

- Careers and Employability

Resource implications

8. None relevant

Risk management

9. None relevant

Equality & diversity

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

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

11. Committee secretaries will collate suggestions and pass these to the Senate Clerk.

12. Collated themes will be passed to the Principal, who will make the final selection of presentation and discussion themes for 2020/21. Selected themes will be advertised via the [Senate website](#) and in advance of each meeting.

Author

Kathryn Nicol, Academic Policy Officer
May 2020

Freedom of Information

Open

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

21 May 2020

Annual review of effectiveness of Senate Standing Committees

Description of paper

1. This paper notifies Senate Committee members of plans for the annual review of Senate Committees' effectiveness. The paper also sets out plans to review the operation of the revised Senate Committee remits which were approved by Senate in September 2019, and notes that these reviews will be consolidated into one review process.

Action requested / recommendation

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

Background and context

3. The 2017 version of the Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance states that institutions are expected to review the effectiveness of their Senate and its committees annually and to hold an externally-facilitated review every five years: "49. The governing body is expected to review its own effectiveness each year and to undertake an externally facilitated evaluation of its own effectiveness and that of its committees, including size and composition of membership, at least every five years. As part of these processes or separately, the effectiveness of the academic board (also known as Senate, Senatus Academicus or academic council) is expected to be reviewed similarly. These reviews should be reported upon appropriately within the Institution and outside. Externally facilitated reviews should be held following any period of exceptional change or upheaval (allowing suitable time to see the effects of changes made), the usual timetable for externally facilitated review being brought forward if necessary in these circumstances."
4. In line with the requirements of the Code, during Spring/Summer 2020, Academic Services is conducting an annual review of the three Senate Standing Committees. The outcomes of this review will be reported to Senate in September / October 2020.
5. Revisions to the number and remits of the Senate Standing Committees were approved by Senate in September 2019, with the recommendation that an evaluation of the efficiency and effectiveness of the changes to the Terms of Reference and memberships should be carried out at the end of the first year of operation.
6. This review will also provide an opportunity to review and report on Senate Standing Committees' preparedness for academic year 2020/21 in the context of the impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic.

Discussion

7. In the interests of efficiency and coherence, the two strands identified above - the annual effectiveness review, and review of the revised remits - will be covered under a single review process and report.
8. In the context of current University priorities and resources, review activities must be proportionate and take into account the ongoing University response to the Covid-19 emergency.
9. The review process is intended to gather information on and evaluate effectiveness in terms of the:
 - a. Composition of the committee
 - b. Support and facilitation of committee meetings
 - c. Engagement of members and knowledge and understanding of their roles and committee remits
 - d. Impact and strategic relevance of Senate Committees' work
10. The review process will be primarily self-reflective and will gather information as described below:
 - a. Senate Committee members will be asked for verbal comments at the final committee meetings of 2019/20.
 - b. Senate Committee members will be invited to respond to an online questionnaire during summer 2020 (managed by Academic Services). Draft questions are appended below.
 - c. The Senate Education Committee Convener and Secretary will review committee coverage of Postgraduate Research Student business.
 - d. Academic Services will review Senate Standing Committees' Covid-19 preparedness for 2020/21, in the context of ongoing developments in the governance and management of learning and teaching and the student experience as part of the University's management of the impact of the Covid-19 emergency.
11. Academic Services will collate the information above and produce a report on the findings.

Resource implications

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

Risk management

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

Equality & diversity

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

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

15. The report will be represented to Senate and the Senate Standing Committees in September / October 2020. If the review identifies required actions or enhancement opportunities, these will be taken forward by Academic Service (if directly related to the functioning and support of the Senate Committees) or referred to the appropriate body for consideration.

Author

Kathryn Nicol, Academic Policy Officer

May 2020

Freedom of Information

Open

Appendix

Senate Standing Committees: Internal Effectiveness Review 2019-20

Draft questions for Summer 2020 survey

Members of the Senate Committees will be invited to fill in an online questionnaire during Summer 2020 and the draft questions for this exercise are set out below for comment.

1. Committee remit

- 1.1. Is the Committee's remit clear? If not, what improvements would you suggest?
- 1.2. Is the scope of the remit appropriate?
- 1.3. Has the Committee adapted effectively to the challenges or changes in priority?
- 1.4. Are you happy with your Committee's use of task groups?

2. Governance and impact

- 2.1. Do you have a clear understanding of how the Committee fits into the academic governance framework of the University?
- 2.2. Do you feel that the Committee makes the desired impact based on its remit and priorities?
- 2.3. Are there clear links between Committee business and University strategic priorities?

3. Composition

- 3.1. Do you think that the current composition of the Committee enables it to fulfil its remit?
- 3.2. Is the size of the Committee appropriate in order for it to operate effectively?

4. Equality and Diversity

- 4.1. Is the composition of the Committee suitably representative of the diverse University population?
- 4.2. Are you satisfied that equality and diversity considerations are adequately addressed when discussing Committee business?

5. Committee members – Role clarity and participation

- 5.1. Are you clear on your role and responsibilities as a Committee member?
- 5.2. If this is not clear, do you have any suggestions on how to improve this?
- 5.3. If you were a new member in 2019/20, were you satisfied with the induction you were given to the Committee and its business?
- 5.4. Is lack of engagement by members ever an impediment to the Committee?
- 5.5. Does anything create a barrier to your engagement with the Committee?

6. Stakeholder Engagement and Communications

- 6.1. Does the Committee engage and communicate effectively with stakeholders? (For example, is the Senate Committees' Newsletter an effective vehicle?)
- 6.2. Do you have a clear understanding of your role on the Committee as a representative of your College or Group?
- 6.3. Do you have a clear understanding of your role in cascading information from the Committee to your College or Group?

7. Committee support

- 7.1. Do you feel that the Committee is supported effectively by Academic Services?
- 7.2. Does the information provided to the Committee (in format and volume) support effective decision-making by the Committee?
- 7.3. Do papers provide you with appropriate levels of detail on the background of issues brought to the Committee, and on how Committee decisions will be implemented?

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

21 May 2020

**Internal Periodic Review
Reports and Responses**

Description of paper

1. The final reports from Internal Periodic Reviews 2019/20 and a further response to the Teaching Programme Review of Medicine (MBChB).

Action requested / recommendation

2. For Approval. The Committee is asked to note the commendations and recommendations.

Background and context

3. The following final reports from Internal Periodic Reviews 2019/20 are published on the Committee wiki:

<https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/display/SQAC/Thursday+21+May+2020>

- Internal Periodic Review of Business School (UG provision)
- Internal Periodic Review of Geography (UG provision)
- Internal Periodic Review of School of Informatics (PGR provision)
- Internal Periodic Review of Social Policy (UG provision)

- Year on responses 2017/18: Teaching Programme Review of Medicine (MBChB) – providing clarity on milestones and completion dates as requested by SQAC.

Discussion

4. See attached paper.

Resource implications

5. No additional resource implications

Risk management

6. No risk associated

Equality & diversity

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

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

8. The reports will be published on the Academic Services website and circulated to those who have been remitted recommendations.

Author

Gillian Mackintosh

Presenter

Academic Services

14 May 2020

**Freedom of Information
Open**

Internal Periodic Review reports 2019/20

IPR	No	Commendations	Recommendations	Responsibility
Business School (UG provision)	1.	The programme handbooks, and general programme information available online is to be commended. The review team found this information easy to navigate, and very logically laid out. No students contacted to comment upon the review suggested any problems with the information and the way in which it was presented.	It is strongly recommended that the identification of appropriate, high quality space for the Business School is prioritised by the College. The lack of capacity to have any undergraduate teaching in the building is likely to continue to be a very significant negative factor in terms of student experience, and act against efforts to build a community of practice.	College Estates Officer
	2.	The recent revision of the School's organisational structure to drive strategy, so that the heads of the six subject groups are now on the School Executive Board, with an associated change to the dynamic and greater focus on more thematic and cross-area teaching, is to be commended. This has led to an increased sense of responsibility for programmes by groups, which was reinforced by the appointment of six new academic subject group UG Teaching Champions from November 2019. The review team believe that this will facilitate the sharing of pedagogic innovations and good practice.	The review team recommends that the Business School is supported by the College to engage proactively with the central timetabling unit to ensure that room scheduling and timetabling is efficient and effective. Currently, the scheduling of concurrent classes which are not proximate is highly detrimental to students and staff, and also raises concerns about accessibility.	School and College Estates Officer
	3.	The review team commends efforts by Course Organisers to close the feedback loop with "You said, We did" to feedback raised through SSLCs etc.	The review team recommends that there is School-level teaching practice training provision for Postgraduate Tutors, and that this is compulsory and paid for. Furthermore, Postgraduate Tutors should be mentored and signposted to courses by IAD and programmes and fellowship routes by Advance HE. We also recommend strongly that Postgraduate Tutors be given the opportunity for meaningful annual review of their teaching in line with University policy.	School
	4.	The review team commends the Business School's initiative to put in place a holistic approach to student development through pathways to the Edinburgh Awards, and the innovative BizPALS scheme.	The review team recommends that the School invests in providing teaching staff with increased opportunities for teaching practice training and reflection, and signposting to the relevant courses by IAD and programmes and fellowship by Advance HE. This is particularly important for new members of faculty staff.	School
	5.	The undergraduate student trek to India was seen to be innovative and a good example of cross-disciplinary work, and is to be commended. One of students who had been on this	Building on the School Forum, the review team recommends that the School investigate ways of providing more and better	School

		trip met with the review team was very positive about its disciplinary nature.	advertised opportunities to share good practice in relation to teaching.	
	6.	The Global Challenges for Business course (including the Learning to Fail aspect) is seen to be highly important for student transition and is commended by the review team, and rated highly by students.	It is recommended that the School consider whether the apparently wide number of Honours option courses available meet the School's educational goals, and also meet with student demand and expectation.	School
	7.	The review team noted that there are challenging issues for the School with space, but the Business School are making creative solutions in order to bring the undergraduates together within significant constraints and this is to be commended. 'Make Your Mark' is an excellent example of this.	The review team recommends that the School works with the College to ensure that the professional services UG support resourcing model is adequate for current and future needs.	School
	8.	Though it is a University-wide initiative, the teaching related presentation at interview for potential new staff is being addressed conscientiously and successfully in faculty recruitment, with firm commitment from heads of group, the Dean and the senior leadership team. Since bringing in the requirement for a teaching related presentation, a number of shortlisted candidates have been deemed un-appointable due to failing to convince the school about their ability to, and competency in, providing a good teaching and learning experience. The School's approach to the teaching presentation at interview is commended by the review team.		
	9.	The Postgraduate Tutors who met with the review team were really focused and engaged with the teaching in the School and are to be commended.		
	10.	The School is commended by the review team for ensuring that programmes are well connected to the world of practice.		
	11.	In response to the lower than desired DLHE scores for highly skilled employment and further study, the School was commended for building a close and productive relationship with the relevant services including the Careers Service.		

			<p>review team were concerned to hear evidence of unacceptable comments made by some academic staff to students for example ‘this institute offers success, money and women’. The review team recommends that supervisor training is enhanced. Induction of new supervisors is important, but ongoing supervisor training is needed in addition to the normal five year cycle, particularly in areas such as diversity and respect. Cultural issues need to be addressed around gender, equality and diversity. It would also support the School’s remit item on supporting postgraduate research student mental and wellbeing if mental health training is included as part of a suite of supervisor training enhancements. Transparency on how issues are dealt with within the School must be increased and inappropriate behaviour must be dealt with. The School must ensure safe mechanisms for reporting inappropriate behaviour are in place and communicated clearly to students and staff. The School should explore alternative mechanisms so that students have greater confidence in the system and will not worry about retribution. The black listing of staff from supervision should be more transparent.</p>	
	3	<p>The review team commends the School’s engaged management team’s recognition of the need for structural reorganisation and evident will for change which will be essential for continued growth.</p>	<p>The review team commends the Building Manager and Senior Team for engaging with Estates Department to ensure building work to address issues in terms of heat and air quality. The review team recommends that efforts to move forward rapidly with this are supported by the College.</p> <p>The review team heard evidence from students that other clear and more transparent communications to students were needed. The review team recommends a “you said we did” approach, transparent communication on important issues (for example, air quality issues in the building) and involving students in planning (to take advantage of engaged and enthusiastic students).</p>	<p>College Estates Officer</p> <p>School Management Team/Graduate School</p>
	4	<p>The review team commends the School on its high performing academic staff, generating multiple CDTs and great opportunities for research students.</p>	<p>The review team recommends that student pastoral support is strengthened particularly for low-level issues, with better awareness of available support structures amongst staff and students.</p>	<p>School Management Team/Graduate School</p>

			The review team recommends that the School provides appropriate funding and opportunities for students to take the lead in organising to self-support and build resilience, particularly around coping with failure	
	5	The review team commends the research provision provided by the School of Informatics.	<p>Final course moderation practices were not clear. The review team recommends that each course is clearly moderated by the Course Organiser in line with University and College guidance.</p> <p>The review team found that there was no underlying problem with students rejecting opportunities to teach and recommends that the School delivers teaching, including postgraduate support for teaching, within the available teaching resources and GTA resource budget, and that students are allowed freedom to pursue the teaching that interests them. Course Organisers should work with the Informatics Teaching Organisation to advertise teaching opportunities.</p> <p>The review team commends the good practice in tutor training and materials provided by Course Organisers in the larger courses for example, Machine Learning and Pattern Recognition (INFR11130). The review team recommends that the School consider ways this good practice can be shared with other Course Organisers</p>	<p>School Management Team</p> <p>School Management Team/Teaching Organisation</p> <p>School Management Team</p>
	6	The review team commends the horizontal marking practice evidenced by postgraduate tutors. This ensures a consistent approach to marking for coursework and examinations.	<p>Students were aware of variable occupancy of postgraduate research student offices and the impact growth is having. There were also tensions around different expectations of office etiquette. The review team recommends the School supports students to develop a set of student-led, shared values, particularly in terms of office etiquette.</p> <p>The review team recommends that the School facilitate the formation of a student body that makes the most of the Institute representative system so that greater communication between students from institutes is achieved and opportunities for collaboration enhanced. This would also help address issues around acceptable behaviours.</p>	School Management Team/Graduate School
	7	The review team commends the School's bystander approach, where members of the School community are encouraged to	The review team recommends that the external member of the progression review panel is formally recognised by the School for	Graduate School

		<p>speak out on inappropriate behaviour, as an area of good practice.</p>	<p>the important role they play in the student experience and that the external, if at all possible, should be the same person for the duration of the PhD.</p>	
	8	<p>The School provides induction information for all new students through the Graduate School and CDTs. There are welcome events during the key intake months of September and February and the review team commends the School on its induction activity.</p>	<p>The review team recommends that the School ensures that both students and staff are made better aware of the Postgraduate Research Personal Tutors, that awareness is assessed after a suitable period, and that Postgraduate Research Personal Tutor resource is increased to a level appropriate to the number of research students in the School.</p>	<p>Graduate School/School Management Team</p>
	9	<p>The review team also commends the School on co-locating the Graduate School office in the Informatics Forum building, thus giving more visibility for the Graduate School and ease of access for students.</p>	<p>The review team recommends that the Head of School and School Management Team ensures clarity for staff on financial routes and what can and cannot be achieved. If particular operational difficulties are incurred, College should work with the School to resolve these.</p>	<p>Head of School/School Management Team/College</p>
	10	<p>The School has introduced a questionnaire on expectation at induction which is completed by both supervisors and students. Results are then exchanged so both groups can see the differences. The School has found this very useful in establishing clear expectations between students and supervisors and the review team commends this as an area of good practice.</p>	<p>The unfavourable comparison by staff and PhD students of the Edinburgh PhD to that of American competitors should be avoided as it appears to devalue the offering. The review team recommends that the Graduate School and Careers service work with students in recognising the value of their PhD work.</p>	<p>Graduate School/Careers Service</p>
	11	<p>The review team commends the School's enthusiastic, high quality students who are keen to contribute to research and teaching.</p>		
	12	<p>The review team commends the effectiveness of Student Staff Liaison Committee as a communication mechanism.</p>		
	13	<p>The review team commends the School for provision of teaching opportunities to students across a broad spectrum of courses.</p>		
	14	<p>The review team commends School engagement with the Edinburgh Teaching Award and encourages all staff including University Teachers and students to obtain formal recognition</p>		

		of their teaching efforts. Leadership by the University Teachers in engaging PhD students in professional development is good practice.		
	15	The review team commends the good practice in tutor training and materials provided by Course Organisers in the larger courses for example, Machine Learning and Pattern Recognition (INFR11130).		
	16	The review team commends the School's commitment to single desk policy so far, noting that this cannot be maintained due to space restrictions in the short term; managing space allocation appropriately is key to a positive student experience.		
IPR	No	Commendations	Recommendations	Responsibility
Social Policy (UG provision)	1	The review team commends the work being undertaken by the School to reflect and enhance current working practices such as the review of governance structures and the review of the postgraduate tutor role. In addition, the review team commends the Subject Area for the importance given to building community and developing the curriculum and the commitment to enhancing these areas.	The review team recommends that the Schools' review of Tutors and Demonstrators is in line with the University The review team recommends that tutors are involved in the review process if this has not already been agreed. The review team recommends that a dedicated space is considered to enable tutors to do marking, to meet with students and to meet as a group to facilitate opportunities to share practice.	Head of School
	2	The review team commends the Subject Area for its commitment to diversifying the curriculum	The review team recommends that the Subject Area review and reflect on feedback provided to students to ensure it is effective, transparent, useful and timely. The team also recommends that the Subject Area consider ways to make exam feedback more useful and meaningful.	Head of Subject Area
	3	The review team recognises the importance of the Senior PT role and commends the commitment with which it is carried out.	The review team recommends that the Subject Area and School consider approaches to improve community building and enhance communications	Head of School and Head of Subject Area

4	The Student Support Officer role is very highly thought of by the Personal Tutors and students and the review team commends the role and the way it is currently executed within the Subject Area.	It is recommended that the Subject Area consider approaches to strengthen the effectiveness of the Education Committee In addition, the review team recommends that the Subject Area consider using the Education Committee to systematically consider how to use staff research interests to reflect on possible diversity topics, especially for new members of staff who may have relevant research interests. The review team recommends that the Subject Area continues with planned changes and consider the topic-based suggestions	Head of Subject Area
5	Staff and students highlighted a number of examples which contributed to community building and these are commended by the review team	Therefore the review team recommends that the School and Subject Area review the award application details on what has already been agreed and use this as a starting point to further enhance diversity and/or improve community.	School and Subject Area
6	The review team commends the Fundamentals course in supporting community building.	The review team recommends that the School considers upgrading administrative support structures to 1 FTE to reflect the increase in staffing in the Subject Area.	Head of School & Director of Professional Services
7	It was noted that one of the teaching staff holds a group marking exercise to work through examples with the tutors. Towards the end of the course, the staff member reviews tutorial engagement and carries out a tutorial observation. The outcome of the observation and tutorial engagement is discussed with the PG tutor. This is commended as an example of good practice.	In addition, the review team recommends that the School and Subject Area review communications to ensure that all students are aware of the location of the SSO office and the mechanisms to book appointments and rooms confidentially	School and Subject Area
8	The review team commends the PPALS scheme, the commitment of the leaders and the contribution to community building.	The review team recommends that the School consider ways in which current study and teaching spaces can be improved to enhance the student experience and consider where any unused spaces could be used as social spaces for students to come together. The Student User group should be involved in these discussions if not already invited to do so.	Head of School
9	The review team commends the leaders of the Social Policy Student Society and its commitment to fostering a social policy community	The review team recommends that the Timetabling Unit consider the allocation of teaching rooms across campus to reduce transition time between classes.	Timetabling Unit

			The review team also recommends that the University Estates' Space Management Group are mindful of the factors noted above and the impact that the pressures on the School estate is having on the student and staff experience	University Estates' Space Management Group
	10	The review team commends the School for their approach in recognising the need to review growth and space options	The review team recommends that the School and Subject Area consider succession planning and are mindful of the reliance on a small number of people during the interim period.	School and Subject Area
	11	To further support students and enable good working practices, the Teaching Office are keen to introduce monthly meetings with Personal Tutors to flag students that may be causing concern and the review team commends this approach.	The review team recommends that the School consider ways in which additional financial assistance could be provided for the PPALS scheme. It is recommended that the School consider ways in which additional financial assistance could be provided to the Social Policy Student Society support events and activities	Head of School
	12	The Subject Area operates within the framework of the Personal Tutoring statement. It is conscious of the need to support students at all stages of the student journey and is commended for its commitment to student support.	It is recommended that the Subject Area review course content with partner institutions.	Head of Subject Area
Geography (UG provision)	1	The review team commends the culture of reflection and enhancement within the subject area.	The review team felt from discussions throughout the review that the School needs to reflect on where Geography sits within the wider School strategic vision and recommends that the School prioritises this exercise to enable the vision to inform further strategic thinking about teaching and other areas of development (e.g. admissions)	Head of School
	2	The review team commends the School-wide policy of using a teaching panel as part of the recruitment process for four new Human Geography staff members.	It is recommended that the School reflect on their structures to ensure that they best facilitate and encourage enhancements to learning and teaching provision and empower and support staff to make change.	Head of School
	3	The review team commends the adaption of the WAM to provide staff with space (50 hours incentive) to innovate practice and share across the subject area. This is a good example of the use of the WAM to encourage Innovation.	It is recommended that the School reflects on the capacity of the Student Support Coordinator and Student Support Office and subsequently sustainably resource the team.	Head of School

4	It is clear that the Personal Tutors and Student Support Team work well together, and the review team commends the School's efforts to provide robust student support.	The review team recommends that the School reflect on and revise the WAM appropriately to take account of large courses, equitable distribution of workload and facilitating teaching innovation through explicit resourcing of innovation.	Head of School
5	The review team commends the subject areas commitment to supporting students in a consistent way each year through "Welcome/Year meetings" each semester and recognise this as an example of good practice.	The review team recommends that the subject area consider effective communication on curricular reform. In particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how best to communicate changes to staff and students (matriculated and prospective) • how to engage the community of students in curriculum reform • how to work effectively with the School and College curriculum approval processes to ensure a robust consideration is given to such matters for future changes. 	Head of School, Director of Undergraduate Teaching, Degree Programme Convenor
6	The Student Support Office and Student Support Coordinator are commended for their dedication and commitment to supporting students.	The review team recommends that the subject area's review of Tutor and Demonstrator provision remit is directed to ensure that Tutors and Demonstrators have good support in their work, are well trained, and have transparent processes for appointment and allocation of work in their roles in line with the Policy for the recruitment, support and development of tutors and demonstrators. To this end the review team recommends that the review considers the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • clarifying appointment processes • ensuring job descriptions are accurate and informative • monitoring Tutor and Demonstrator experience on courses • providing a structured approach to CPD • providing clear redress procedures in the case of Tutors and Demonstrators having issues with their management 	Head of Student Services
7	The review team commends the work done to develop the Student Staff Liaison Committees and identified student chairs as a key strength and as an example of good practice.	The review team recommends that the Subject Area investigates how to work more closely with College Admissions to ensure transparency and exchange of information to facilitate understanding recruitment patterns and how to achieve goals of greater diversity and rebalancing recruitment across the School.	Head of School
8	The review team commends the Degree Programme Convenor's dedication to enhancing the student experience and commitment to developing opportunities for hearing and using the student voice to build community and shape the development of the curriculum.	The review team recommends that the School works with students to better understand the challenges students face due to the social composition of the cohort and how to combat this.	Degree Programme Convenor

9	The review team commends the subject area for its field course provision for MA and BSc students and its commitment to fully fund compulsory field courses to enhance the student experience.	The review team recommends that the review team for Joint Honours provision fully engage with Joint Honours students to identify the key issues of provision for Joint Honours students and work to better integrate them into the academic life of the subject area.	Head of School, Director of Undergraduate Teaching, Honours Coordinator, Degree Programme Convenor
10	The review team commends the commitment and strategic approach to enhance the Joint Honours student experience through the Joint Honours working group.	The review team recommends that the School considers how to incorporate an element of Teaching Professional Development into the Annual Review Process.	Head of School
11	The review team commends the positive changes made to enhance the student experience through improvements to assessment within the subject area.	The review team recommends that the subject area better communicates employability and personal development opportunities to students and incorporate more external employer engagements as well as greater support for those interested in careers in academia earlier in the student lifecycle.	Head of School
12	The review team commends the subject areas adoption of innovative assessment methods and the WAM reward for staff developing them.	The review team recommends that the School works with students to identify better ways to close the feedback loop with the wider student body.	Degree Programme Convenor
13	The review team were satisfied with the subject area's approach to feedback and commends the 'Talking about teaching' reading group which has resulted in proposals to revise feedback practices and the review team welcomed the proposed improvements.	The review team recommends that the School works with students to enhance peer assisted learning opportunities for Pre-Honours students (particularly second year students) to improve student engagement.	Head of School
14	A Widening Participation Coordinator is in place (0.2 FTE) and the review team commends the Schools for commitment to this cause and dedicating staff time to it.		
15	The review team commends the subject area for working closely with the Marketing Manager to diversify marketing materials, use social media and incorporate student testimonials from BSc students.		
16	The review team commends the School's allocation of the coffee common room as both a staff and student space as well as making the Old Library available as a student study space during the mornings following its return to School control.		
17	Staff are awarded 50 hours on the WAM after the successful completion of the Edinburgh Teaching Awards and the review		

		team commends the subject area's approach to continuing professional development for its staff.		
	18	The review team commends the commitment to sharing of best practice to enhance teaching excellence within the subject area.		
	19	The review team commends the excellent support provided to students and staff by the professional services staff.		

TPR of Edinburgh Medical School: UG Medicine (MBChB)

Date of review: 27th and 28th November 2017

Date of 14 week response: 1st May 2018

Date of year on response: 31st October 2018

Date of updated response: 1st April 2019

Date of updated response: 1st August 2019

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

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

Recommendation no	Recommendation	Timescale for completion	Comment on progress towards completion and/or identify barriers to completion	Completion date
1.	The review team recommends that the senior leadership team engage with NHS Education Scotland (NES), Regional ACT Groups and NHS Boards to ensure ACT funding is used appropriately to support academic and administrative delivery and co-ordination of placement based medical education. There is a need for a step change in the approach to resourcing administration of clinical modules to enhance the student experience.	Minimum 12 months	<p>Senior Medical School staff have met with the Medical Director of NHS Lothian and the relevant NHS Boards to discuss the transparent allocation of ACT funding and expenditure at Module level, however it should be noted that ACT funding is the responsibility of the NHS Boards and the Medical School does not have any influence over this expenditure.</p> <p>Additional ACT funding has been allocated to support 8 additional hours per week to the administration of clinical modules. This additional support will help with the timely delivery of clinical placement timetables, induction and will act as a key contact for students whilst on placement.</p> <p>August 2019: The College Dean of Learning & Teaching has met with the Convenor of Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC) to discuss ongoing issues. The medicine programme will require a new Director of Quality in 2020 after the currently post holder retires and we will be reviewing how best to engage with module staff in quality processes at that point.</p> <p>Medical schools in Scotland (and England) generally have limited, indirect influence on administration of resource paid directly to Health Boards to support teaching of medical students. Possible movements in funding are severely limited when one major Health Board provides the great majority of clinical experience, as is the case for the medical schools in Scotland. Changing this situation would require a major political move.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Complete</p> <p>Complete</p> <p>Ongoing</p>

			<p><u>May 2020</u> The main issue relating to module support was addressed as noted above. The broader concern about influencing allocation of resources is an ongoing issue. There are regular meetings with NHS Lothian, as noted above.</p> <p>The new Director of Quality for medical education was appointed. She will be involved in future meetings with NHS Lothian.</p>	
2.	The review area expressed concerns to the review team about marginalisation of consultant time for undergraduate teaching. The review team recommends that the senior leadership team engage with NHS Education Scotland (NES) and NHS Boards to address this resource issue.	Minimum 12 months	<p>Unfortunately despite discussions being held over consultant time for teaching it remains NHS Scotland policy for all new consultants to be appointed to a '9+1' contract which contains no time for either UG or PG education and training delivery. New consultants can subsequently make a case to be given an 'extra programmed activity' for teaching/training which would be at the discretion of their clinical director/NHS organisation and dependent on funding being available.</p> <p>Improved transparency of the ACT embedded funding and improved job planning for teaching commitments in health boards continues to be a national priority across Scotland but again, the Medical School has very little authority of this.</p> <p>August 2019: Modest funding allocations are made for the delivery of the support for Medical Education such as student experience, additional teaching sessions and PBL facilitator payments but the resource for teaching remains within the Deaneries and via ACT funding. Although the transparency of the ACT is a national issue, NHS Lothian Health Board remain our largest Learning Provider and we will continue to work with them on the delivery of teaching.</p> <p><u>May 2020</u> This work remains ongoing and in the context of COVID-19 it is unlikely that significant progress will be made in the coming months.</p>	Ongoing
3.	The review team recommends that there is a need to strengthen the administrative resilience of programme organisation and delivery. This should include clarification of Human Resource, Information	6 months	The Medical School restructured its professional services functions by merging the Centre for Medical Education and the Medical Teaching Organisation. This has highlighted areas of strengths and weaknesses. Additional support within the MTO	complete

	Technology and Finance support, and support to develop resilience in the Year Co-ordinator roles.		<p>has been agreed and after successfully recruiting two Team Leaders to help support the Year Coordinators.</p> <p>The College has appointed two Learning Technology Advisers. The programme team is able to refer to this team for advice. We have access to the College Finance administrator who can help with the day to day expenses and reimbursement processes.</p> <p>Human Resources support is subject to the University's SEP project.</p>	
4.	The review team recommends that the subject area strengthens academic (including clinical academic) capacity on the programme, to enable the effective delivery of the programme and maintain and enhance its quality.	12 months (ongoing)	<p>This remains an issue and the need for additional academic input is in line with College strategy. The Medical School is planning a curriculum restructure for 2020 and at this point, bids for additional academic support will be made to College. The College Workload Allocation Model is yet to be confirmed but this should help to clarify time allocated to teaching for UoE members of staff. Discussions continue with regards to NHS Job Planning to ensure that UG teaching is adequately resourced.</p> <p><u>May 2020</u> The new Year 1 and 2 curriculum has been developed and will be delivered from Sept 2020. The move towards a hybrid teaching model due to COVID-19 brings additional resource demands for medical education given that many clinicians will have reduced time to contribute to teaching. An outline of additional resource requirements has been made to College.</p>	Sept 2020
5.	The review team recommends that the subject area continue with their plans for expansion of the use of clinical skills within the programme, and endorse their current plans to expand the physical resource in this area.	12 months (ongoing)	Plans to expand the clinical skills facilities have been included in the designs for the new Medical School. The team has been expanded since the review with an additional Clinical Fellow.	Ongoing
6.	The review team strongly endorses the plans that the review area have for re-considering how best to assess non-academic attributes at admission and selection stage, and recommends that the review area looks for evidence in support of the various different models before taking a decision on the way forward. This should encompass enhanced systems to genuinely widen participation on to the programme.	12 months (ongoing)	<p>The new Director of Admissions has started investigations into new admissions processes including selection, widening access and communication methods. We have undertaken an online consultation and run a workshop on how we select our medical students, what we do well, and what we would like to do better. It is hoped that implementation of these changes will impact on 2020 entry.</p> <p>We are currently exploring specific assessment tools, and will pilot these with our graduate interviews in early 2019. As an</p>	complete

			<p>interim, the Medical School has worked to ensure that WP students are made early offers, and are encouraged to attend the offer days, with financial support for travel costs.</p> <p>August 2019: the Medical School will be interviewing all applicants for 2020 entry.</p> <p><u>May 2020</u> The new admissions process was implemented very successfully. The evaluation showed a high level of satisfaction with the process among applicants and assessors.</p>	
7.	Technology enhanced learning is expanding, and the review team recommends that there is a need to ensure that all tutors and Module Organisers and Year Co-ordinators have equal access to the Virtual Learning Environment LEARN (including appropriate editing rights), and that sufficient training is provided to enable this.	May 2018	Module Organisers have access to edit their module page(s) in the Virtual Learning Environment (Learn). Bespoke MBChB training sessions were designed and scheduled but due to the timing of the sessions and availability of clinical staff, these sessions were of limited use. Bespoke instructions and user guides have been created and support is still provided by the Year Coordinators when required.	complete
8.	The review team recommend that the review area enhance the quality assurance process with a particular focus on obtaining feedback from students in relation to the support they receive from Personal Tutors/Clinical Teaching Associates.	6 months (reviewed annually)	<p>The Director of Teaching and Deputy Director (Quality) have reviewed quality processes. The Quality team work with central University services to develop with use of Course Evaluations. We have introduced the mid-conversations within modules and at the end of each attachment. Outcomes will be discussed at Year Committees and overseen by Programme Management Group.</p> <p>Student Wellbeing are monitoring PT meetings (via Euclid) and have developed systems to review CTA engagement. Further work on developing the PT system and general student support mechanisms are under review.</p>	complete
	Please report on steps taken to feedback to students on the outcomes of the review	The outcome of the TPR was published on the programme wide Learn page alongside the Year on actions. The report and actions has also been through all UG medicine committees. The MSC have been asked to report on any student comments and feed this back to the School. Comments were positive about the review and the work planned to enhance the programme.		
For Year on response only	Any examples of a positive change as a result of the review	The review helped to address some ongoing concerns raised by the school in terms of staffing structures. There is still progress to be made but the additional support within the MTO has help with the day to day running of the programme. Access to the Learning Technology Advisers will also help to develop our online presence and further enhance our Learn site.		

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

21 May 2020

Report from the Knowledge Strategy Committee

Executive Summary

To update SQAC on certain matters considered by the Knowledge Strategy Committee.

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

Not applicable.

Action requested

SQAC is invited to note the report.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Not applicable.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

Where applicable, as covered in the report.

2. Risk assessment

Where applicable, as covered in the report.

3. Equality and Diversity

Where applicable, as covered in the report.

4. Freedom of information

This paper is open.

Key words

Knowledge Strategy Committee

Originator of the paper

Dr Lewis Allan, Head of Court Services

REPORT FROM THE KNOWLEDGE STRATEGY COMMITTEE

24 March 2020 (Meeting by correspondence)

1 Core Systems Supporting Strategies

A progress report on the development of Core Systems Supporting Strategies was considered and the process for reviewing and approving the supporting strategies approved. Addressing ethical implications was considered, with each supporting strategy template document to include a section reflecting on potential ethical impacts. Privacy implication will be considered by the Data Protection Officer and accessibility, equality and diversity implications will be considered by the Information Services Group's disability officer and data governance implications currently under review. Any changes to the strategies will be reviewed by the Core Systems Sub-strategy Board.

2 National Student Survey Library and IT Questions Report

A summary of the 2019 National Student Survey scores and analysis for the three IT and Library related questions was reviewed.

3 Research Publications and Copyright Policy: Open Access

A new Research Publications and Copyright Policy to replace the existing Research Publications Policy given changes in funder regulations relating to open access was noted. The move to establishing author copyright was supported and it was noted that monographs are not covered as yet, with the College of Arts, Humanities & Social Sciences to be consulted if and when changes relating to monographs are proposed as funder regulations change.

4 LEARN Foundations

An update on the Learn Foundations project that aims to make all courses in the Learn Virtual Learning Environment more usable and consistent was noted.

5 Other Matters

The work of information services staff including Melissa Highton and colleagues in the Directorate of Learning, Teaching and Web Services in supporting the move to online teaching during the Covid-19 pandemic was welcomed and thanked.

The Committee also: received an update on recent changes to the People & Money Programme to deliver core IT systems for HR, Finance, Payroll and Procurement; received a regular update from Chief Information Security Officer; and, reviewed additional information security risk management controls, primarily URL (i.e. web address) filtering, that could be introduced within the network replacement project.