

H/02/27/02

**Meeting of the Senatus Academic Policy and Regulations Committee (APRC)  
to be held online on Thursday 22 September 2022 at 2.00pm**

**AGENDA**

1.	<b>Minutes of the previous meeting:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 26 May 2022 (enclosed)</li><li>• 15 – 22 July 2022 e-Business (enclosed)</li></ul>	APRC 22/23 1A
2.	<b>Matters Arising</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Support for Study</b><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ A short Support for Study policy update paper was due to be presented to the September meeting of APRC. APRC had requested further work be done on the policy, and the new Deputy Secretary, Students has asked for further time to review feedback and practices before further updates are brought to APRC.</li></ul></li></ul> <b>Report of Convener's Action</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Student Discipline Officers</li><li>• Student Discipline Committee</li><li>• Student Fitness to Practice and Appeals Committee</li><li>• Summary of approved concessions</li></ul>	Verbal Update
<b>For approval</b>		
3.	<b>Academic Misconduct Procedure</b> For approval	APRC 22/23 1B
4.	<b>MSc Mathematical Economics &amp; Econometrics</b> For approval	APRC 22/23 1C
<b>For discussion</b>		
5.	<b>Developments from 11 August 2022 Senate meeting, including new guidelines for Senate Committee operations</b> For discussion	APRC 22/23 1D
<b>For information</b>		
6.	<b>Vice President Education Priorities 2022/23</b> For information	APRC 22/23 1E
7.	<b>Curriculum Transformation</b> For information	Presentation & verbal update
8.	<b>APRC Membership and Terms of Reference</b> For information	APRC 22/23 1F

9.	<b>CE &amp; SC Task Group update</b> For information	APRC 22/23 1G
10.	<b>Any Other Business</b>	

**Meeting of the Senatus Academic Policy and Regulations Committee (APRC)  
held online on Thursday 26 May 2022 at 2.00pm**

**Unconfirmed minute**

<p><b>Present:</b> Dr Paul Norris (Convenor) Professor Judy Hardy (Vice-Convenor) Professor Jeremy Crang Professor Antony Maciocia Dr Adam Bunni Sarah McAllister</p> <p>Rachael Quirk Tara Gold Charlotte MacDonald Dr Deborah Shaw Dr Catherine Bovill</p> <p>Heather McNeill Kirsty Woomble</p> <p><b>In attendance:</b> Olivia Hayes Professor Tina Harrison Stuart Lamont</p> <p><b>Apologies for absence:</b> Professor Patrick Hadoke</p> <p>Stephen Warrington Philippa Burrell</p>	<p>Dean of Quality Assurance and Curriculum Approval (CAHSS) Dean of Learning and Teaching (CSE) Dean of Students (CAHSS) Dean of Postgraduate Research (CSE) Head of Academic Policy and Regulation, Academic Services Head of Student Support Operations, Student Systems and Administration Head of Taught Student Administration &amp; Support (CAHSS) Vice President Education, Students' Association The Advice Place, Deputy Manager Dean of Students (CMVM) Senior Lecturer in Student Engagement, Institute for Academic Development (IAD) Deputy Head of Academic Affairs (CSE) Head of PGR Student Office (CAHSS)</p> <p>Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance Academic Policy Coordinator (Students' Association)</p> <p>Director of Postgraduate Research and Early Career Research Experience (CMVM) Dean of Student Experience (CSE) Head of Academic Administration (CMVM)</p>
---	--

<b>1.</b>	<p><b>Minutes of the previous meeting held online on 31 March 2022 &amp; 17 May 2022</b></p> <p>The minutes of the previous meetings held on 31 March and 17 May were approved as an accurate record.</p>	APRC 21/22 5A
<b>2.</b>	<p><b>Matters Arising</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Support for Study</b></li> </ul> <p>Members were thanked for sending their comments on the Support for Study policy which was presented at the 27 January meeting. Comments were collated and shared with Rebecca Shade who will take this forward with Andy Shanks, Lisa Dawson and Academic Services.</p> <p>APRC will receive a further update on the policy in due course, likely at the first meeting of next academic year.</p>	

	<p>It was understood that some proposed text had been shared with Colleges. The Convener would confirm and update APRC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Industrial Action &amp; relaxation of regulations</b></li> </ul> <p>The UCU marking and assessment boycott has been suspended and it is not expected that a relaxation of the regulations will be needed. Any issues which arise as a result of industrial action will be managed on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p><b>Standing Items:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Approved concessions</b></li> </ul> <p>The Convener updated APRC on the actions which have been taken by Convener's action since the Committee last met.</p> <p>There have been 5 concessions approved:</p> <p>One Undergraduate student with a concession approved to take additional credits.</p> <p>Two Postgraduate Taught students requiring a further authorised interruption of studies</p> <p>One Postgraduate Research student requiring a further authorised interruption of studies</p> <p>One 'cohort' concession relaxing the requirement for external examiners to review exam papers was approved.</p> <p>APRC was granted devolved authority from SQAC to allow for policies related to external examiners to be considered by APRC to enable the efficient management and oversight of concessions required to address the impact of industrial action.</p>	
3.	<p><b>Assessment and Feedback Principles and Priorities - Implications for Taught Assessment Regulations</b></p> <p>Professor Tina Harrison, Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance, introduced this item.</p> <p>The paper proposes changes to the Taught Assessment Regulations, and specifically the removal of Regulation 16 Feedback Deadlines and consideration of the potential modification of Regulation 11 Principles of assessment and Regulation 15 Provision of formative feedback. These have arisen from the development of new Assessment and Feedback Principles and Priorities in response to the recent QAA ELIR.</p> <p>The University was required to develop a holistic and strategic approach to assessment and feedback, which these new principles will achieve. Regulations 11, 15 and 16 are now contained within the new principles, and there will be a softening of feedback deadlines with useful and constructive feedback to be provided, instead of strict adherence to a fifteen working day turnaround.</p> <p>The Committee discussed removing Regulations 11, 15 and 16 however agreed that colleagues within the University are familiar with where to find this information and therefore retaining this within the Taught Assessment Regulations was important. The regulations and headings would be retained, with the regulations to be revised and linking out to the new principles.</p>	APRC 21/22 5B

	<p>It was noted that the Assessment Principles do not currently exist as a standalone policy, and therefore some work to develop this would be needed. This is needed by August in time for the start of next academic year.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Academic Services to redraft Regulations 11, 15 and 16 of the Taught Assessment Regulations and recirculate to APRC for approval.</p>	
4.	<p><b>Coursework Extensions – update on interim change for 2022-23.</b></p> <p>This item was introduced by Olivia Hayes, Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services.</p> <p>The paper summarised the responses received in the consultation on an interim amendment to the Taught Assessment Regulations relating to coursework extensions ahead of the 2022/23 academic year. It was noted that the majority of feedback received indicated that the interim measure would not address the key concerns raised by Schools. APRC were invited to note the outcome of the consultation and agree a recommended approach for 2022-23.</p> <p>The Committee discussed the paper and members agreed that this was a difficult issue. It was noted that the relaxation of feedback deadlines may be beneficial to addressing some of the key points raised in the consultation, and the existing regulations allow Schools to reduce the default extension available for coursework extensions. There is also a proposal to be considered by APRC to set up a task group to review the coursework extension and special circumstances policies indicating that is a key priority for APRC. It was noted that the interim change would have system and resource implications for the management of Extra Time Adjustments.</p> <p>There is strong appetite in some Schools and Colleges for change to happen and it was queried whether the relaxation of feedback deadlines would be sufficient to mitigate the impact of coursework extensions on Schools.</p> <p>It was noted that the response to the minor change proposed was mixed and no consensus on the proposed change was reached.</p> <p>It was queried whether Schools have the option to not permit extensions and whether APRC had a view on this approach. It was confirmed that under 28.2 of the Taught Assessment Regulations this was possible, though generally this would be where a late or extended submission made it impractical or unfair to other students. If Schools choose not to permit extensions or late submissions, this must be publicised to students.</p> <p>Thanks were extended to all who participated in the consultation. It was confirmed that there would be no change to the regulations, however Schools would be reminded that they have the flexibility to offer a shorter extension under the existing regulations, if they wish to do so.</p> <p>APRC noted the difficulties that extensions cause, however it is hoped that the relaxation of feedback deadlines proposed under the new Assessment and Feedback Principles would alleviate some pressure ahead of a more substantial review of policies to be undertaken in 2022/23.</p>	APRC 21/22 5C

5.	<p><b>Review of Coursework Extension and Special Circumstances Policies</b></p> <p>This item was introduced by Olivia Hayes, Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services.</p> <p>The paper proposes to set up a task group to review the University policies on coursework extensions and special circumstances and propose changes to these, as appropriate. The task group will review the existing policies, benchmark policy changes against other UK institutions, take account of the student and staff experience and changes in student behaviour.</p> <p>APRC were invited to comment on, and approve, the proposed remit, membership and timelines for the task group. The intention is that the task group would bring bringing policy changes to the March 2023 meeting for implementation in the 2023-24 academic year.</p> <p>The Committee discussed the paper and identified gaps in the task group remit and membership. Concern was also raised regarding the feasibility of the timelines set out in the paper, particularly on undertaking consultation and incorporating any system changes required to support a change in policy. It was noted that the timelines set out are ambitious and would require the task group to be able to prioritise the work required by the review.</p> <p>The interaction of the task groups work with Student Systems was identified as a gap, and concern raised that the timelines would need to incorporate final deadlines for Student Systems to be able to incorporate system changes ahead of the following academic year.</p> <p>Further detail around the scope for consultation and engagement from Schools and Colleges was requested.</p> <p>The remit of the task group would be amended to include education and development of time management skills.</p> <p>The membership of the task group would be amended to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An additional member from CAHSS.</li> <li>• Three student members, one from The Advice Place and two from the Students' Association, comprising of one elected member and one member from the permanent staff.</li> <li>• One member from Student Systems.</li> </ul> <p>The task group's deliverables would be amended to include reference to the implications of EDI requirements, which the task group are to reflect on from an early stage.</p> <p>The timeline set out was discussed and it was agreed that the task group would be given a strong steer that implementing changes for 2022/23 should be prioritised. The review of the coursework extension and special circumstances policies is critical and it is important that this be prioritised and achieved. It was requested that the task group consider the time lines at an early stage and report back to APRC if there are concerns with the feasibility of meeting these. Student Systems require an indication of the direction of travel by</p>	APRC 21/22 5D
----	--	---------------

	<p>January, as any system changes require development and testing ahead of being launched.</p> <p>The timelines are to be considered by the task group with specific consideration given to ensuring consultation can be undertaken, and systems changes made in time for recommended changes to be introduced in 2022/23.</p> <p>The paper proposing a task group be set up would be reworked and recirculated to APRC ahead of being implemented.</p>	
6.	<p><b>Proposed amendments to the Code of Student Conduct</b></p> <p>This item was introduced by Dr. Adam Bunni, Head of Academic Policy and Regulation, Academic Services.</p> <p>The paper proposes amendments to the Code of Student Conduct, which is the University's student disciplinary process. APRC is asked to approve the proposed amendments to the Code of Student Conduct. Appendix 1 includes a summary of the proposed amendments to the Code, with a rationale for each. Appendix 2 includes an updated version of the Code, showing the amendments.</p> <p>It was noted that there has been an exponential growth in the serious student cases being handled by the Student Conduct team within Academic Services. Academic Services monitor the application of the Code, and the proposed changes reflect the learnings from individual cases, plus feedback from students involved in the process. Academic Services has undertaken consultation on amendments to the code, and stakeholders consulted are outlined in the paper.</p> <p>APRC discussed the amendments and members noted that they were pleased to see some of the changes proposed.</p> <p>Some concerns were raised on areas which are not addressed in the Code, including equity of access, clarity around the process, and reporting of cases. It was noted that communicating with students regarding the revised Code is important, and explaining why these areas are not addressed in the revisions.</p> <p>It was noted that the Research Misconduct Policy is also being redrafted.</p> <p>APRC approved the amendments to the Code.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> The Student Code of Conduct will be taken to University Court for approval by Resolution. It is anticipated that the revised Code will take effect from 1 January 2023.</p>	APRC 21/22 5E
7.	<p><b>Programme and Course Approval Policy Update</b></p> <p>This item was introduced by Dr. Adam Bunni, Head of Academic Policy and Regulation, Academic Services.</p> <p>The paper presents minor updates to the Programme and Course Approval and Management Policy for approval by APRC.</p>	APRC 21/22 5F

	<p>It was noted that the Academic Collaborations wiki is referred to under Business Case for New Programmes and Collaborations/Partnerships. The wiki is being replaced by a SharePoint site and the author was encouraged to contact the Academic Collaborations Advisory Group to confirm the information and link.</p> <p>Approved by APRC subject to corrections regarding the Collaborations wiki.</p>	
<p><b>8.</b></p>	<p><b>Programme and Course Handbooks Policy Update</b></p> <p>This item was introduced by Dr. Adam Bunni, Head of Academic Policy and Regulation, Academic Services.</p> <p>The paper presents minor updates to the Programme and Course Handbooks Policy for approval by APRC.</p> <p>The Committee requested some revisions to the text included under Student Support. It is requested that these please be revised as it is not clear whether a PT statement will be in use, and if so, what format these will take.</p> <p>The information under Student Wellbeing is to be revised, and it is asked that any revisions be undertaken in consultation with College Deans of Students. It was requested that information on IAD, and reference to the Equally Safe team be included.</p> <p>It was suggested that the text be reworded to be for students, rather than about students.</p> <p>It is requested that corrections be made to the policy, in consultation with College Deans of Students and revisions referred back to APRC for approval. This may be considered by Convener's action, or recirculated to APRC.</p>	<p>APRC 21/22 5G</p>
<p><b>9.</b></p>	<p><b>Taught Assessment Regulations</b></p> <p>This item was introduced by Olivia Hayes, Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services.</p> <p>The key changes for APRC to consider were outlined, as set out in the paper.</p> <p>Regulation 30.3 was amended to include translation services in addition to proof reading.</p> <p>Regulations 11, 15 and 16 would be amended as per the discussion under item 3. APRC agreed that these amendments would be considered by Convener's action.</p> <p>APRC approved the Taught Assessment Regulations for 2022-23, subject to the amendments to Regulations 11, 15, 16 and 30.3.</p>	<p>APRC 21/22 5H</p>



<p><b>10.</b></p>	<p><b>Postgraduate Assessment Regulations for Research Degrees</b></p> <p>This item was introduced by Dr. Adam Bunni, Head of Academic Policy and Regulation, Academic Services.</p> <p>The key changes for APRC to consider were outlined, as set out in the paper.</p> <p>APRC approved the Postgraduate Assessment Regulations for Research Degrees for 2022-23.</p>	<p>APRC 21/22 5I</p>
<p><b>11.</b></p>	<p><b>Student Discipline Officers</b></p> <p>This item was introduced by Dr. Paul Norris, Convener of APRC.</p> <p>It was noted that a number of appointments which were outdated.</p> <p>APRC did not approve the paper.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Academic Services to review the list and liaise with Colleges to confirm appointments for the coming academic year. The updated list of Student Discipline Officers is to be returned to APRC for approval in due course.</p>	<p>APRC 21/22 5J</p>
<p><b>12.</b></p>	<p><b>Academic Policy and Regulations Membership and Terms of Reference 2022/23</b></p> <p>This item was introduced by Dr. Paul Norris, Convener of APRC.</p> <p>This paper was presented to Senate on 25 May. Senate did not reach quorum and therefore APRC membership and terms of reference for 2022-23 were not approved.</p> <p>Corrections to the paper were identified.</p> <p>Dr. Deborah Shaw, Dean of Students (CMVM) is to be added to the membership as one of the senior staff member from CMVM with responsibility for academic governance and regulation, and maintaining and enhancing the quality of the student experience at all levels.</p> <p>Charlotte Macdonald's job title is to be updated to Advice Place Manager, Students' Association.</p> <p>APRC confirmed that Stuart Lamont is to be listed as a co-opted member.</p> <p>APRC approved the paper subject to the corrections identified. The updated paper would be presented to the next meeting quorate of Senate, where the membership and terms of reference would be approved for 2022/23. APRC were advised that the current membership and terms of reference would continue until these are superseded.</p>	<p>APRC 21/22 5K</p>

	<b>Action:</b> Academic Services to update the paper with the corrections identified and pass to the Senate Clerk for presentation at the next quorate meeting of Senate.	
<b>13.</b>	<p><b>Annual Report of the Senate Standing Committees</b></p> <p>This item was introduced by Dr. Paul Norris, Convener of APRC.</p> <p>This paper was presented to Senate on 25 May. Senate was invited to approve the annual report, however this was opposed and therefore this paper was not approved as the meeting was not quorate.</p> <p>APRC discussed the paper and noted the APRC priorities for 2022-23, and specifically a review of the Support for Study policy, and a review of the coursework extensions and special circumstances policies.</p> <p>APRC also agreed to develop a timeline to undertake the scheduled periodic review of policies which were delayed due to external factors, such as Covid.</p> <p>APRC approved the annual report and the priorities for 2022/23. The paper would be presented to the next quorate meeting of Senate for approval.</p>	APRC 21/22 5 L
<b>14.</b>	<p><b>Annual Review of Effectiveness of Senate Standing Committees</b></p> <p>This item was introduced by Dr. Paul Norris, Convener of APRC.</p> <p>APRC noted the plans for the annual review of Senate Committees' effectiveness.</p>	APRC 21/22 5M
<b>15.</b>	<p><b>Senate Presentation and Discussion themes for 2022/23 meetings</b></p> <p>This item was introduced by Dr. Paul Norris, Convener of APRC.</p> <p>Members were invited to put forward suggestions for Senate Presentation and Discussion themes for 2022-23. Members were invited to submit suggestions for presentation topics, and presenters, by email to the Senate Clerk.</p>	APRC 21/22 5N
<b>16.</b>	<p><b>Deadlines for Submission of Late Special Circumstances. Applications for the 2022/23 academic year</b></p> <p>This item was introduced by Sarah McAllister, Head of Student Support Operations, Student Systems and Administration.</p> <p>The paper proposes sets out the suggested deadlines for Special Circumstances applications for the academic year 2022/23. ESC is seeking APRC's approval of the SC deadlines for late submission of Special Circumstances applications for the academic year 2022/23.</p> <p>The paper sets out a coordinated approach to the deadlines for SC applications across the University and sets out deadlines for Semester 1, Semester 2 and the August resit diet. Colleges and ESC have been consulted on the dates and CAHSS and CSE are both satisfied with the dates.</p>	APRC 21/22 5O

	<p>A number of CMVM programmes do not run on traditional programme dates and therefore a revised schedule for these programmes and College is being discussed with ESC. This discussion is ongoing between CMVM and ESC.</p> <p>APRC approved the paper subject to the alternative dates for CMVM programmes being agreed.</p>																																									
<p><b>17.</b></p>	<p><b>Election of APRC Convener and Vice-Convener for 2022/23</b></p> <p>The Vice-Convener, Professor Judy Hardy introduced and chaired this item.</p> <p>A paper outlining the terms of reference and membership for the Senate Standing Committees, including APRC, was presented to Senate on 25 May. Senate did not reach quorum and therefore APRC membership and terms of reference for 2022-23 were not approved. APRC will continue to operate under the existing membership and terms of reference until these are considered by the next quorate meeting of Senate.</p> <p>The Convener and Vice-Convener of APRC are elected, as per the APRC terms of reference. The existing Vice-Convener, Prof. Judy Hardy, would be stepping down from the role as of 1 August.</p> <p>It is proposed that APRC meet to elect a Convener and Vice-Convener in advance of 1 August, and once the date of the next meeting of Senate is known. APRC were invited to consider and approve the proposal.</p> <p>APRC agreed to the action proposed. The Convener would update the Committee once more detail on the next meeting of Senate is known.</p>																																									
<p><b>18.</b></p>	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p> <p><u>Student Discipline Committee- new student members</u></p> <p>APRC were asked to approve a raft of new student members for the Student Discipline Committee:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="284 1458 991 1794"> <tr> <td>Alana Pradhan</td> <td>CAHSS</td> <td>SPS</td> <td>New</td> <td>s1971019</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grayson Bartels</td> <td>CAHSS</td> <td>Law</td> <td>New</td> <td>s1883564</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lisa Jonasdottir</td> <td>CAHSS</td> <td>LLC</td> <td>New</td> <td>s2077954</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Aileen Cunningham</td> <td>CAHSS</td> <td>HEA</td> <td>New</td> <td>s2255634</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ishita Parakh</td> <td>CAHSS</td> <td>HCA</td> <td>New</td> <td>s2026679</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Giuseppe Mavuli</td> <td>CAHSS</td> <td>SPS</td> <td>New</td> <td>s1916580</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Steve Anderson</td> <td>CAHSS</td> <td>PPLS</td> <td>New</td> <td>s1866818</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gulce Baskaya</td> <td>CAHSS</td> <td>SPS</td> <td>New</td> <td>s2269222</td> </tr> </table> <p>The Student Discipline Committee require emergency approval of student members as a number of existing members are soon to graduate and the Committee is short on student members. It was noted that the list of members presented is CAHSS-heavy, however this list will continue to be added to as new members are recruited. New members are able to be added by Convener's action.</p>	Alana Pradhan	CAHSS	SPS	New	s1971019	Grayson Bartels	CAHSS	Law	New	s1883564	Lisa Jonasdottir	CAHSS	LLC	New	s2077954	Aileen Cunningham	CAHSS	HEA	New	s2255634	Ishita Parakh	CAHSS	HCA	New	s2026679	Giuseppe Mavuli	CAHSS	SPS	New	s1916580	Steve Anderson	CAHSS	PPLS	New	s1866818	Gulce Baskaya	CAHSS	SPS	New	s2269222	
Alana Pradhan	CAHSS	SPS	New	s1971019																																						
Grayson Bartels	CAHSS	Law	New	s1883564																																						
Lisa Jonasdottir	CAHSS	LLC	New	s2077954																																						
Aileen Cunningham	CAHSS	HEA	New	s2255634																																						
Ishita Parakh	CAHSS	HCA	New	s2026679																																						
Giuseppe Mavuli	CAHSS	SPS	New	s1916580																																						
Steve Anderson	CAHSS	PPLS	New	s1866818																																						
Gulce Baskaya	CAHSS	SPS	New	s2269222																																						

	<p>A query was raised regarding the process for allocating a student member to a case, it was confirmed that members are asked to declare a conflict of interest for any case they are allocated to. Students under investigation are also able to raise any concerns with the panel members allocated to a case.</p> <p><u>Thanks to departing members</u></p> <p>Thanks from the Committee were extended to members demitting office at the end of the academic year and who will no longer be on APRC in 2022/23.</p> <p>Thanks were extended to Tara Gold, Vice President Education, Students' Association, who is demitting office over the summer.</p> <p>Thanks were extended to Heather McNeill, Deputy Head of Academic Affairs (CSE), who is departing the University for another institution.</p> <p>Thanks were extended to Dr. Adam Bunni, Head of Academic Policy and Regulation, Academic Services, who departs for another role within the University. Adam's replacement, Dr. Kate Nicol will join the committee as Head of Academic Policy and Regulation, Academic Services.</p> <p>Thanks were extended to the Vice-Convenor Professor Judy Hardy who is retiring from the University at the end of the academic year.</p>	
--	--	--

## APRC 2021/22 Meeting by correspondence

### Minutes of the Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee (APRC) meeting held by correspondence from Friday 15 July - Friday 22 July

#### Present:

Dr Paul Norris (Convener)	Dean of Quality Assurance and Curriculum Approval (CAHSS)
Professor Judy Hardy (Vice-Convener)	Dean of Learning and Teaching (CSE)
Stephen Warrington	Dean of Student Experience (CSE)
Dr Adam Bunni	Head of Academic Affairs (CSE)
Philippa Burrell	Head of Academic Administration (CMVM)
Professor Jamie Davis	Dean of Education (CMVM)
Dr Paddy Hadoke	Director of Postgraduate Research
Dr Cathy Bovill	Institute for Academic Development (IAD)
Dr Adam Bunni	Head of Governance and Regulatory Framework Team, Academic Services
Sarah McAllister	Student Systems and Administration
Tara Gold	Vice President Education, Students' Association
Stuart Lamont	Academic Policy Co-ordinator, Students' Association
Charlotte Macdonald	Advice Place Manager
Rachael Quirk	Head of Taught Student Administration and Support (CAHSS)
Dr Jeremy Crang	Dean of Students (CAHSS)
Dr Antony Maciocia	Dean of Postgraduate Research (CSE)
Professor Neil Turner (CMVM)	Dean of Undergraduate Learning and Teaching
Kirsty Woomble	Head of PGR Student Office (CAHSS)
Kathryn Nicol	Head of Academic Policy and Regulation

#### In Attendance:

Olivia Hayes (Secretary)	Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services
--------------------------	--

The meeting was conducted by correspondence and convened by the demitting Vice-Convener, Professor Judy Hardy.

#### 1. Election of Convener and Vice-Convener for 2022-23

The Terms of Reference approved by Senate for APRC in 2021/22 state, "At the final meeting of the academic year, the Committee will identify a Convener and Vice-Convener for the Committee from amongst its membership, to serve in the following year."

At the 26 May meeting of APRC, the Committee agreed to postpone the decision to elect a Convener and Vice Convener for the 22/23 academic year as Senate did not approved the Terms of Reference and Membership of APRC for 2022/23.

Senate agreed that its Standing Committees (including APRC) will operate with their existing Terms of Reference and Membership until Senate meets to agree any updates to these. This meeting is currently unlikely to happen ahead of Semester 1.

Therefore, given the urgent nature of some business of APRC (for instance the handling of concessions from degree regulations for specific students), the committee agreed to nominate and elect a Convener and Vice Convener via a virtual meeting so these positions are place for the 1st of August.

Members were invited to put forward a note of interest for the role of Convener and Vice-Convener. A single candidate was received for each position and the nominees for each position are as follows:

**Convener of APRC:** Dr Paul Norris (2 nominations)

**Vice-Convener of APRC:** Professor Paddy Hadoke (2 nominations)

The Committee were invited to approve these nominations via email with nil response taken as approval. The nominees were approved with the unanimous agreement of the Committee. Each of the candidates were invited to accept their appointment and the 2022/23 Convener and Vice-Convener have been confirmed as follows:

**Convener of APRC:** Dr Paul Norris

**Vice-Convener of APRC:** Professor Paddy Hadoke

Olivia Hayes  
July 2022

## Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee

22 September 2022

### Proposed Changes to the Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures

#### Description of paper

1. This paper proposes changes to the Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures.

#### Action requested / recommendation

2. APRC is asked to approve the proposed amendments to the Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures. Appendix 1 includes a summary of the proposed amendments to the Procedures, with a rationale for the changes. Appendix 2 includes an updated version of the Procedures, highlighting the amendments.

#### Background and context

3. The Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures ([academicmisconductprocedures.pdf](#)) set out the process which should be followed when handling cases of suspected academic misconduct within the University. The next scheduled review of the Procedures is not due until 2023/24. Since the last review of the Procedures, in 2018/19, the volume of cases referred to the College Academic Misconduct Officers (CAMO) within each of the Colleges has significantly increased. This has had a severe impact upon the workload of the CAMOs and their capacity to handle cases in an efficient and timely manner.
4. Whilst the Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures are applied locally at College level, Academic Services work closely with the CAMOs, as a group, to monitor and address any ongoing issues which may arise and discuss any implications that these may have for the Procedures. Due to the significant increase in the volume of cases since the last review, the CAMO group recommend that the Procedure is amended now. Their view is that immediate amendments are necessary in order to ensure that cases are handled in an efficient and timely manner and to minimise any distress that students may experience as a result of any delays which may occur.
5. The CAMO group have therefore proposed the changes explained in Appendix 1.
6. The CAMO group have discussed further amendments to the Procedures (in addition to those proposed in this paper). The CAMO group have agreed that these should be brought to APRC at a later date as further work is required prior to these being proposed to APRC. The group's view is that these additional changes will be necessary ahead of the next review in 2023/24. Therefore, the CAMO group would like to propose returning to APRC with further changes at a later meeting during this academic year (2022/23), to seek approval for these changes to be implemented ahead of the 2023/24 session.

**Discussion**

7. A summary of the proposed amendments to the Procedures is provided in Appendix 1. A version of the Procedures showing the proposed amendments is provided Appendix 2. **APRC is asked to approve the proposed amendments.**

**Resource implications**

8. The proposed amendments to the Procedures do not carry any significant resource implications. It is intended that the amendments to the role of the School Academic Misconduct Officer (SAMO) do not have significant implications in terms of workload. The changes are intended to address workload pressures currently faced by CAMOs.
9. CAMOs have consulted on the proposed changes with School Academic Misconduct Officers in their Colleges.

**Risk management**

10. In order to ensure that cases of suspected academic misconduct are handled fairly and sensitively, it is vital that the process is conducted in an efficient but thorough manner. The proposed changes will support this.

**Responding to the Climate Emergency & Sustainable Development Goals**

11. The proposals within this paper have no impact on the Climate Emergency and Sustainable Development Goals

**Equality & diversity**

12. The proposed amendments do not raise any specific equality and diversity concerns. The proposed amendments have been suggested to ensure that the investigation process is conducted in a fair, efficient and timely manner in order to minimise delays and any potential distress to students involved.

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

13. Should APRC approve the amendments, the Procedures will be finalised, published for use immediately and implemented at College level.
14. Academic Services will communicate the changes in an e-mail to relevant staff in Schools, Colleges and Support Services.

**Author**

Roshni Hume  
Academic Policy Officer  
Academic Services

**Presenter**

Roshni Hume  
Academic Policy Officer  
Academic Services

**Freedom of Information (Is the paper 'open' or 'closed')**

**Open**



## Proposals for amendments to the Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures

**September 2022**

### Background

The number of academic misconduct offences have increased significantly since the previous review of the Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures. The statistics from the 2016 – 2021 are below:

Academic Year	College			Total
	CAHSS	CSE	MVM	
2016/17	174	135	42	351
2017/18	167	106	47	320
2018/19	236	81	48	365
2019/20	258	104	57	419
2020/21	454	162	76	692

Finalised statistics for the 2021/22 academic year are not yet available. However, Academic Services has been provided with overall statistics for each College as they stand for the 2021/22 session and can provide these at the Committee meeting, if requested.

The College Academic Misconduct Officers (CAMOs) expressed concern in relation to the volume of cases which they are receiving and have highlighted that this has had a significant impact on their workload and their ability to handle cases in an efficient and timely manner. It was agreed by the CAMO group that immediate amendments to the Procedures were necessary in order to alleviate the impact of the volume of cases which are being referred to them as well as mitigating against delays which are currently taking place in the escalation and processing of cases.

### Proposed Amendments

It is envisaged that the proposed amendments below will allow cases to be handled more efficiently with more minor cases being dealt with at School level. It is hoped that this will ease some of the pressures at College level in terms of volume. It is also hoped that these amendments will create a further focus around the promotion of academic integrity and allow students the opportunity to learn about good academic practice.

The current Procedures are available at [academicmisconductprocedures.pdf](#) and the proposed amendments are as follows:

Section(s)	Proposed Amendment(s)
3.2	It is proposed that a SAMO may, at their discretion, invite a student to a preliminary meeting before deciding how to proceed with the case. It is envisaged that this will allow the SAMO the opportunity to gather further information about the alleged misconduct.
3.3	It is proposed that the remit of the School Academic Misconduct Officers is expanded to allow them to deal with a case, provided that it meets the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The SAMO is satisfied that the case has come about through a genuine lack of understanding by the student; and</li> <li>- It is a first offence; and</li> </ul>

	<p>- The SAMO believes that the case is minor in nature and can be appropriately dealt with by issuing a warning or applying a mark penalty of <b>no more than 10 marks</b> in accordance with the relevant Common Marking Scheme</p> <p>Currently, it is not within the SAMO's remit to apply a mark penalty. It is envisaged that this will alleviate the number of minor cases being referred to CAMOs for investigation and also allow students the opportunity to learn from their mistakes.</p>
3.4	<p>The following amendment is proposed:</p> <p><i>“Cases which satisfy the criteria cited in section 3.3, the SAMO or another relevant member of academic staff will address the issue with the student in assessment feedback, by e-mail, or in a meeting. The student should be issued with a warning and/or penalty, and advised to seek support from the Institute of Academic Development or other study skills/misconduct resources. A record of the breach must be maintained by the SAMO and the student should be warned about the consequences of any further misconduct allegations.”</i></p> <p>It is envisaged that this will allow the students concerned to be directed to appropriate sources of support to help ensure that they have an opportunity to learn from their mistakes.</p>
3.5	<p>The following amendment is proposed to ensure consistency in practice and clarify any ambiguity in relation to marks applied where cases of misconduct are proven:</p> <p><i>“A face value mark that is appropriate for the work as submitted and assuming no misconduct has occurred should be determined by this point. A fair estimate mark that is suitably reflective of the student's level of scholarship should also be established”.</i></p> <p>This is to ensure that there is a record of the face value mark and the mark which is suitably reflective of the student's ability.</p>
3.7	<p>It is proposed that the SAMO must refer cases to the CAMO within 15 working days of face value marks having been released. Cases of suspected academic misconduct which are found outside of this period must also be referred for CAMO consideration within 15 working days of when the allegation arises.</p> <p>This amendment has been proposed due to reports of significant delays in referring cases to the CAMO in some cases resulting in severe delays in informing students of the outcome of the investigation. It is envisaged that this will minimise delays in referral.</p>
3.9	<p>The following amendment is proposed as a result of varying practice in relation to the ratification and publication of marks and it is envisaged that it will ensure consistency in practice across the University:</p> <p><i>“When a case has been referred to the CAMO, marks must not be ratified by Board of Examiners or published until the investigation has been concluded.”</i></p>
4.2 & 4.5	<p>References to the role of 'Personal Tutor' have been replaced with 'Personal Tutor / Student Adviser' to reflect the upcoming changes within the Student Support System.</p>
5.4(b)	<p>It is proposed that the following amendment (highlighted in bold) is made to the list of penalties which are available to the CAMO:</p>

	<p><i>“In the case of a first offence which is a result of poor scholarly practice rather than any deliberate attempt to deceive, the CAMO may decide that a mark penalty will not be appropriate. <b>In such cases, the CAMO may decide to ask the student to attend a mandatory meeting with the SAMO to discuss good academic practice”</b></i></p> <p>It is envisaged that this amendment will help students improve their practice and limit repeat offences.</p>
--	--

Next Steps

Should the proposed amendments be approved, Academic Services and the CAMOs will ensure that these are implemented. The CAMO group have discussed further amendments to the Procedures, however, it was agreed that these would require further discussion and consultation. The group have agreed that it is likely that further changes will be required ahead of the 2023/24 academic year in order to further alleviate some of the challenges which CAMOs are currently facing. It is therefore proposed that approval for further changes should be sought at a later date in anticipation of implementing these changes ahead of the 2023/24 academic session.

Roshni Hume

Academic Services



# Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures

## Purpose of Procedure

This document sets out the University's procedures for dealing with suspected cases of academic misconduct by students or graduates of the University. These procedures apply to all types of academic misconduct including plagiarism, self-plagiarism, collusion, falsification, cheating, deceit and personation.

The University takes very seriously any suspected incidences of academic misconduct and aims to ensure that all suspected cases are investigated efficiently and dealt with appropriately.

## Scope: Mandatory Procedure

All staff and students

## Contact Officer

Roshni Hume

Academic Policy Officer

[Roshni.Hume@ed.ac.uk](mailto:Roshni.Hume@ed.ac.uk)

## Document control

Dates	Approved: 30.05.19	Starts: 01.08.2019	Equality impact assessment:	Amendments: 11.12.15 02.06.16 16.06.17 05.07.18 30.05.19 24.09.20 <u>22.09.22 TBC</u>	Next Review: 2023/24

## Approving authority

Academic Policy and Regulations Committee (APRC)

## Consultation undertaken

College Academic Misconduct Officers, College administrative staff dealing with academic misconduct, EUSA.

## Section responsible for procedure maintenance & review

Academic Services

## Related policies, procedures, guidelines & regulations

Academic Misconduct Report Form  
Code of Student Conduct  
Code of Student Conduct Guidance

## UK Quality Code

UK Quality Code – Assessment

## Procedures superseded by this procedure

Previous versions of the Procedures for Dealing with Suspected Academic Misconduct

## Alternative format

If you require this document in an alternative format please email [Academic.Services@ed.ac.uk](mailto:Academic.Services@ed.ac.uk).

## Keywords

Academic misconduct, plagiarism, self-plagiarism, collusion, falsification, cheating, deceit, personation



## Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures

---

### 1. Definition of academic misconduct

- 1.1 Academic misconduct is defined by the University as the use of unfair means in any University assessment. This includes assisting a student to make use of unfair means, and doing anything prejudicial to the good conduct of the assessment. Examples of misconduct include (but are not limited to) plagiarism, self-plagiarism (that is, submitting the same work for credit twice at the same or different institutions), collusion, falsification, cheating (including contract cheating, where a student pays for work to be written or edited by somebody else), deceit, and personation (that is, impersonating another student or allowing another person to impersonate a student in an assessment).
- 1.2 These procedures explain how the University investigates allegations of academic misconduct in relation to any work submitted for assessment. The University may also investigate cases where a student is alleged to have committed an act of academic misconduct in a piece of work which has not been submitted for assessment at the University (e.g. a conference paper or publication) under the Code of Student Conduct, where this may represent a breach of the Code:  
[www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/codeofstudentconduct.pdf](http://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/codeofstudentconduct.pdf)
- 1.3 Staff investigating allegations of academic misconduct will make a decision based on the balance of probabilities. This means that they will be satisfied that an academic misconduct offence has been committed if they consider that, on the evidence available, it is more likely than not that an offence has been committed.
- 1.4 A School Academic Misconduct Officer (SAMO) and a College Academic Misconduct Officer (CAMO) may nominate a deputy to hold meetings with students in cases where there is a conflict of interest or where subject specific expertise is required e.g. where there is reasonable doubt that a student's work may not be their own and further enquiry into the student's work is required in order to establish whether there is a potential case of academic misconduct.

#### **A. Suspected academic misconduct in assessed work submitted for taught courses**

### 2. Reporting of suspected academic misconduct in taught courses

- 2.1 Any member of staff who has evidence that a student may have committed an academic misconduct offence in an assessed piece of work submitted for a taught course must complete an Academic Misconduct Report Form. They will submit the form and any other relevant documentation to the School Academic Misconduct Officer (SAMO), informing the relevant Course Organiser. The work under investigation will be assessed and awarded a face value mark prior to referral to the SAMO. The face value mark is the mark that the work is believed to merit based solely on the content as presented, assuming no academic misconduct has taken place.
- 2.2 The Academic Misconduct Report Form is available at:  
[www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/staff/discipline/academic-misconduct](http://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/staff/discipline/academic-misconduct)

### 3. Investigation by the School Academic Misconduct Officer (SAMO) – suspected academic misconduct in taught courses



## Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures

---

3.1 The SAMO is responsible for deciding whether there is a case to answer. The SAMO will discuss the case with the relevant Course Organiser and/or marker and can consult with the College Academic Misconduct Officer (CAMO) if necessary. If the SAMO decides that there are grounds for investigation, they will determine whether they are able to deal with the case or whether it needs to be referred to a CAMO.

3.2 A SAMO (or nominee) may, at their discretion, invite a student to a preliminary meeting before deciding how to proceed with the case. The student may be accompanied at that meeting by a member of the University community, e.g. their Personal Tutor / Student Adviser or an adviser from the Edinburgh University Students' Association Advice Place. The SAMO or CAMO may not draw any inference if the student chooses not to attend the meeting. If the student is unable to attend in person, the SAMO will consult with the student and select one of the following options:

- To conduct the meeting electronically (e.g. by video, web-camera, etc.); or
- To offer the student the opportunity to make a written submission.

~~A SAMO will be able to deal with the case if it meets all of the following criteria:~~

- ~~• It is a first offence (the relevant College can advise where it is a potential repeat offence);  
**and**~~
- ~~• The SAMO is satisfied that the case has come about through a genuine lack of understanding by the student; **and**~~
- ~~• The SAMO believes that the case can be appropriately dealt with without recourse to a mark penalty.~~

~~In cases where the SAMO is unsure about whether the criteria above apply, the SAMO should consult the CAMO, who will determine whether the SAMO can deal with the case.~~

3.3 The case will not require referral to the CAMO provided that it meets all of the following criteria:

- The SAMO is satisfied that the case has come about through a genuine lack of understanding by the student; **and**
- It is a first offence (the relevant College can advise where it is a potential repeat offence);  
**and**
- The SAMO believes that the case is minor in nature and can be appropriately dealt with by issuing a warning or applying a mark penalty of no more than 10 marks in accordance with the relevant Common Marking Scheme.

In cases where the SAMO is unsure about whether the criteria above apply, the SAMO should consult the CAMO, who will determine whether the SAMO can deal with the case.

~~The SAMO cannot apply a mark penalty or make any alteration to marks for cases outlined above in 3.2.~~

3.4 For cases which satisfy the criteria in 3.3, the SAMO or another relevant member of academic staff will address the issue with the student in assessment feedback, by email, or in a meeting. The student should be issued with a warning and/or penalty, and advised to seek support from the Institute of Academic Development or other study skills/misconduct resources. A record of the breach must be maintained by the SAMO and the student should be warned about the consequences of any further misconduct allegations.

~~For cases identified by the SAMO as poor scholarship rather than academic misconduct, the SAMO or another relevant member of academic staff will address the issue with the~~



## Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures

---

~~student in assessment feedback, by email, or in a meeting. If appropriate, the SAMO will return the assessment to the marker to determine a mark that fairly reflects the student's own contribution.~~

- 3.5 A face value mark that is appropriate for the work as submitted and assuming no misconduct has occurred should be determined by this point. A fair estimate mark that is suitably reflective of the student's level of scholarship should also be established.

~~A SAMO (or nominee) may, at their discretion, invite a student to a preliminary meeting before deciding how to proceed with the case. The student may be accompanied to that meeting by a member of the University community, e.g. their Personal Tutor or an adviser from the Edinburgh University Students' Association Advice Place. The SAMO or CAMO may not draw any inference if the student chooses not to attend the meeting. If the student is unable to attend in person, the SAMO will consult with the student and select one of the following options:~~

- ~~• To conduct the meeting electronically (e.g. by video, web-camera, etc.); or~~
- ~~• To offer the student the opportunity to make a written submission.~~

- 3.6 The SAMO will refer all cases which fail to meet the criteria set out at 3.32 above to the CAMO. Allegations of serious misconduct, including examination misconduct and contract cheating, will always be referred to the CAMO.

- 3.7 The SAMO must refer cases to the CAMO within 15 working days of face value marks having been released. Cases of suspected academic misconduct which are found outside of this period, must also be referred for CAMO consideration within 15 working days of when the allegation arises.

- 3.8 When referring a case to the CAMO, the SAMO must complete the relevant section of the Academic Misconduct Report Form and submit this with any relevant documentation to the College Academic Misconduct Administrator.

- 3.9 When a case has been referred to the SAMO or the CAMO, marks must not be ratified by Boards of Examiners or published until the investigation has been concluded.

### **4. Investigation by the College Academic Misconduct Officer (CAMO) - suspected academic misconduct in taught courses**

- 4.1 The CAMO is responsible for investigating all cases of suspected academic misconduct referred to them by a SAMO and for deciding on the penalty (if any) to be applied. As part of this investigation, the CAMO should ascertain whether or not this is the student's first academic misconduct offence.

- 4.2 If the CAMO considers there is a case to answer, they will write to the student suspected of academic misconduct describing the alleged offence and inviting the student to respond to the evidence reported by the School. The CAMO will copy the initial correspondence to the student's Personal Tutor / [Student Adviser](#) and encourage the student to speak with their Personal Tutor / [Student Adviser](#).

- 4.3 Where the student acknowledges the offence and there is sufficient information for the CAMO to make a decision, the CAMO may decide that there is no need for a formal academic misconduct interview. In such cases the CAMO will write to the student and the SAMO, to inform them of the outcome and any penalty decision. The SAMO will advise the Convener of



## Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures

---

the relevant Board of Examiners of the decision and any penalty to be enacted (see Section 6). If the CAMO's recommendations relate to specific staff members, the SAMO will forward each recommendation to the relevant staff member. Where appropriate, the SAMO, or another member of academic staff, will also offer to meet with the student concerned in order to provide advice on academic best practice

- 4.4 In all other cases, the CAMO will invite the student to attend an interview. The interview will be conducted by a panel chaired by the CAMO (or nominee), and including at least one representative SAMO from that College (not from the same School as the student). The CAMO will be assisted by a note-taker who will take a record of the meeting.
- 4.5 Where the CAMO conducts an interview with the student, this should be held in person wherever possible. The student may be accompanied by a member of the University community, e.g. an adviser from the Edinburgh University Students' Association Advice Place, or their Personal Tutor / [Student Adviser](#). If the student is unable to attend in person, the CAMO will consult with the student and select one of the following options:
  - To conduct the interview electronically (e.g. by video, web-camera, etc.); **or**
  - To offer the student the opportunity to make a written submission.
- 4.6 In exceptional cases, the panel may invite an academic staff member with relevant specialist knowledge to attend the interview as an expert witness. In such cases, the expert will provide specialist knowledge to assist the panel in making a decision. However, the expert will not form part of the panel, and will not be involved in any decision making.
- 4.7 The purpose of the interview will be to enable the panel to obtain further relevant information about the alleged academic misconduct offence and to allow the student the opportunity to put forward their response to the allegation. The panel will take this information into account when deciding on any penalty to be applied.
- 4.8 Following the interview, the CAMO will send a confidential report of the meeting to the student. The student will be given the opportunity to comment on the accuracy of the report. The CAMO will then approve a final version of the report.
- 4.9 The CAMO, in consultation with the rest of the panel, will decide on the penalty, if any, to be applied (see 5.1 below). The CAMO will inform the student of the decision as soon as possible following the outcome of the meeting.
- 4.10 The CAMO will send a report of the meeting, the outcome, and any recommendations arising from the case, to the reporting SAMO.
- 4.11 The SAMO will forward the outcome of the case, including any penalty to be enacted, to the Convener of the relevant Board of Examiners (see section 6). If the CAMO's recommendations relate to specific staff members, the SAMO will forward each recommendation to the relevant staff member.
- 4.12 If an allegation of academic misconduct is upheld in relation to a student registered on a programme with Fitness to Practise requirements, further action may be taken under the relevant College Fitness to Practise Procedure. This will not involve reinvestigating the allegation of academic misconduct.





## Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures

---

### 5. Penalty decisions available to the College Academic Misconduct Officer (CAMO) - academic misconduct in taught courses

5.1 In deciding whether or not it is appropriate to apply a penalty, and which penalty to apply, the CAMO will take into account the severity, perceived intent and benefit to the student of the academic misconduct, as well as any previous academic misconduct offences.

5.2 Any penalty will apply **only** to the specific work under investigation, which in itself may represent only a part of the overall course assessment. The College will retain a record of any penalties applied by the CAMO, but this will not appear on a student's transcript. In cases where one or more students have colluded on a piece of work, penalty decisions for each student will be made on an individual basis.

5.3 Where the student claims that the affected assessment was impacted by special circumstances, the CAMO will advise the student to request consideration of these by the appropriate Special Circumstances Committee. The CAMO will not take account of special circumstances in reaching a penalty decision.

5.4 The following options are available to the CAMO:

- (a) To decide that there is no case to answer and no penalty is therefore to be applied;
- (b) In the case of a first offence which is a result of poor scholarly practice rather than any deliberate attempt to deceive, the CAMO may decide that a mark penalty will not be appropriate. In such cases, the CAMO may decide to ask the student to attend a mandatory meeting with the SAMO to discuss good academic practice;
- (c) A penalty deducting 10, 20 or 30 marks from the face value mark will be applied. The penalty applied should be proportionate to the offence. The face value mark must be expressed as a percentage using the relevant [Common Marking Scheme](#) (e.g., 15/20 must be presented as 75% so that, for example, a 30 mark penalty would reduce the mark to 45%);
- (d) The mark is to be reduced to zero;
- (e) In cases where students have colluded in producing a piece of work, the face value mark may be split (not necessarily equally) between the students involved. For instance, a face value mark of 70 may be split equally between two students, so that each student receives a mark of 35;
- (f) In serious cases or where the student has a record of having committed a number of previous academic misconduct offences, the CAMO may decide to refer the case for disciplinary action under the Code of Student Conduct. In such cases, the CAMO investigation is equivalent to that of the Conduct Investigator for other student conduct cases, and no further investigation is required under the Code of Student Conduct. The CAMO may refer the case to a Student Discipline Officer, or to the Student Discipline Committee, as appropriate. If referring to the Student Discipline Committee, the CAMO should contact the Secretary to the Student Discipline Committee to discuss the matter. Details of the University disciplinary procedures and of the penalties available to Student Discipline Officers and the Student Discipline Committee under the Code of Student Conduct are available at:  
[www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/staff/discipline/code-discipline](http://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/staff/discipline/code-discipline)

The CAMO may choose to issue a formal warning in addition to one or more of the above.

### 6. Application of penalties by the Board of Examiners - taught courses



## Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures

---

- 6.1 The Board of Examiners is required to apply the penalty determined by the College Academic Misconduct Officer (CAMO). It cannot apply any additional penalty for the offence. If the student has submitted Special Circumstances relating to the affected assessment the Board will take into account the decision of the Special Circumstances Committee when reaching its decision, in accordance with the Special Circumstances Policy:  
[www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/students/assessment/special-circumstances/](http://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/students/assessment/special-circumstances/)

### **B. Suspected academic misconduct in work submitted for postgraduate research programmes (other than taught components, which are investigated in line with A)**

#### **7. Reporting of suspected academic misconduct in postgraduate research programmes**

- 7.1 Any member of staff who has evidence that a student undertaking a postgraduate research programme may have committed an academic misconduct offence (in the thesis or other work submitted for assessment and/or progression) must complete an Academic Misconduct Report Form in conjunction with the relevant SAMO. They must submit the form and any other relevant documentation to the CAMO.
- 7.2 The Academic Misconduct Report Form is available at:  
[www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/staff/discipline/academic-misconduct](http://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/staff/discipline/academic-misconduct)

#### **8. Investigation by the College Academic Misconduct Officer (CAMO) – suspected academic misconduct in postgraduate research programmes**

- 8.1 The CAMO is responsible for investigating all cases of suspected academic misconduct referred to them by a SAMO and for deciding on the penalty (if any) to be applied.
- 8.2 If the CAMO considers that there is a case to answer, the CAMO will arrange for an academic misconduct panel comprising the CAMO and one other relevant academic member of staff (for example a relevant College Dean or a Graduate School Director or School Academic Misconduct Officer from a different School in the same College) to interview the student, following the same procedure as outlined in 4.5-4.8.
- 8.3 The CAMO, in consultation with the rest of the panel, will decide on the penalty, if any, to be applied (see 9.1 below). The CAMO will inform the student of the decision as soon as possible following the outcome of the meeting. The CAMO will provide the student's principal supervisor with an outline of the decision.
- 8.4 Except in cases referred for further consideration under the Code of Student Conduct, once the CAMO has approved the report of the meeting and decided on the penalty (if any) to be applied, the CAMO will submit a written report to the SAMO for forwarding to the Convener of the relevant Board of Examiners. This will include details of any penalty which the Board must apply in light of the decision (see section 9 below).

#### **9. Penalty decisions available to the College Academic Misconduct Officer (CAMO) – academic misconduct in postgraduate research programmes**



## Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures

---

- 9.1 In deciding whether or not it is appropriate to apply a penalty, and which penalty to apply, the CAMO will take into account the severity, perceived intent and benefit to the student of the academic misconduct, as well as any previous academic misconduct offences.
- 9.2 Where the student claims that the affected assessment was impacted by special circumstances, the CAMO will advise the student to request consideration of these by the appropriate Special Circumstances Committee. The CAMO will not take account of special circumstances in reaching a penalty decision.
- 9.3 The following options are available to the CAMO:
- (a) Decide that there is no case to answer and no penalty is therefore to be applied;
  - (b) Allow the student to edit and resubmit the work having corrected the affected section(s)\*;
  - (c) Instruct the examiners to reassess the work with the affected sections removed (without offering the student the chance to edit)\*;
  - (d) Deem the thesis (or dissertation, or other assessment or components of assessment) to have failed and instruct the Board of Examiners accordingly;
  - (e) In serious cases or where the student has a record of having committed a number of previous academic misconduct offences, the CAMO may decide to refer the case for disciplinary action under the Code of Student Conduct. In such cases, the CAMO investigation is equivalent to that of the Conduct Investigator for other student conduct cases, and no further investigation is required under the Code of Student Conduct. The CAMO may refer the case to a Student Discipline Officer, or to the Student Discipline Committee, as appropriate. If referring to the Student Discipline Committee, the CAMO should contact the Secretary to the Student Discipline Committee to discuss the matter. Details of the University disciplinary procedures and of the penalties available to Student Discipline Officers and the Student Discipline Committee under the Code of Student Conduct are available at:  
[www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/staff/discipline/code-discipline](http://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/staff/discipline/code-discipline)

\*Options (b) and (c) may involve the thesis no longer being fit for a specific award.

- 9.4 Where the work affected has been submitted for annual review the CAMO will submit a report, including a recommendation, to the student's annual review panel.
- 9.5 The relevant College will keep a record of any penalties applied by the CAMO, but this will not appear on a student's transcript.
- 10. Application of penalties by the Board of Examiners – postgraduate programmes**
- 10.1 The Board of Examiners is required to apply the penalty determined by the College Academic Misconduct Officer (CAMO). It cannot apply any additional penalty for the offence. If the student has submitted Special Circumstances relating to the affected assessment the Board will take into account the decision of the Special Circumstances Committee when reaching its decision, in accordance with the Special Circumstances Policy:  
[www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/students/assessment/special-circumstances/](http://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/students/assessment/special-circumstances/)
- 11. Students funded by UK Research Councils**
- 11.1 Where there is evidence that a student who is receiving funding from one of the UK Research Councils may have committed an act of academic misconduct in their research, the University



## Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures

---

is required to report this to the relevant Research Council. Staff reporting suspected academic misconduct to the relevant CAMO should indicate on the Academic Misconduct Report form where a student is funded by a UK Research Council. Should the CAMO decide that there is a case to answer, they will notify the School, who will inform the relevant Research Council of the allegations against the student, and provide updates on the outcome of the case.

- 11.2 Policies and guidance relating to research integrity for students funded through UK research councils are published by UK Research and Innovation (formerly known as Research Councils UK), and can be found online at:  
[www.ukri.org/about-us/policies-and-standards/research-integrity/](http://www.ukri.org/about-us/policies-and-standards/research-integrity/)

### C. Suspected academic misconduct by graduates of the University

#### 12. Reporting of suspected academic misconduct – graduates

- 12.1 Any member of staff who has evidence that a graduate of the University may have committed an academic misconduct offence that could impact upon the award, or classification of award, including the award of postgraduate Merit or Distinction, must complete an Academic Misconduct Report Form in conjunction with the relevant SAMO. They should submit the form and any other relevant documentation to the CAMO.

#### 13. Investigation by College Academic Misconduct Officer (CAMO) - graduates

- 13.1 If the CAMO considers there is a case to answer, the CAMO will write to the graduate notifying them of the allegations and inviting them to attend an interview. The interview procedures for graduates are identical to the investigation and interview procedures for enrolled students (sections 4.2 to 5.4 for taught courses, and 8.2 to 9.6 for research programmes).
- 13.2 Following investigation the following options are open to the CAMO:
- (a) If there is no case to answer, or if it is concluded that academic misconduct is proven but was taken into account at the time of the original award, the CAMO will report the case and the outcome of the investigation to the Convener of the relevant Board of Examiners. No further action will be taken;
  - (b) If the allegation is found to be proven, but is unlikely to have impacted on the award or classification of award (including the award of postgraduate Merit or Distinction) made to the graduate, the CAMO will report the case and the outcome of the investigation to the Convener of the relevant Board of Examiners. No further action will be taken;
  - (c) If the allegation is found to be proven, and is likely to have impacted on the award or class of award made to the graduate, the CAMO will refer the case for disciplinary action under the Code of Student Conduct. In such cases, the CAMO investigation is equivalent to that of the Conduct Investigator for other student conduct cases, and no further investigation is required under the Code of Student Conduct. The CAMO may refer the case to a Student Discipline Officer, or to the Student Discipline Committee, as appropriate. If referring to the Student Discipline Committee, the CAMO should contact the Secretary to the Student Discipline Committee to discuss the matter. Details of the University disciplinary procedures and of the penalties available to Student Discipline Officers and the Student Discipline Committee under the Code of Student Conduct are available at:  
[www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/codeofstudentconduct.pdf](http://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/codeofstudentconduct.pdf)



## Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures

---

### D. Review of a College Academic Misconduct Officer (CAMO) decision

#### 14. Request for a review by the Board of Examiners

- 14.1 If the Board of Examiners believes that there is a justifiable reason to challenge the CAMO's decision about the penalty to be applied, the Convener may request that the decision be referred for review by the CAMOs of the University's other two Colleges jointly. The relevant Convener will submit a request in writing to the relevant contact in Academic Services, outlining the reasons for challenging the decision. The Convener will write to the student to inform them that their case has been referred for review, explaining that the final course result has therefore not yet been agreed.
- 14.2 Academic Services will arrange for the case to be reviewed by the CAMOs of the other two Colleges. The original investigating CAMO will be required to submit a copy of all of the case documentation which was considered by the CAMO along with copies of the report and decision letter. Each CAMO will be sent the documentation and will be asked to come to a decision separately before meeting to discuss the case; this meeting may be held by correspondence. The CAMOs may decide to invite the student to a further academic misconduct interview, following the same procedure as outlined in section 4.5. The CAMOs may be assisted by a note-taker who will take a record of the meeting.
- 14.3 Once the meeting and any further academic misconduct interview has been held, the two reviewing CAMOs will make a joint decision about whether or not to uphold the original investigating CAMO's decision, to rescind a penalty or to apply an alternative penalty. In determining an alternative penalty, the reviewing CAMOs may only choose from those penalties listed in 5.4 (for work submitted as part of a taught course), 9.3 (for students undertaking postgraduate research programmes) and 13.2 (for graduates).
- 14.4 Academic Services will notify the Convener of the Board of Examiners and the student in writing of the joint CAMO decision. The original investigating CAMO will be informed of the outcome of the review. The Board will be required to adhere to that decision and cannot request a further review. The Convener of the Board of Examiners will write to the student to inform them of the final course result agreed by the Board.

#### 15. Student right of appeal

- 15.1 CAMO decisions resulting in mark penalties are ratified by Boards of Examiners. Students have a right to appeal decisions made by Boards of Examiners, including decisions affected by the outcome of an academic misconduct investigation. Students wishing to submit an academic appeal should refer to the University's Student Appeal Regulations and related guidance at:

[www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/students/appeals](http://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/students/appeals)

**24 September 2020**

**Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee****22 September 2022****Proposed Reform to MSc Mathematical Economics and Econometrics:  
Research Project****Description of paper**

1. The School of Economics propose to allow their students, undertaking the MSc *Mathematical Economics and Econometrics (MEE)*, to choose between completing a dissertation or a research project as the capstone of their PGT studies. This choice is intended to allow students to tailor their studies towards the development of skills that will aid them most in their future pursuits.
2. In anticipation of the curriculum transformation being implemented in 2025, the School view the proposal as an experiment on our relatively small PGT programme, with an eye to extend it to our bigger programmes in case of the reform's success.

**Action requested / recommendation**

3. Consideration of the content of the paper to grant approval, or otherwise, to the request to create a Research Project option within the Mathematical Economics and Econometrics (MSc).

**Background and context**

4. The paper outlines the rationale for creating a Research Project option within this programme.

**5. Discussion****Summary**

Alongside other reforms (which have recently been approved) to the MSc Mathematical Economics and Econometrics (MEE), we propose to allow students on this programme to choose between completing a dissertation and a research project as the capstone of their PGT studies. This choice is intended to allow students to tailor their studies towards the development of skills that will aid them most in their future pursuits. Students who wish to pursue a future academic career will be encouraged to complete the dissertation. Students who wish to focus on developing skills which are in demand outside of academia will be encouraged to complete the Research Project, and will work as part of a group to develop their quantitative research abilities. Both capstone projects will be overseen by an experienced economist, and will result in all students on the programme demonstrating the programme learning outcomes in a robust way. In anticipation of the curriculum transformation being implemented in 2025, we view the proposal as an experiment on our relatively small PGT programme, with an eye to extend it to our bigger programmes in case of the reform's success.

## Proposal

The proposal involves two distinct aspects, each consistent with the spirit of curriculum transformation in its own right.

### *Aspect 1: (Group) Research Project as an Alternative Type of MSc Capstone Project*

- We propose to allow the students to engage in a Research Project, which is a **group project with a substantial individual component**. Consistent with the spirit of curriculum transformation, it provides an opportunity to increase students' capacity for performing quantitative research in economics and to develop their transferable skills.
  - *Rationale:* We hope that this type of capstone will be better tailored for the students who expect to build their career outside of academia, and would thus allow the students to develop and demonstrate their competencies in the skills required by the modern workplace.
- Students completing the Research Project will work as a group (although they may be allowed to undertake the project individually at the discretion of the programme director and in consultation with the project supervisor). Students will produce two outputs: a **research report** compiled by the **group**, and a **project synopsis** produced **individually and independently**.
- The **research report** (40%) is a **groupwork** component which would enable the students to experience working on a research which both in the scale and the scope is **beyond** what they could explore on their own.
  - *Rationale:* The group aspect of the project is expected to reflect the **comparative advantages/individual competencies** of the individual students and to combine them in productive and efficient way. That would allow the students to undertake more ambitious research and to achieve a level of accomplishment which **surpasses** what each individual student would be expected to achieve on their own, providing the students a sense of accomplishment. Peer-to-peer learning would further allow the students to widen their set of skills beyond what they would develop when working individually and independently.
- It is expected that a research report at **distinction-level** will have a substantial element of original contribution and will extend well beyond the supervisory input.
  - *Rationale:* This aspect ensures that the research project is neither perceived nor actually is an easy way to achieve distinction-level marks. It also provides a clear benchmark which ensures the comparability of rigour to the ones achieved at the other type of capstone, the dissertation.
- The **project synopsis** (60%) is an **individual** component which will be an extended summary of the research report, augmented by each student's own, further, insights on the subject and the relevant literature. The form of the synopsis will be decided by the academic supervisor for the entire group, and could be in the form of an essay, presentation slides, poster, research proposal, policy report, or other form which will allow students to develop their transferable skills.

- *Rationale:* The individual component will be assessed on individual merits, which ensures that students have an opportunity to excel relatively to their groupmates, and for separating out the students who might have not achieved the same level of understanding of the subject as their groupmates. In our discussion with the students, an ability to **distinguish themselves from teammates** appeared to be very important to the students.

### *Aspect 2: Choice Between Two Types of MSc Capstone Project*

- We propose to offer students a **choice between the two types of capstone**, -- the traditional dissertation and this new (group) research project. Consistent with the spirit of curriculum transformation, the choice is intended to allow students to determine for themselves how best to support their aspirations for the future. Importantly, **rather than** allowing students to pursue the traditional dissertation route as a part of a capstone project (as it is done in some postgraduate programmes at CAHSS), we propose an explicit **choice as means** to provide **valuable information** about students' intentions.
  - *Rationale:* The choice between the two types of capstone will be **clearly reflected on students' transcripts**, and thus will provide **valuable information** to future employers and the relevant accreditation agencies.
    - As the a result, students interested in pursuing an **academic degree** or engaging in high quality economic research will be able to **clearly convey** their academic predilection and commitment to academic standards of research by their performance on the MSc dissertation.
    - We also are taking into account that many of our PGT students are international, with a substantial number from China. The Chinese students informed us that for a UK MSc degree to be **accredited** in China, they need to do a dissertation as a capstone of their MSc degree.
    - In contrast, students who have decided that they are interested in focusing on developing skills which are in demand **outside of academia**, and who are not compelled by the third parties to complete a dissertation, will be able to do so by choosing to work on the Research Project, while still required to individually demonstrate the programme-level learning outcomes.
  - Based on our discussion with the students and their future plans, we expect that a **large majority** of students will pursue the traditional dissertation route due to either the intentions to pursue the academic career or because of accreditation requirements. However, there is a small minority of students who would be interested in developing their transferable skills via the group project (particularly through the peer-to-peer learning).



## Course Outline

Please see below course information review file (“Economics Research Project 50 credits v2”) for more details regarding the Research Project course itself.

## Course Name – PG course information Review

*\*asterisked info is the minimum information that I need to input new courses, the rest will be needed at some point so it’s useful to have it at the outset.*

<b>Course name*</b>	Research Project (Economics)
<b>Course level/Year taken*</b>	Postgraduate (level 11)
<b>Course Type</b>	Dissertation
<b>Home Subject Area*</b>	Economics
<b>Course organizer</b>	
<b>Who will be teaching the course and at what institution are they based?</b>	University of Edinburgh
<b>In which semester will it be taught?</b>	Semester 2
<b>Course Summary*</b>	<p>Like the MSc Dissertation, the Research Project is the most challenging element of the programme - undertaking it requires students to develop a deep level of analysis and understanding of core economic theory and econometrics. However, the project is suitable only for those students who intend to build their career only outside of academia and thus would like to concentrate on further development of their transferable skills. Those students who contemplate building an academic career, should develop the relevant skills by working on MSc dissertation instead.</p> <p>The Research Project is an opportunity to investigate an economic subject in depth, undertaken in groups of up to 5 students, under the guidance of an experienced economist.</p> <p>The project is expected to reflect the comparative advantages/competencies of the individual students in particular aspects of mathematical economics, econometrics, numerical methods, programming, data collection methods, literature research, critical analysis, and writing skills, and to combine them in productive and efficient way.</p> <p>The topic will be agreed in consultation with supervisor. The project normally involves students developing the methodology best suited to explore the subject, whether it involves the standard data sources, big data, advanced numerical modelling, mathematical modelling, analytical</p>

	<p>methods, computer coding, critical literature survey, design of an economic experiment, collection of original data, and so on.</p> <p>The students will submit two types of outputs: a research report produced by the group and project synopsis produced by each student individually and independently. The group report is expected to be a substantial piece of work. Given the synergy of the individual student competencies, peer support and peer-to-peer learning, the students are expected to achieve the level of accomplishment which surpasses what each individual student is expected to achieve on their own. It is expected that the distinction-level research report will have a substantial element of original contribution and will extend well beyond the supervisory input.</p> <p>The individual project synopsis will involve students producing the extended summary of the research report augmented by student's own further insights on the subject and the relevant literature. Students are expected to work on synopsis independently and without any consultation with the other group members. The form of the synopsis will be decided by the supervisor for the entire group, and could be in the form of an essay, presentation slides, poster, research proposal, policy report, or other form which will allow students to develop their transferable skills.</p> <p>Single individuals may be allowed to work on the project by the discretion of the programme director in a consultation with the project supervisor.</p>
<b>Description*</b>	<p>The Research Project is an opportunity to investigate an economic subject in depth, undertaken in groups of up to 5 students, under the guidance of an experienced economist. It provides an opportunity to apply core economic concepts and theories to research a topic, to develop computational modelling skills, qualitative and quantitative analysis and interpretation of data, knowledge of statistical package, programming languages, experimental design, data collection techniques, etc., all of which increase students' capacity for performing quantitative research in economics and to develop their transferable skills.</p>
<b>Summary of Learning Outcomes*</b>	<p>On completion of this course, the student will be able to demonstrate competence in working in a particular area of economics and/or econometrics; demonstrate ability to</p>

	use the advanced economic methods; produce a substantial piece of economics research in a suitably written form; communicate economics ideas and results in a succinct and clear fashion; work as a team. They will have knowledge and understanding relating to the topics covered and will have developed and demonstrated a wide range of key skills including managing tasks and time; independent action and initiative; critical analysis and assessment, teamwork and group interaction. The student will be able to demonstrate their ability to appropriately use econometrics techniques to answer an empirical question, to successfully solve a computational problem, develop and present a coherent and structured written review on a key issue, topic or theme relating to economic theory or policy.
<b>Breakdown of Learning and Teaching activities*</b>	Total Hours: 500 (Lecture Hours 15, Supervision Hours 3, Formative Assessment Hours 3, Programme Level Learning and Teaching Hours 2, Directed Learning and Independent Learning Hours 477)
<b>Breakdown of Assessment Methods*</b>	Coursework 100 % 40% group project (up to 8000 words) 60% individual project (up to 5000 words)
<b>Exam information*</b>	No exam
<b>Feedback</b>	
<b>Other information not required but which it can be entered:</b>	
<b>Syllabus</b>	
<b>Transferable skills</b>	
<b>Reading list</b>	
<b>Keywords</b>	
<b>Other Requirements</b>	
<b>Pre-requisites</b>	

**Resource implications**

6. n/a

**Risk management**

7. There are no risks associated with this paper.

**Responding to the Climate Emergency & Sustainable Development Goals**

8. n/a

**Equality & diversity**

9. n/a

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

10. The School of Economics with undertake the necessary action in the event of approval of the request.

**Author**

*School of Economics  
9 September 2022*

**Presenter**

**Freedom of Information**

## Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee

22 September 2022

### Developments from 11 August 2022 Senate meeting, including new guidelines for Senate Committee operations

#### Description of paper

1. At its 11 August 2022 meeting, Senate approved some guidelines for the operation of the Senate Committees, including arrangements for access to and production of Senate Committee papers. This paper sets out these guidelines.
2. We anticipate that Senate will clarify some detail associated with these guidelines through the process of approving the minutes of its August meeting. Senate will not approve the minutes of the meeting until its next Ordinary meeting on 12 October 2022. In order that the Committees can begin to follow Senate's guidance, we have produced this paper in advance of the approval of those minutes – we will update the Committee on any substantive developments once Senate has approved the minutes of its August meeting.
3. The paper also highlights some other developments from the 11 August 2022 Senate meeting which have implications for Senate Committees – changes to Senate Committee membership, and an upcoming external effectiveness review of Senate.

#### Action requested / recommendation

4. The paper invites Committee members to note these new guidelines and to take them into account when preparing Committee papers.

#### Background and context

5. Academic Services has well-established arrangements for publishing agendas, minutes and 'open' Senate Committee papers on its website ([www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/committees](http://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/committees)). Following discussions on Senate effectiveness and transparency, Senate committees have taken steps to build on these arrangements by sharing committee papers proactively with Senate as a whole, including announcing to Senate members when papers are posted.

#### Discussion

##### *Guidelines on access to papers*

6. At its 11 August 2022 meeting, Senate agreed a set of guidelines which build on the arrangements by setting how to provide access to 'closed' Senate Committee papers:
  - Papers should be open by default, meaning they can be accessed at will by members of Senate whether or not they are on the committee. Where an author categorises their paper as 'closed', we will still need distribute the

paper to Senate members on request. The default position would not be to redact papers before doing this, unless there are very compelling reasons associated with their Closed Freedom of Information status for doing so, or unless it is necessary to redact personal information for Data protection reasons. Where we need to redact papers, we would need to provide Senate members with the reason for redaction and a sufficient summary of any redacted information to allow consideration of any matters relevant to Senate's oversight role. **In this context, authors should only categorise papers as 'closed' if it is essential to do so and there is a clear rationale in terms of Freedom of Information or Data Protection exemptions.**

- Papers should be available in advance of the meeting at which they are considered, if possible, to facilitate comments and participation. **Therefore please could authors aim to prepare papers on a timeline that will allow us to circulate them one week in advance?**
- If information is presented as an oral report, a detailed summary shall be included either in the minutes or as a supplementary paper that includes sufficient detail to engage the content of the report. Given this guidance, in many cases **it would be more efficient and transparent for authors to provide papers to update the committee on substantive issues, and only to use oral reports for less material issues.**

### ***Resourcing issues associated with Committee papers***

7. At its August 2022, Senate also agreed that Senate committees should take account of resourcing issues, including implications for staff workload, when making decisions. The Senate Committee paper template already includes a Resource Implications section, and the Senate guidelines would build on these established arrangements. Senate will provide specific guidance on this issue when it meets in October 2022. In the meantime, **please can authors ensure that Committee papers include a thorough analysis of resourcing issues (including staff workload issues) in the Resource Implications section of the cover-sheet, and can all Committee members ensure that they considers these resourcing issues when discussing proposals?**

### ***Other issues***

8. At its 11 August 2022 meeting, Senate also agreed to add three elected Senate members to each Senate Standing Committees. Senate Conveners will meet with a group of interested Senate members in September 2022 to discuss the mechanisms for this, with a view to presenting proposals to Senate's October 2022 meeting.
9. At its 11 August 2022 meeting, Senate also discussed ways to strengthen the Standing Committees' reporting to Senate, including the format of annual reports to Senate.

10. At its May 2022 meeting, Senate agreed to bring forward to 2022-23 an external effectiveness review of Senate, and at its August meeting it approved the terms of reference for the review. The review will cover the Senate Committees as well as Senate itself (for example, the effectiveness of the relationship between Senate and its Committees, and the effectiveness and suitability of the current membership of the Senate Committees). In due course, we will inform Committee members of their opportunities to engage with the review.

### **Resource implications**

11. The guidelines are broadly aligned with established Committee practice. However, some elements of these guidelines (redacting closed papers, arrangements for recording information provided in oral reports) may increase the workload for authors of papers and staff supporting the Committees.

### **Risk management**

12. Since the paper is not inviting the Committee to make a decision, it is not necessary to consider risk management. Senate did however consider this when approving the guidelines.

### **Responding to the Climate Emergency & Sustainable Development Goals**

13. Not applicable.

### **Equality & diversity**

14. Since the paper is not inviting the Committee to make a decision, it is not necessary to consider equality and diversity dimensions. Senate did however consider this when approving the guidelines, and identified ways that the guidelines would have positive equality and diversity implications.

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

15. This paper communicates the guidelines to Committee members, and asks them to implement the guidelines.

#### **Author**

Tom Ward  
Director of Academic Services  
26 August 2022

#### **Presenter**

Tom Ward

### **Freedom of Information**

Open

**Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee  
22nd September 2022**

**Edinburgh University Students' Association Vice President Education  
Priorities 2022/23**

**Description of paper**

1. This paper provides an overview of the Students' Association Vice President Education's priorities for the academic year 2022/23.

**Action requested / recommendation**

2. For information and comment from Committee members.

**Background and context**

3. Following the Students' Association elections in March 2022, Sam MacCallum was elected as Vice President Education for the 2022/23 academic year. They are one of five elected Sabbatical Officers who work full-time within the Students' Association to represent students' interests. The Vice President Education is responsible for representing and advocating for students in areas of learning and teaching. This paper outlines their priorities for the academic year and highlights key areas of work.

**Discussion**

4. For the 2022/23 session, Sam will be focusing on the following areas:

**Increasing academic transparency and student academic support**

The last two years of pandemic-altered teaching have demonstrated that substantial change can happen quickly when needed. From assessment methods to student support, the pandemic has demonstrated that policy changes can act reflexively and with timely implementation. With a full-scale return to in-person teaching and assessment now imminent, the University will need to work quickly to ensure adequate provisions are in place to support students through this transition, and to consider alternative methods of assessment where possible to ensure accessibility and equitable outcomes.

Sam will work to address the substantial risk associated with an abrupt return to in-person assessment, particularly for Undergraduate students entering honours this year without previous experience of in-person examinations. They believe that the University must recognise post-pandemic assessment literacy as a key priority for their students, and they will lobby against decisions regarding assessment which will not support the interests of already disadvantaged students.

Narratives have surfaced regarding academic misconduct and student integrity surrounding online assessment methods. In response, Sam will be working to improve student awareness of academic expectations and clarifying grading processes.



## **Working towards a more accessible and inclusive curriculum**

In line with the University's own commitment to improve student satisfaction, Sam will be prioritising overall student experience and staff workloads within the next stages of the Curriculum Transformation Programme. Sam will be working to encourage increased involvement of student voice within decision making related to curriculum content and delivery.

As a global institution, Edinburgh should be giving due consideration towards the diversity of its student body when approaching curriculum reform. Using Curriculum Transformation as a platform to address systemic issues within the curriculum will demonstrate the University's commitment to creating meaningful change for its future students. Sam will push to create spaces for staff and students to work together on key issues surrounding curriculum decolonisation to inform design priorities.

Sam will also be working to ensure that experiential learning within teaching is accessible, particularly for disabled students and those from Widening Participation backgrounds, so that all students feel able to fully engage with opportunities available to them. Sam is hoping to work within student engagement and experiential learning discussions to prioritise the early incorporation of reasonable adjustments into experiential learning structures, prioritising students' needs over a focus on diagnosis.

## **Improving staff and student engagement with student voice**

As the key Sabbatical Officer contact for Programme and School Representatives, Sam will continue to improve engagement and overall awareness with the Association's student voice structure across the University. They will work towards ensuring that student representatives have greater agency in learning and teaching matters, and that staff and students are partners in decisions impacting academic experience.

Sam will be chairing monthly School Representative Forums and will use these spaces to amplify engagement between our School Representatives and the wider University community. They will work to facilitate the effective escalation of issues and strengthen existing feedback mechanisms between staff and students. A key focus throughout their term will be creating accountability methods for feedback gathered from students, and streamlining the process of navigating university structures. Sam aims to develop a greater sense of trust and belonging within the University community, and enhance connectivity and collaboration between students and staff.

## **Resource implications**

5. No changes to workload are envisioned beyond existing staff remits. The Vice President Education will be working full-time with these points as priorities for the academic year.

## **Risk management**

6. To be agreed if specific actions arise from the paper.

**Responding to the Climate Emergency & Sustainable Development Goals**

7. The Students' Association recognises the urgency of the Climate Emergency and the Sabbatical Officer team will be working in collaboration with the university to educate and empower our students to tackle this important issue.

**Equality & diversity**

8. The principles of equality, diversity and inclusion remain at the heart of the Students' Association's work, and this paper reflects that. Equality and diversity implications will be considered if specific actions arise from the paper.

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

9. To be agreed if specific actions arise from the paper.

**Author**

*Name: Sam Maccallum  
Vice President Education, Edinburgh  
University Students' Association  
Date 02/09/2022*

**Presenter**

*Name: Sam Maccallum  
Vice President Education, Edinburgh  
University Students' Association*

**Freedom of Information** This paper is open.

**Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee (APRC)**

**22 September 2022**

**APRC Membership and Terms of Reference**

**Description of paper**

1. Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee (APRC) Membership and Terms of Reference for 2022/23.

**Action requested / recommendation**

2. The Membership and Terms of Reference are presented to APRC for information.

**Background and context**

3. The membership and terms of reference APRC were most recently reviewed by APRC in May 2022. A number of positions remained vacant at that time, and have since been filled over the summer. Any changes to the membership are highlighted in yellow.
4. The membership and terms of reference for APRC was most recently reviewed by Senate in [August 2022](#).
5. Senate gave time-limited approval of the membership of its Standing Committees, which will expire at the next Ordinary meeting of Senate.
6. Senate Standing Committees report to Senate annually. These committees feed into and out of College level committees (Undergraduate Education, Postgraduate Education, Quality Assurance) and specialist Support Services (the Institute for Academic Development, Careers Service, Student Recruitment and Admissions, Student Systems) via the committee members. In many cases, therefore, the committee roles are ex officio, to ensure that committee members have the appropriate knowledge, expertise and responsibility / accountability to fulfil the committee remit. All committees include student representation.
7. Senate members who are not included in APRC's membership may have opportunities to contribute to the work of these committees as co-opted members or as members of task or working groups.
8. Senate members receive notification via email when papers for Senate Standing Committees are available. Members are encouraged to feed into Standing Committee's by sharing comments or feedback with either their College representative, or in their absence, the relevant Standing Committee Convener.

**Discussion**

9. The APRC webpages have been updated with the membership as approved by Senate and as presented in this paper.
10. The APRC webpages will be updated throughout the year as required to reflect any changes to the approved membership.

**Resource implications**

11. There are no amendments to the membership of APRC which are expected to result in resource implications at this point in time.
12. A number of positions on APRC are largely defined according to defined role-holders, or as representative of particular stakeholders (e.g. College representatives). The membership of APRC is therefore largely a consequence of decisions taken elsewhere to appoint individuals to particular roles and any resource implications resulting from membership on the Committee are expected to be reflected in the role-holders duties.
13. A small number of the committee roles are ex officio, to ensure that committee members have the appropriate knowledge, expertise and responsibility / accountability to fulfil the committee remit. APRC's membership includes student representation.

**Risk management**

14. Effective academic governance assists the University in managing risk associated with its academic activities.

**Equality & diversity**

15. The composition of the Senate Committees is largely determined according to defined role-holders (e.g. defined Assistant or Vice-Principal, Director of a defined Support Service or delegate) or as representatives of particular stakeholders (e.g. a College or the Students' Association). The membership of APRC is therefore largely a consequence of decisions taken elsewhere to appoint individuals to particular roles. Ensuring that appointment processes support a diverse staff body is part of the broader responsibility of the University.

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

16. The APRC's Membership and Terms of Reference are communicated via the Academic Services website: <https://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/committees/academic-policy-regulations>
17. Senate Standing Committees are subject to an annual internal review process, and this is reported annually to Senate.

**Authors**

Olivia Hayes Academic Policy Officer  
September 2022

**Freedom of Information**

Open

**The University of Edinburgh  
Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee  
Terms of Reference**

**1. Purpose and Role**

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

**2. Remit**

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

**3. Operation**

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

**4. Composition**

Role	Term	Draft 2022/23 membership
3 x senior staff members from each College with responsibility for academic governance and regulation, and maintaining and enhancing the quality of the student experience at all levels		<p>Dr Paul Norris, Dean of Quality Assurance and Curriculum Approval (CAHSS) (Convener)</p> <p>Dr Jeremy Crang, Dean of Students (CAHSS)</p> <p>Rachael Quirk, Head of Taught Student Administration and Support (CAHSS)</p> <p>Professor Tim Stratford, Dean of Learning and Teaching (CSE)</p> <p>Stephen Warrington, Dean of Student Experience (CSE)</p> <p>Dr, Adam Bunni Head of Academic Affairs (CSE)</p> <p>Dr. Deborah Shaw, Dean of Students (CMVM)</p> <p>Professor Jamie Davies, Dean of Taught Education (CMVM)</p> <p>Philippa Burrell, Head of Academic Administration (CMVM)</p>
1 x senior staff member from each College with responsibility for postgraduate research		<p>Kirsty Woomble, Head of PGR Student Office (CAHSS)</p> <p>Dr Antony Maciocia, Dean of Postgraduate Research (CSE) (Senate member)</p> <p>Dr Paddy Hadoke, Director of Postgraduate Research and Early Career Research Experience (CMVM) (Vice-Convener)</p>
1 x Edinburgh University Students' Association sabbatical officer	Ex Officio	Sam Maccallum, Vice-President, Education
1 x member of the Edinburgh University Students' Association permanent staff		Charlotte Macdonald, Advice Place Manager, Students' Association

1 x member of staff from Student Systems and Administration	Ex Officio	Sarah McAllister, Scholarships and Financial Support Team, Student Systems
1 x member of staff from the Institute for Academic development		Professor Cathy Bovill, Senior Lecturer in Student Engagement
1 x member of staff from Academic Services		Dr. Kathryn Nicol, Head of Governance and Regulatory Framework Team
1 x member of staff from Information Services' Learning, Teaching and Web Services Division		Ms Karen Howie, Head of Digital Learning Applications and Media
Up to 3 co-options chosen by the Convener	Up to 3 years	To be confirmed, Edinburgh University Students' Association Academic Engagement Coordinator

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

#### **5. Responsibilities and Expectations of Committee Members**

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

Approved by Senate  
August 2022

## Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee

22 September 2022

### Update from the Coursework Extension and Special Circumstances Task Group

#### Description of paper

1. The paper provides APRC with an update on the work of the Coursework Extension and Special Circumstances Task Group since the group was approved in by APRC in May 2022. The task group was officially formed in August 2022.

#### Action requested / recommendation

2. APRC is asked to note the progress of the group to date.

#### Background and context

3. At its May 2022 meeting, APRC approved a task group to review the coursework extension and special circumstances policies with a view to bringing policy changes to the March 2023 meeting for implementation in the 2023-23 academic year. The approved remit, deliverables and membership of the task group are provided in Appendix 1 for information.
4. APRC agreed that there would be no change to the existing policies in 2022/23 and the task group is expected to present policy changes for approval by the end of the 2022/23 academic session. The task group are aware of the relevant meetings of APRC for annual policy approvals and the group has representation from Student Systems and Student Administration to ensure any proposed changes can be supported by systems and in time for implementation the following year.

#### Discussion

5. Over the summer, the Convener and task group members were agreed and meetings for the year ahead were arranged. Meetings are currently front-loaded in Semester 1, to work towards the required deadlines for any systems changes. Further meetings are planned to take place in October, December and January.
6. The first meeting of the group was held in late August and a timeline for the work of the group was discussed. The group are aware of the significant dissatisfaction around the existing policies and there was strong appetite for improvement among members. The group agreed that the timeline is very ambitious, however agreed that the existing policies and associated workload are unsustainable across all areas of the University and there is a strong drive for positive change in this area.
7. Ahead of the next meeting of the task group members have been invited to identify key elements they would like to see if any policy redraft. It has been agreed that any changes to policy will be accompanied by guidance for staff and students, as set out in the deliverables for the task group.

#### Resource implications



8. The potential resource implications of the task group were considered by APRC when approving the group. At present, resource implications are limited to the work of the members on the task group and members were made aware of the expected resource requirements via the terms of reference.
9. The existing policies on coursework extensions and special circumstances require a high level of resource and the impact of policies on staff workload is a key driver in undertaking this review. Resource is a key focus of the work of the task group. The review of policies is being undertaken with the intention of presenting changes to policy that will reduce the resource required to support these.
10. The task group are considering the implications of student and staff workload in any policy redrafting.
11. The group have received a strong steer from APRC that this is a crucial area of review, and members have been asked to prioritise this area of work.

### **Risk management**

12. The timeframe for completion of work is ambitious and the task group may struggle to adhere to the current timeframe if the work goes beyond the specific and restricted remit as a response to discussions following the remit being confirmed.
13. There is a risk of industrial action taking place which may have an impact on the group's work and ability to adhere to the current timeframes.
14. There are potential risks relating to resourcing and staff workload if this work is not undertaken.
15. There are potential risks relating to the student experience and support provided to students if this work is not undertaken.
16. The task group are aware of the risks associated with the review of these policies and are carefully considering the staff and student experience throughout their work.

### **Equality & diversity**

17. Equality and diversity implications are being considered by the task group at each stage of their work. The work of the task group to date does not carry impacts for student in any particular characteristic groups.

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

18. The paper does not propose a change to policy at this stage and is for information only.

#### **Author**

Professor Sabine Rolle  
Convener of CE & SC Task Group

#### **Presenter**

No presenter

Olivia Hayes  
Academic Policy Officer  
September 2022

**Freedom of Information  
Open**

**Appendix 1:****Task Group to review Coursework Extension and Special Circumstances Policies****Background:**

The University policies on coursework extensions and special circumstances were last reviewed prior to the launch of the ESC service. The centralisation of the service has provided an opportunity to reflect on the type and volume of coursework extension and special circumstances applications received, the challenges that the existing policies present, and provides opportunities to target and develop support for students in areas they find difficult.

**a. Remit:**

To review the University-wide policies on coursework extensions and special circumstances for taught courses. The group will not consider extensions and special circumstances policies related to research programmes.

The task group will look to amend the existing policies to ensure they provide supportive and appropriate outcomes for students, while making an efficient and proportionate use of staff time. It is intended that the task group will take a collaborative approach to the review, working closely with colleagues in ESC to ensure that recommended policy changes can be implemented by the service. The precise remit of the group may be amended in response to the outcomes of the ESC review. The task group aims to:

- Consider the existing distinction between the coursework extensions and special circumstances processes, and determine whether this remains desirable, needs clarification, or if there is scope for integration;
- Consider and potentially refine the acceptable grounds for requesting a coursework extension or applying for special circumstances;
- Consider the approach to requiring evidence to support an application for coursework extensions or special circumstances;
- Provide clarity around the application, consideration and approval process, in relation to coursework extensions and special circumstances;
- Clarify the process for determining appropriate outcomes in the special circumstances process, including whether this should take account of the perceived severity of circumstances.
- Review the current special circumstances outcomes and consider whether there is scope to refine or clarify actions.

The task group will align its work with the outcomes delivered by the ESC Review and the Assessment and Feedback working group.

The group will not provide recommendations relating to student support required to support policy changes, though any insights gained into student behaviours or gaps in the provision of support will be shared with the relevant services.

**b. Membership:**

Convener & Chair. To be nominated at the first meeting.

3 x Representative each from CMVM and CSE. 4 x Representative from CAHSS<sup>1</sup>. College representatives will comprise of one College representative, one School academic representative such as a Director of Teaching or Convener of a Board of Examiners, and one School professional services representative such as a teaching administration or student support staff member.

Colleges are asked to consider breadth of student type and experience in nominating their representatives.

1 x Representative for Postgraduate Research as determined by the Doctoral College

1 x Representatives from Academic Services (also acting as secretary to the group)

2 x Representatives from Student Administration, including a representative from ESC and Student Systems

2 x Representatives from Support Services, for instance, colleagues from SDS or IAD

3 x Student Representatives ,including one representative from The Advice Place and two representatives from the Students' Association, comprising of one elected member and one permanent staff member.

**c. Methodology:**

4 task group meetings and consideration of e-business via a dedicated Microsoft Teams site.

**d. Deliverables**

- Proposed revisions to University policy and regulations relating to coursework extensions
- Proposed revisions University policy and regulations relating to special circumstances
- New guidance for students and staff regarding coursework extensions to be formulated following any revisions to policy and regulation as appropriate.
- New guidance for students and staff regarding special circumstances to be formulated following any revisions to policy and regulation as appropriate.

---

<sup>1</sup> CAHSS have four College representatives on the group to reflect the higher student numbers within this College.

The task group is to reflect on Equality, Diversity and Inclusion from an early stage in formulating any recommended revisions to the coursework extension and special circumstances policies.

**e. Timelines:**

The task group will meet approximately four times over the course of the 2022-23 academic year.

The first meeting will take place in early August, following the release of the ESC Review outcomes. A schedule for further meetings will be agreed at the first meeting of the task group. The task group's work is expected to be front-loaded in Semester 1, with the group expected to have a clear direction of travel by January 2023 and in time for any systems changes to be made for the following year.

A final report is to be prepared for the March 2023 meeting of APRC for implementation in the 2023-24 Academic Year.