

Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee
Thursday 23 May 2024 2:00pm
Cuillin Room, Charles Stewart House (hybrid meeting)

UNCONFIRMED MINUTES

<p>Present: Dr Adam Bunni</p> <p>Professor Jeremy Crang Professor Jamie Davies Lisa Dawson Dr Murray Earle Lucy Evans Professor Patrick Hadoke (Convener)</p> <p>Clair Halliday Karen Howie</p> <p>Alexandra Laidlaw Professor Antony Maciocia Callum Paterson Professor Tim Stratford Dr Emily Taylor</p> <p>Professor Stephen Warrington (Vice-Convener) Kirsty Woomble</p> <p>Substitute members: Olivia Eadie on behalf of Donna Murray Valentina Ferlito on behalf of Uzma Tufail-Hanif Patrick Walsh on behalf of Aidan Brown</p> <p>In attendance: Meg Batty Craig Bolan Andrew Horrell Patrick Jack Cristina Matthews</p> <p>Catriona Morley</p> <p>Paul Norris</p> <p>Apologies: Dr Aidan Brown Lucy Evans</p>	<p>Head of Academic Policy and Regulation, Academic Services Dean of Students (CAHSS) Dean of Taught Education (CMVM) Academic Registrar, Registry Services Elected member of Senate (CAHSS) Deputy Secretary, Students (Co-opted member) Director of Postgraduate Research and Early Career Research Experience (CMVM) The Advice Place, Deputy Manager Head of Digital Learning Applications and Media, Information Services Head of Academic Affairs (CSE) Dean of Postgraduate Research (CSE) Academic Engagement Coordinator, Students' Association Dean of Learning and Teaching (CSE) Dean of Quality Assurance and Curriculum Validation (CAHSS) Dean of Student Experience (CSE)</p> <p>Head of PGR Student Office (CAHSS)</p> <p>Co-Director (IAD)</p> <p>Elected member of Senate (CMVM)</p> <p>Elected member of Senate (CSE)</p> <p>Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services Performance Sport Coordinator Senior Lecturer, MHSES Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services APRC administrator and Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services Head of Taught Student Administration & Support (CAHSS) Senior Lecturer, SPS (Seconded to Curriculum Transformation Project)</p> <p>Elected member of Senate (CSE) Deputy Secretary, Students</p>
---	--

<p>Carl Harper Dr Donna Murray Dr Deborah Shaw Dr Uzma Tufail-Hanif</p>	<p>Vice President Education, Students' Association Head of Taught Student Development (IAD) Dean of Students (CMVM) Elected member of Senate (CMVM)</p>
--	--

<p>1.</p>	<p>Welcome and apologies</p> <p>The Convener welcomed members and introduced substitute members. The Convener also welcomed Cat Morley, who will soon join the Committee as a member in the role of Head of Taught Student Administration and Support in CAHSS, and will be observing this meeting.</p> <p>The Convener thanked a number of members for whom this may be the last Committee meeting, for their contributions to the Committee. This included the Students' Association VP Education for 2023/24, a number of representatives from CSE, and Senate representatives, for whom this may also be the last meeting, depending on the outcome of the Senate Standing Committee elections.</p> <p>It was also noted that a number of guests would be joining the meeting in order to present papers.</p>	
<p>2.</p>	<p>Minutes of the previous meeting To approve</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21 March 2024 <p>The Committee approved the minutes of the meeting from the 21 March 2024 as presented.</p>	<p>APRC 23/24 7A</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>3.1 Matters Arising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convener's communications <p>Notes of interest for Convener and Vice-Convener: The Convener noted that there had been a call for committee members to submit any notes of interest for the Convener and Vice-Convener roles for next year, and that these would be discussed as part of item 7 on Committee membership.</p> <p>Update from Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC): The Convener shared an update regarding the action for the Committee to request a 'for information' update from SQAC on any impact of the temporary variations to the regulations noted in the output of annual quality assurance monitoring processes, or in SQAC's discussion of degree outcomes for 22/23. The statement from SQAC was as follows:</p> <p><i>A paper on the Degrees Awarded Outcomes analysis was presented to the May meeting of SQAC. It was noted in the paper that, based on the information provided by Schools, there were two cases in one School</i></p>	<p>Verbal Update</p>

	<p><i>where students who were in the borderline for classification purposes (i.e. they had a weighted course average of 68.00-69.99%) were awarded a First Class degree, where their full profile was ultimately found to be in the 2:1 category (based on the rules relating to the award of classification in borderline cases in operation in CAHSS). There were small numbers (between 0 and 13 in any given School) of cases in several Schools involving students whose degree classification was upgraded based on their full profile of results.</i></p> <p><i>Going forward, SQAC requested more granular detail on the awarding gap and the impact on particular cohorts of students, and requested a clearer indication from School data of which mitigations have been applied. It was recognised by SQAC that e.g. extensions and special circumstances will have affected the 2022-23 data but these mitigations are not separated out from MAB mitigations.</i></p> <p>Policies due for review 2023/24: There are two policies that were due for periodic review in 2023/24 but are now expected to come to the Committee next year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for Study policy (expected for September 2024) • Shared Academic Timetabling policy (the intention is that this will be reviewed as part of a project being proposed by the Student Lifecycle Management Group) <p>• Actions log</p> <p>The Convener noted a number of updates to the actions in the action log.</p> <p>3.2 Report of Convener's Action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of approved concessions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 9 individual student concessions approved (7 PGR, 2 UG) - 2 cases of concessions to the criteria for appointing PhD External Examiners - No cohort concessions approved 	
4.	<p>Board of Examiners Handbook for Taught Courses and Programmes To approve</p> <p>This paper was presented by Adam Bunni, Head of Academic Policy and Regulation.</p> <p>The Handbook was due for periodic review this year. Consultation has been undertaken with Colleges and Schools, and the proposals set out in the paper take into account feedback as part of that consultation.</p> <p>The Committee noted the amendments in the Taught Assessment Regulations (Paper 7C) which relate to the proposed amendments to the Handbook.</p> <p>The main proposed changes are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To reduce the duplication between the Handbook and the Taught Assessment Regulations; some of the wording is 	APRC 23/24 7B and 7B Appendix 1

	<p>currently slightly different between the two documents so there is potential for confusion;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To reflect aspects of current practice where these are appropriate, e.g. examiners are not appointed by Head of College; - To clarify the roles of office holders in relation to Boards of Examiners; - To review appropriate and efficient size of Boards of Examiners. <p>The Committee agreed that there was no additional conflict of interest presented by Cohort Leads being able to take the role of Convener of a Board of Examiners (4.5). There was discussion regarding whether or not there was a conflict of interest between being a marker and being a Convener. The Committee agreed that, as with Programme Directors and Course Organisers, markers could take the role of Convener as long as formal chairing of the Board was delegated to another member of the Board for discussion of the course where there is a potential conflict of interest.</p> <p>Members agreed that where the Handbook mentions the Head of School, it should be clear that the Head of School may delegate specific responsibilities.</p> <p>Members welcomed the addition of 4.22, whereby Board meetings are able to take place asynchronously, given that this sometimes happens in practice. However, members agreed that it should be clarified that asynchronous meetings should be exceptional, rather than routine practice, and that Schools should seek approval from their College if an asynchronous meeting was required. College members noted that approval would not be required for 'mop-up' discussions following a Board meeting, e.g. where a meeting is held asynchronously, following the formal Board meeting, in order to follow up on specific outstanding items.</p> <p>Members noted a number of typos in the numbering, which will be corrected by Academic Services.</p> <p>There was discussion regarding whether the publication of prize winners contravened the principle of anonymity (5.1). The Convener clarified that it would not, given that the publication of prize information would not include specific assessment results.</p> <p>The Committee agreed to approve the proposed amendments, and that minor amendments as noted above could be approved by Convener's action.</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p>Taught Assessment Regulations 2024/25 To approve</p> <p>This paper was presented by Cristina Matthews, Academic Policy Officer.</p> <p>The Taught Assessment Regulations are reviewed on an annual basis and the Committee was invited to discuss and approve the proposed amendments. Colleges were requested to consult with their Schools</p>	<p>APRC 23/24 7C and 7C Appendix 1</p>

and submit proposals for changes to the regulations. The proposed amendments take this consultation into account.

A number of amendments were dependent on the Committee's approval of item 4 (Board of Examiners Handbook), which was now approved.

The Convener noted that the amendment to regulation 50 was dependent on Senate's approval to delegate the authority to confer degree awards to Boards of Examiners. Senate did not cover this item of business at its meeting on 22 May 2024, so this proposed amendment was withdrawn from consideration at the meeting.

The Committee agreed to replace the reference to '*examiners*' with '*markers*' in regulation 23. *Oral assessment*.

Members had queries and requested amendments, which the Committee agreed to, regarding regulation 27. *Resit assessment*:

- The Advice Place noted that there is further detail regarding how resits apply to visa-sponsored students in 27.12, but requested that this also be highlighted nearer to the top of the regulation so that students would not overlook this.
- CSE requested further review of regulation 27.5 to clarify that the next available opportunity for resits also applies to visiting students. Academic Services agreed to draft amended wording to reflect this, and the Committee agreed that this could be approved by Convener's action.
- To change "may be awarded the higher mark" to "will be awarded the higher mark" in 27.9 since this should be applied consistently and should not be at the discretion of the Board.

Members agreed to add the link to proofreading guidance to 30.3 (in relation to Academic Misconduct).

There were several further comments, which the Committee agreed required no amendments:

- Members discussed whether or not regulation 27.6 would include periods of interruption of study. Members agreed to keep the wording as is, given that this allows Colleges flexibility on how to best manage the concessions required for these cases.
- One member noted that in regulation 27.10, it is technically possible that students achieve a classification of 'fail' based on their original result, but achieve a classification of 'pass' upon their resit result. Members agreed that, although this was possible, the cases are extremely infrequent and sufficiently niche to not include this in the regulations, but that the Committee would consider concessions in these cases.

A member noted a reference to '*special circumstances*' which should be amended to '*exceptional circumstances*', in line with the new policy.

The Committee agreed to **approve** the proposed amendments, including the minor amendments agreed during the meeting (as above), and that these could be approved by Convener's action.

<p>6.</p>	<p>Postgraduate Assessment Regulations for Research Degrees 2024/25 To approve</p> <p>This paper was presented by Cristina Matthews, Academic Policy Officer.</p> <p>As with the previous item 5, the amendment to regulation 40 was dependent on Senate’s approval to delegate the authority to confer degree awards to Boards of Examiners. Senate did not cover this item of business at its meeting on 22 May 2024, so this proposed amendment was withdrawn from consideration at the meeting.</p> <p>The Committee agreed to approve the proposed amendments, with no further amendments.</p>	<p>APRC 23/24 7D and 7D Appendix 1</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Committee membership 2024/25 For information</p> <p>This paper was presented by the Committee Convener.</p> <p>As part of this item, the Convener explained that the Committee would need to approve its Convener and Vice-Convener roles for next year, which is done on an annual basis at the last Committee meeting of the year. Members had been asked in advance whether there were any notes of interest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One note of interest for Convener role (from Prof Patrick Hadoke, the current Convener) - One note of interest for Vice-Convener role (from Dr Emily Taylor) <p>The Convener asked for confirmation of whether there were any further notes of interest. Members present noted there were no further notes of interest.</p> <p>For discussion of the role of Convener, Prof Hadoke left the room. Prof Warrington, as Vice-Convener, chaired this part of the meeting. The Committee discussed and approved that Prof Hadoke continue in the role of Convener for the next academic year 2024/25.</p> <p>The current Vice-Convener, Prof Warrington, confirmed that he would be stepping down from his role as Dean of Student Experience in CSE later in 2024, and would thereafter not continue as a member on the Committee. The Convener thanked Prof Warrington for fulfilling the role of Vice-Convener for 2023/24. For discussion of the role of Vice-Convener, Dr Taylor left the room. The Committee discussed and approved that Dr Taylor take the role of Vice-Convener for the next academic year 2024/25.</p> <p>The Convener confirmed that the elections for the Senate representatives at the Senate Standing Committees for 2024/25 was still to take place. Current Senate representatives were advised that, if they would like to continue to represent Senate at the Committee, they should present their nomination to these elections. Senate representatives for this Committee for 2024/25 would therefore be</p>	<p>APRC 23/24 7E</p>

	<p>confirmed once the outcome of the elections for members of the Senate Standing Committees had been confirmed.</p> <p>The Convener also noted that the Standing Committees membership paper was due to go to Senate for approval at its meeting yesterday (22 May 2024), but that the meeting did not cover this item of the agenda.</p> <p>The Convener also noted that there would be further changes to the membership, with a number of ex-officio members who had either finished their term of office, or would be leaving their current roles in the next academic year, and new members who would be taking on these roles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dylan Walch will become a new member of the Committee from June 2024 as the new Students' Association VP Education, a role currently held by Carl Harper. - Catriona Morley (in attendance at this meeting) will formally become a new member of the Committee once she commences in the role of Head of Taught Student Administration & Support (CAHSS), previously held by Rachael Quirk. - All four ex-officio CSE members would be demitting from, or moving to new roles within the University over the course of 2024/25, with their replacements to be confirmed in due course. 	
<p>8.</p>	<p>Senate Committees' Internal Effectiveness Review For comment</p> <p>This paper was presented by the Committee Convener.</p> <p>Senate Standing Committee members will be invited by the Committee Administrator to respond to an online survey regarding the Committee's effectiveness, in line with the Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance during Summer 2024. The number of survey questions has been reduced since last year, and these were provided in Appendix 1 to the paper.</p> <p>The Convener noted that the main issue to highlight was the low response rate the survey had received in previous years, and encouraged all members to complete this. Members who are not to continue on the Committee for 2024/25 should still complete the survey, given that it is a reflection on the Committee's effectiveness over the past year.</p> <p>There were no comments from members on this item.</p>	<p>APRC 23/24 7F</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p>Curriculum Transformation: Taught Postgraduate (PGT) Curriculum Framework and Programme Archetypes For comment</p> <p>Secondee to the Curriculum Transformation Project, Paul Norris, presented this paper.</p> <p>This paper was presented to the Committee for comment, as a follow up to discussions held at Senate at its meeting on 22 May 2024. The paper specifically highlights policy issues in relation to the PGT aspects of the Curriculum Transformation Project (CTP), which will be presented</p>	<p>APRC 23/24 7G</p>

to the Committee for consideration in due course. The paper also includes a proposed timeline for implementation, and it is anticipated that the work will be undertaken during 2024/25.

The presenter noted that Senate will have final approval of any approvals made by APRC in relation to CTP proposals.

The key issues the Committee discussed were:

Progression points

The presenter noted that the range of current practices relating to progression means there is a lack of consistency across the University regarding the criteria and purpose of progression points. The range of practices includes Masters programmes that have progression points for a range of routes, e.g. taught-only or dissertation, as well as programmes with elevated hurdles. The presenter noted initial discussions at a workshop with SQAC members, who had suggested that there may be different approaches to progression for different archetypes. SQAC members at the workshop had also suggested that it would be desirable to review practices with elevated hurdles for progression, particularly given that these decisions are approved by Boards of Studies without any guidance, and there is now a lack of consistency across Schools.

The Committee noted that some Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs) stipulate elevated hurdles for progression, and agreed that these will need to be accommodated within the new framework.

A member from CAHSS noted that they have had initial discussions with their Schools about removing progression points. Most staff seemed open to this in principle, although some staff still consider that dissertations are at a higher level than taught courses, even though they are at the same SCQF level. The presenter noted the argument that some programme outcomes can only be covered in the dissertation, even if it is accepted that they are at the same level, and that these programmes would be able to retain the dissertation as a compulsory element within the new archetypes.

A member noted that the data obtained following the marking and assessment boycott showed that students who were allowed to progress (in the absence of the standard amount of data required for progression decisions) did not then fail, and that other students did, i.e., that progression criteria were not a useful predictor of student performance in the dissertation.

The presenter explained that there would be consultation with Colleges and Schools on this over summer 2024, and that the expectation was to return to the Committee with proposals in early 2024/25. It was likely that proposals would include a set of options for progression.

A member requested that the CTP team include staff who work with Postgraduate Research students as part of any consultations, and that the CTP team be alert to the needs of Postgraduate Research students who take PGT courses as part of their PhD programmes, as well as

MSc by Research programmes, and where these would fit into the CTP models.

PGT models and archetypes

The presenter noted that the majority of existing programmes will fit into the proposed archetypes and that there would be no additional approval required for these. There was clarification regarding the mechanisms for identifying programmes that do not fit into the archetypes, and confirmation that there will be multiple routes for checking this, e.g., via Programme Directors and also via Deans and Colleges.

A member from CMVM noted that their College consider the proposed PGT framework will be a helpful simplification of the approval mechanisms, and that it will enable staff to make changes to programmes, and set up new programmes, in more efficient ways.

A member noted some concerns regarding the option for stackable programmes that are research-based/experience-based (Model E), given that assessment of these could be very difficult, and that it would be helpful to have more clarity on these. The presenter agreed that there may be aspects of this model that need further review, given that Model E is one of the new models. It was confirmed that there would be no requirement for every programme to offer every option, i.e. not all programmes would need to offer stackable models. The presenter also noted that it would be useful for the Committee to consider how it would like to review these sorts of amendments in future.

A member noted the comments at the Senate meeting on 22 May 2024 regarding whether or not the framework is transformative, and what the archetypes would do that was not done already. Members noted that the proposed framework would standardise approaches currently approved by exception, which would enable staff to set up, and modify, more innovative programmes without needing to seek concessions to regulations from APRC. This would in turn reduce the workload for Programme Directors and administrators in Schools, as well as Board of Studies and College committees.

Degree-specific regulations

The presenter noted that many of the degree-specific regulations had been included in the general degree regulations many years ago, and that some of these no longer applied, some of them were no longer exemptions from the standard regulations, and some would be covered within the new CTP archetypes. The presenter proposed that CTP could be an opportunity to remove these degree-specific regulations, and that these would be better placed in programme handbooks.

Members supported the proposal to remove the degree-specific regulations, given that many are out of date and also that there are exemptions agreed at the Committee which are not included in the regulations, so the current approach to these is inconsistent.

Study period table

The presenter noted that the Study Period Table would need to be adapted for the new degree models, and that this would come to the Committee for discussion and/or approval.

	<p>Maximum duration of PGT degrees The presenter noted that there is currently no maximum period stated in the regulations for PGT degrees, as there is for UG degrees. Given the proposal to include stackable models of degrees, this is a discussion that will need to take place.</p> <p>Regarding point 15 of paper 7G, the Committee agreed that simple changes to terminology could be approved by Convener's Action, but that any more substantial changes to policy should come to the full Committee.</p>	
<p>10.</p>	<p>Performance Sport Policy To approve</p> <p>Craig Bolan, Performance Sport Coordinator at Sports and Exercise, and Andrew Horrell, Senior Lecturer at Moray House, presented this paper.</p> <p>The proposed amendments follow the periodic review of this policy, which has not had a significant review since it was introduced in 2015. The policy review has been led by colleagues in Sport and Exercise and Moray House with support from Academic Services.</p> <p>Amongst our students we have athletes who are at the highest level, and the requirements of these athletes are increasingly demanding. The proposed amendments aim to clarify the eligibility criteria and also to provide more flexibility for adjustments without impacting on students' ability to complete their degree.</p> <p>The Committee discussed the options for adjustments and agreed that it was critical that academic standards were maintained. Some members noted that it can be difficult to know how far to go with the adjustments without there being more detail in the policy, and that Schools may therefore take different approaches. Overall, members agreed that the proposed wording was appropriate but also agreed to include a sentence to note that where Schools were unsure about the approach to take, they should consult with their College.</p> <p>The Committee also agreed that in order to enable students to take part in elite sports it is reasonable that there should be a higher tolerance of risk to students' academic progress associated with this policy than with other policies. Student athletes are aware of these risks, and as staff we need to help students understand and manage those risks.</p> <p>There was discussion about how this policy interacts with other policies, e.g. interruptions of study, maximum periods of study, etc. The Convener confirmed that very few concessions to policies and regulations reviewed by this Committee relate to performance sport.</p> <p>The Committee agreed to approve the proposed amendments, including the minor amendment agreed during the meeting (as above).</p>	<p>APRC 23/24 7H and 7H Appendix 1</p>

<p>11.</p>	<p>Academic misconduct investigation procedures To approve</p> <p>Meg Batty, Academic Policy Officer, presented this paper.</p> <p>This policy was not due for periodic review; however, the amendments proposed are in response to feedback from teams across the University, e.g., the appeals team, College Academic Misconduct Officers (CAMOs), School Academic Misconduct Officers (SAMOs), and the Students' Association Advice Place.</p> <p>The key amendments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarification of how affirmation meetings fit in to the procedures - Addition of penalty options for pass/fail courses, which were not previously included - Addition of information regarding requirements for reporting academic misconduct investigations to students in receipt of UKRI funding - Formatting and clarifications <p>Affirmation meetings</p> <p>The Committee discussed the addition of affirmation meetings in 2.2. The paper's author confirmed that the inclusion of affirmation meetings is to ensure that these take place separately, and not as part of the academic misconduct procedures, and that students should have the opportunity to respond to an allegation of academic misconduct in addition to any affirmation meetings, if these have taken place.</p> <p>Members agreed that describing the affirmation meeting as a 'precursor' of an investigation could be misleading given that there may be no follow-up investigation, and could also be misinterpreted as being a new compulsory step prior to screening. The Committee agreed to remove section 2.2 and instead clarify in sections 4.1 and 5 that students must be offered the opportunity to respond to the allegations, regardless of any prior interventions or meetings.</p> <p>Reporting of academic misconduct to UKRI</p> <p>Members noted that there was potential for confusion regarding whether research misconduct or academic misconduct should apply, particularly for PhD students, and noted that the Doctoral College would likely review the guidance on research misconduct.</p> <p>A member queried whether the reporting of academic misconduct in these cases was in line with GDPR regulations. The paper author confirmed that it was, and advice from Legal Services was that, given that this is a requirement within the UKRI Terms and Conditions, the University and students in receipt of their funding would be bound by these Terms and Conditions.</p> <p>'Breach' vs 'offence'</p> <p>A member representing the Students' Association Advice Place noted the replacement of the term 'breach' with 'offence', reversing the change made in previous years. The Advice Place were concerned about reintroducing the term 'offence', and noted that removing this had resulted in fewer students thinking that they needed a lawyer. The</p>	<p>APRC 23/24 7I and 7I Appendix 1</p>
------------	---	---

	<p>paper author explained that staff had correctly pointed out that the phrase 'breach of the procedures' did not make sense. The Committee agreed to replace references to 'offence', either with 'academic misconduct investigation', or by rewording the sentence simply to remove the word.</p> <p>The Committee agreed to add a link in section 1.1 to the Guidance on the appropriate use of AI, and also to remove some of the double negatives between sections 3.3, 3.4 and 3.6.</p> <p>The Committee agreed to approve the proposed amendments, including the minor amendments agreed during the meeting (as above), and that these could be approved by Convener's action.</p>	
<p>12.</p>	<p>Programme and Course Handbooks policy To approve</p> <p>Patrick Jack, Academic Policy Officer, presented this paper.</p> <p>The proposed amendments are a result of a policy review conducted within Academic Services in consultation with key stakeholders. The number of amendments is small, mainly to ensure that the information and links provided are up to date, and there none of the amendments are substantive changes.</p> <p>The Committee agreed that it would be helpful for the policy to clarify that course and programme handbooks may contain degree-specific regulations.</p> <p>There was also discussion about the requirement for degree-specific progression requirements to be publicly available, and how this interacts with the option to hold copies of course and programme handbooks on webpages that are not publicly accessible (e.g. wikis or Virtual Learning Environments). The Committee agreed it would be helpful for the policy to clarify that these requirements must also be available publicly (for example, on the Degree Programme Table) if the course and programme handbooks were not publicly available.</p> <p>The Committee agreed to approve the proposed amendments, and to incorporate the minor amendments as noted above could be approved by Convener's action.</p>	<p>APRC 23/24 7J and 7J Appendix 1</p>
<p>13.</p>	<p>Exceptional Circumstances policy communications plan To note</p> <p>Lisa Dawson, Academic Registrar, presented this paper.</p> <p>A member representing the Students' Association Advice Place noted that the plan included lots of communications at the start of semester, but that these might need to be repeated around assessment/exam times. The Advice Place also asked whether it was possible to have early sight of emails before these were sent to students.</p> <p>Members also noted that there should be central oversight of communications sent out by Schools, and that key contacts at Graduate</p>	<p>APRC 23/24 7K</p>

	Schools should be included in order to ensure there is an awareness that the policy will apply to PGR students taking taught courses.	
14.	<p>Pass/fail arrangements for HCA year abroad courses To approve</p> <p>Emily Taylor, Dean of Quality Assurance and Curriculum Validation (CAHSS), presented this paper on behalf of the College.</p> <p>This paper requests approval for a concession to Taught Assessment Regulation 35.3, which states that “courses with pass/fail assessment may not be offered during the Honours years of a programme unless Academic Policy and Regulations Committee has approved an exemption.” The request follows similar requests approved by APRC previously for courses within the School of Literatures, Languages and Cultures (LLC). The paper has already been approved by the School’s Board of Studies and by the College.</p> <p>The Committee approved the concession.</p>	APRC 23/24 7L
15.	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>The Academic Registrar provided the Committee with the following updates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Watch that Gap project: Meetings to take place next week to agree how to operationalise the recommendations from the project. - Senate Task & Finish (T&F) Group: The T&F Group had agreed that members of the T&F Group may observe meetings of Senate Standing Committee. The Committee agreed to support this. 	
<p>Date of next meeting Thursday 19 September 2024, 2-5pm, at Charles Stewart House, Cuillin Room (central area) (hybrid meeting)</p>		